

**The Concept of Liturgical Reform in the Writings of Romano Guardini
and Joseph Ratzinger / Pope Benedict XVI: A Comparative Analysis**

Róbert Kürnyek

Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Theology, Saint Paul University,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Doctorate of Philosophy degree in Theology

Ottawa, Canada
2016

© Róbert Kürnyek, Ottawa, Canada, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
SIGLA AND ABBREVIATIONS	3
INTRODUCTION	4
1. LITURGY AND THEOLOGY: CONNECTION AND DEVELOPMENT	10
1.1 SHIFT IN THE INTERPRETATION OF PROSPER'S ADAGE	12
1.1.1 <i>The Original Meaning of Prosper of Aquitaine's Adage</i>	15
1.1.2 <i>Lex Orandi – Lex Credendi in Pope Pius XII's Encyclical Mediator Dei</i>	18
1.1.2.1 The Teaching of the Encyclical	18
1.1.2.2 Liturgical and Theological Consequences	21
1.1.3 <i>The Understanding of Prosper's Adage in the Liturgical Movement</i>	25
1.1.4 <i>Liturgy and Theology in the Time of the Liturgical Reform of Vatican II</i>	29
1.2 THEOLOGY AND LITURGY BY ROMANO GUARDINI	33
1.2.1 <i>An Important Category: Der Gegensatz</i>	33
1.2.2 <i>References to Liturgy and Theology</i>	36
1.3 LITURGY AND THEOLOGY BY JOSEPH RATZINGER	40
1.3.1 <i>The Meaning of Theology</i>	40
1.3.2 <i>Theology, Magisterium and Liturgy</i>	48
1.4 CONCLUSION OF CHAPTER 1	53
2. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL TURN IN ROMANO GUARDINI'S INTERPRETATION OF LITURGICAL REFORM	56
2.1 FALSE PATHS OF LITURGICAL RENEWAL: THE 1940 LETTER <i>EIN WORT ZUR LITURGISCHEN FRAGE</i>	57
2.1.1 <i>Liturgicism: Liturgy for the Sake of Liturgy</i>	60
2.1.2 <i>Dilettantism: Liturgical One-Sidedness</i>	62
2.1.3 <i>Pragmatism: Realizing Only the Doable</i>	65
2.1.4 <i>Conservatism: Inaccurate Concept of History and Development</i>	66
2.1.5 <i>Elements of Liturgical Renewal</i>	69
2.2 ENABLED TO PERFORM THE LITURGICAL ACT: THE LETTER <i>DER KULTAKT UND DIE GEGENWÄRTIGE AUFGABE DER LITURGISCHEN BILDUNG</i> 1964	71
2.2.1 <i>Rediscovering the Centrality of the Liturgical Act</i>	72
2.2.2 <i>Consequences of Guardini's Approach</i>	75
2.3 LITURGICAL FORMATION AS THE KERNEL OF LITURGICAL REFORM	80
2.3.1 <i>Recognition of the Connection between Spiritual and Material Existence</i>	81
2.3.2 <i>The Recovery of the Interrelationship between Human Being and Things</i>	86
2.3.3 <i>Living out the Tension between Individual and Community in the Liturgy</i>	88
2.3.4 <i>Maintaining the Objective Character of the Liturgy</i>	93
2.3.5 <i>Allowing Culture to Influence Religion</i>	97
2.4 REFORM IN LITURGICAL PRAXIS	99
2.5 A CONCLUDING WORD ON LITURGICAL FORMATION	103
3. JOSEPH RATZINGER AND THE NEW LITURGICAL MOVEMENT	108
3.1 ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VATICAN II LITURGICAL REFORM	111
3.1.1 <i>Position on the Liturgical Reform</i>	112
3.1.2 <i>Reasons for the Unsuccessful Implementation</i>	123
3.2 RATZINGER'S PROPOSALS FOR A LITURGICAL RENEWAL	134
3.2.1 <i>Principles of Liturgical Renewal</i>	135
3.2.2 <i>Renewal of the Liturgical Awareness: Liturgical Formation</i>	141

3.2.3 <i>Renewal in Praxis</i> _____	145
3.3 POPE BENEDICT XVI'S LITURGICAL PRAXIS _____	151
3.4 CONCLUSION OF CHAPTER 3 _____	155
4. THE CRITERIA FOR LITURGICAL REFORM _____	158
4.1 ON THE ESSENCE OF LITURGY _____	160
4.1.1 <i>The Subject of the Liturgy</i> _____	163
4.1.2 <i>The Church</i> _____	167
4.1.3 <i>The Individual-Community Relation</i> _____	173
4.1.4 <i>Objectivity and Subjectivity in the Liturgy</i> _____	179
4.1.5 <i>A Concluding Word on the Liturgy</i> _____	185
4.2 CRITERIA FOR THE REFORM OF THE LITURGY _____	186
4.2.1 <i>Guardini's Criteria</i> _____	189
4.2.1.1 Liturgical Reform Is Formation _____	190
4.2.1.2 Liturgical Reform Acknowledges the Human _____	190
4.2.1.3 Liturgical Reform Operates on Communitarian Level _____	191
4.2.1.4 The Objective Character of Liturgy to be Maintained _____	191
4.2.1.5 Liturgical Reform Must Concentrate on the Liturgical Act _____	192
4.2.1.6 Appreciation of Interconnected Elements _____	192
4.2.2 <i>Ratzinger's Criteria</i> _____	193
4.2.2.1 Having a Clear Understanding of the Church's Faith _____	194
4.2.2.2 Finding the Real Subject of the Liturgy: Christ _____	195
4.2.2.3 Faithfulness to History, Tradition, and Organic Development _____	196
4.2.2.4 Understanding of the Nature of the Liturgy _____	197
4.2.2.5 Liturgical Reform Means Formation _____	197
4.3 CONCLUSION OF CHAPTER 4 _____	198
5. FROM LITURGICAL REFORM TO LITURGICAL PRAXIS _____	201
5.1 THE FUTURE OF THE ROMAN RITE AND ITS EXTRAORDINARY FORM _____	203
5.1.1 <i>The Coexistence of the Two Forms of the Roman Rite</i> _____	205
5.1.2 <i>Pre-Conciliar Liturgy in the Context of a Post-Conciliar Theology</i> _____	208
5.2 THE FUTURE OF THE ORDINARY FORM _____	213
5.3 NEED FOR A REFORM OF THE REFORM? _____	219
CONCLUSION _____	227
BIBLIOGRAPHY _____	233

SIGLA AND ABBREVIATIONS

CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
FThS	Freiburger Theologische Studien
HK	Herder Korrespondenz
JLW	Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft
LG	Lumen Gentium
LJ	Liturgisches Jahrbuch
LMD	La Maison-Dieu
PL	Patrologia Latina
RPL	Rivista di pastorale liturgica
SC	Sacrosanctum Concilium
SL	Studia Liturgica
SPL	Studia Patristica et Liturgica
StdZ	Stimmen der Zeit

INTRODUCTION

The observer is often lost among the many attempts to define the relationship between the theology of the liturgy and liturgical praxis. This discussion—a debating point in contemporary theological discussion—expanded in 2007, the year of the publication of *Summorum Pontificum*, an Apostolic Letter on the connection between the ordinary and the extraordinary forms of the Roman Rite and thus on the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council.

The debate is not merely about the differences between theological and liturgical ideas or how liturgy is interpreted by different theologians or liturgists. It is rather how the Church sees and understands liturgy in its own life and how it refers to the liturgical reform of the Council. It seems that the liturgical discussion has become extremely polarized, as if it would be the proving ground for the origins of the teaching of the Council. There are those who completely reject the liturgical reform of the Council: the Society of Pius X, for example. However, even inside the Catholic Church one can find both a desire for a major liberalization of the liturgy that will free it from all significant boundaries and rubrics, thereby adjusting it to the needs of the concrete celebrating community, and a desire for strict liturgical exactness to guarantee the preservation of the traditional and transcendental character of liturgy. Naturally, there are several other positions between these two extremes, but it seems that these two extremes dominate liturgical theological discussion. I am convinced that this is not merely a problem affecting the first decades of the twenty-first century, but that it is a general problem for

the future—that of deciding what liturgy is and how we should evaluate the liturgical reform of Vatican II. In this present work I intend to offer the examples of two great thinkers of the twentieth century: Romano Guardini and Joseph Ratzinger, the future Pope Benedict XVI.

Joseph Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy evokes considerable debate in contemporary theological discussion. During his papacy this discussion became more intense, involving not only his theological ideas, but his papal teaching on liturgy, and the meaning of the changes in papal liturgical praxis as well. In this liturgical theological discussion, the alert thinker observes the polarization of opinions about Ratzinger's thought. His critics generally tend in the same direction and focus on his "mistaken" concept of liturgy and misinterpretation of Vatican II's liturgical reform. Ratzinger's critics often equate his criticism of present liturgical forms and theology with a critique of the Council itself.¹ Supporters of Ratzinger's thought, however, praise the emphasis on tradition and his Christocentric understanding of liturgy based on its given nature.²

¹ Reviewing Ratzinger's *Der Geist der Liturgie: eine Einführung* (Freiburg: Herder, 2002), Albert Gerhards writes: "In many places in Cardinal Ratzinger's book, his often expressed concern is emphasised that the reform of the liturgy was miscarried both in its basis and in its implementation" (my translation). "An vielen Stellen des Buchs von Kardinal Ratzinger wird seine schon vielfach geäußerte Sorge deutlich, dass die Liturgiereform sowohl in ihren Grundlagen, als auch in ihrer konkreten Umsetzung vielfach ins Leere gegangen sei." Albert Gerhards, "Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Kardinal Ratzingers neuer Einführung in den christlichen Gottesdienst," *HK* 54 (2000): 263-268, here 267.

Critics see their contentions confirmed by the fact that Pope Benedict XVI gave permission for a wide use of the Roman Rite that was used before Vatican II. Benedikt Kranemann refers to this decision as the "suppression of central reforms of the post-conciliar liturgy" (my translation). "Ausblendung zentraler Reformen der nachkonziliaren Liturgie." Benedikt Kranemann, "Liturgie im Widerspruch. Anfragen und Beobachtungen zum Motu proprio Summorum Pontificum," in *Ein Ritus – zwei Formen: Die Richtlinie Papst Benedikt XVI zur Liturgie*, ed. Albert Gerhards (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2008), 50-66, here 54.

² Among them are the Benedictine monk Alcuin Reid and the Italian priest Nicola Bux, consultant of the Office for the Liturgical Celebrations of the Supreme Pontiff. Alcuin Reid, "The Liturgical Reform of Pope Benedict XVI," in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*, ed. Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford (Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York:

One of the most frequently discussed topics is Ratzinger's understanding of the concept of liturgical reform, one that necessarily includes the question of the development of the liturgy. Many of Ratzinger's pre-papal liturgical writings and ideas in this area raise intense discussion. His papal praxis, in which he reintroduced many forgotten elements of previous papal liturgies, is, however, often referred to without sufficient research into or understanding of the theological motives involved. Consequently, the interpretation of the Second Vatican Council and its texts and the desire for a new liturgical movement³ can be inserted only with difficulty into a wider vision of his theology, and especially of his theology of the liturgy.

When evaluating Ratzinger's thought on liturgical reform, its theological appropriateness and its relationship to the Liturgical Movement, we need to situate the problem within the whole of his theology of the liturgy, understanding the factors that influenced his theological vision. A comparative analysis of Ratzinger's ideas on liturgical reform with those of one leader of the Liturgical Movement provides a critical stance towards Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy that can answer several of the questions raised by his critics.

The most appropriate choice for such a comparative analysis is German scholar Romano Guardini (1885-1968) of the pre-conciliar Liturgical Movement.

Scepter Publishers, 2010), 156-80. Nicola Bux, *La riforma di Benedetto XVI. La liturgia tra innovazione e tradizione* (Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 2008).

³ Joseph Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Perspektiven," in *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie. Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2008), 657-682, especially 673-7. English translation: "Assessment and Future Prospects," in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*, ed. Alcuin Reid (Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2003), 145-53, especially 150-2.

Ratzinger himself admits that Guardini influenced his theological understanding, even though he does not identify the exact areas in which this influence occurred.⁴ Guardini is considered one of the leading figures to take the Liturgical Movement to the conciliar reform of Vatican II through the formulation of the liturgical document *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.⁵ At first glance, Guardini's liturgical ideas differ from Ratzinger's systematic approach, so it is surprising to find that they have many common points, and first of all when they speak about the reform of the liturgy. This common ground will help shed new light on Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy, as it is rooted in the Liturgical Movement.

Guardini and Ratzinger's views are often quoted by those who work in the field of liturgy with the intention of supporting or refuting one or other's liturgical ideas. During his papacy, Ratzinger's liturgical ideas were often referred to as the liturgical and theological foundation of the papal liturgical praxis that became exemplary for many local churches. Romano Guardini, however, is and will remain one of the leading personalities who made possible the great liturgical reform of Vatican II. It is therefore be easy for a superficial reader to think that there is a theological—primarily liturgical—opposition between the two. In my opinion this is not the case.

In this present work I want to compare the theologies of liturgy of these two great thinkers. I will concentrate on the concept of liturgical reform, because understanding this makes it possible to see very concretely how the two view liturgy, and particularly

⁴ Joseph Ratzinger, *Milestones: Memoirs 1927-1977*, trans. E. Leiva-Merikakis (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1998), 43.

⁵ Norman Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (London: Sheed & Ward; Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990).

the theological and practical changes in liturgy. With the help of this analysis it is possible not only to perceive Ratzinger and Guardini's respective understandings of liturgy and liturgical reform correctly, but also to evaluate their preconceptions in terms of which the first represents the spirit of Vatican II, while the second represents the thinking of the time before the Council. Interpreting their thought in light of their own historical context, I intend to show that such apparent oppositions dissolve.

Because there is no similar comparative research on the question of the reform of the liturgy, I propose that my work will make a contribution to a theological question that has not been elaborated until now. An examination of Romano Guardini and Joseph Ratzinger's writings will show that their criteria for the reform of the liturgy were in accord both with each other's and also with the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council, and that such criteria can and must influence the future liturgical praxis of the Catholic Church.

In the first chapter I present the historical context and point to a significant change in the understanding of the liturgy that occurred in the period between our two thinkers. Such a change, I assume, influenced their viewpoints on the liturgy. The second and third chapters expound in a detailed way how liturgical reform was seen by Guardini and then by Ratzinger. These two chapters offer the necessary basis for a comparative analysis of their concept of liturgical reform which is provided in the fourth chapter. Here I show that by setting their thinking in their own historical, liturgical and theological context, the oppositions refine if not dissolve. The fifth chapter turns to liturgical praxis, because it is necessary to see liturgy in its own practical context and to see what the concrete results of this present work might be.

This work deals with a minor aspect of the theology of the liturgy, though I hope that it will nevertheless make a contribution both to the understanding of liturgical reform and to knowledge of the liturgical theologies of Romano Guardini and Joseph Ratzinger.

1. LITURGY AND THEOLOGY: CONNECTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The papacy of Pope Benedict XVI, his magisterial teaching and his liturgical praxis, all point to the importance of worship in the life of the Church and the individual Christian believer. When in 2005 the pope offered his vision on the interpretation of the Second Vatican Council, identifying two contradictory types of hermeneutic that has been applied in the time after the Council,⁶ a discussion was initiated that brought about a renewed emphasis on the theological and historical aspects of Christian liturgy. Even though the legitimacy of the conciliar liturgical reform and the Vatican II liturgy cannot be questioned, many voices have been raised in the last few decades, advocating a *reform of the reform*⁷ or a *new liturgical movement*,⁸ and this desire implies deficiency in or failure of the conciliar liturgical reform, at least in the view of some theologians and believers.⁹ In this discussion, an underlying question has not been elaborated

⁶ Benedetto XVI, "Una giusta ermeneutica per leggere e recepire il Concilio come grande forza di rinnovamento della Chiesa." *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*, vol. 1, 2005 (Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006), 1018-32.

⁷ A reform of the reform is demanded by, for example, Klaus Gamber, Nicola Bux, and László Dobszay. Klaus Gamber, *Ritus modernus: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Liturgiereform*. Studia Patristica et Liturgica 4 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1972); Nicola Bux, *La riforma di Benedetto XVI. La liturgia tra innovazione e tradizione* (Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 2008); László Dobszay, *The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite* (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2010).

⁸ The need for a new liturgical awareness and movement is expressed by Cardinal Ratzinger himself, but one can refer also to the New Liturgical Movement apostolate, whose webpage seeks to foster dialogue on liturgical issues. The number of contributors and visitors reveals a liturgical consciousness that seeks to preserve precious liturgical traditions and rites. For more about this, refer Joseph Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie: Eine Einführung* and the webpage of the New Liturgical Movement at <http://newliturgicalmovement.org>.

⁹ We take note of the difference between the ideas of the *reform of the reform* and the *new liturgical movement*. While the former seeks to bring about new ritual changes in the post-conciliar liturgy, representatives of the new liturgical movement focus on a larger liturgical awareness of priests and laity,

sufficiently, however, and this is the conception of liturgical reform itself. What does reforming the liturgy mean? What kind of reform can be reconciled with the nature of the liturgy? Which hermeneutical principles are needed to realize liturgical reform? What was the goal of the Liturgical Movement in terms of reform and how does this relate to the conciliar liturgical reform?

These questions shape this present work and are significant because if we seek the possibility of liturgical development and reform, while at the same time seeking to preserve the apostolic faith and tradition, at first glance we will face a tension which requires us to give preference to one or the other. While the understandings of liturgy and theology may vary, and so also the interpretation of their relationship, we do need to identify some hermeneutical principles. To this end, the present work explores the ideas on liturgical reform of two great thinkers of the last century.

Alexander Schmemmann regrets that the slogan of Vatican II, *aggiornamento*,¹⁰ was used for liturgical rather than theological reform,¹¹ for these two—*aggiornamento* (or reform) of the liturgy and *aggiornamento* (or reform) of liturgical theology—necessarily go together, even though I can find a slight difference in meaning between the two terms

following which ceremonial changes are of secondary importance. This is, however, connected to an appreciation of old liturgical rites.

¹⁰ In his discourse given on January 25, 1959, John XXIII announced the convocation of the Second Vatican Council and the *aggiornamento* of the Code of Canon Law: Giovanni XXIII, *Allocuzione del Santo Padre Giovanni XXIII con la quale annuncia il Sinodo Romano, il Concilio Ecumenico e l'aggiornamento del Codice del Diritto Canonico*, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/speeches/1959/documents/hf_j-xxiii_spe_19590125_annuncio_it.html [Access July 23, 2016].

¹¹ Alexander Schmemmann, *Liturgy and Tradition: Theological Reflections of Alexander Schmemmann*, ed. Thomas Fisch (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990), 139.

aggiornamento and reform.¹² At the start of every liturgical reform the question of the relationship between liturgy and theology needs to be confronted. Clarifying this relationship will help us understand the authority of liturgy against theology and the authority of theology against liturgy. This understanding is the precondition for identifying, analyzing and comparing the criteria for liturgical reform found in the writings of Romano Guardini and Joseph Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI.

In this first chapter I look at this liturgy-theology relationship, and the significant twentieth-century shift that has taken place in the way this relationship is understood. Both liturgical and theological authorities need to be aware of this shift, for it is one that has influenced liturgical theology in the twentieth century, and thus also the concept of liturgical reform.

I explain why the *lex orandi – lex credendi* relationship is so significant in times of liturgical reform and point out the possible consequences of an unnoticed imbalance therein. Then I explore the understanding of the same question in the thinking of both Guardini and Ratzinger. In so doing, I intend to provide a framework within which their ideas on the reform of the liturgy should be understood.

1.1 Shift in the Interpretation of Prosper's Adage

An exploration of the thought of two influential theologians on the subject of the reform of the liturgy has to include the historical-theological context in which they are

¹² I understand these two terms signify two different approaches to a concrete reality, in this case to liturgy. *Aggiornamento* means refreshing or updating according to certain criteria, while reform is more radical and thorough and implies some kind of discontinuity.

situated. This is especially true of the twentieth century because it was an exciting period in which the Liturgical Movement provided a well-founded and comprehensive historical, theological and anthropological background the preparatory commission of the Second Vatican Council was able to rely upon. The period of the Liturgical Movement, from the middle of the eighteenth century to Vatican II, is a period of endeavour. A growing awareness of the mystery that was being celebrated in liturgy and the underlying anthropological element characterizes a period in which liturgical theology made significant progress. This is the time when systematic and historical research on liturgy became increasingly important; it thus represents the start of scientific research into the liturgy alongside the elaboration of adequate liturgical theological methods.¹³ For this reason, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,¹⁴ which was prepared by the Liturgical Movement, was accepted quickly and almost unanimously by the conciliar fathers.¹⁵ It is a worthy culmination of the work of the Liturgical Movement.

During this long period significant progress in the theological understanding of liturgy led to a significant step being taken in the form of an official magisterial teaching. This event is situated after Guardini's most active period but before that of Ratzinger, and is the publication of Pope Pius XII's encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, on

¹³ The period of the Liturgical Movement is the time when liturgical scholarship starts to develop. Theologians interested in liturgy discover the historical and biblical foundations of worship, rites and texts. Liturgy is studied at universities applying scientific methods and liturgical books are published. Conferences are held in order to bring liturgy closer to the people and to help them understand the importance and the meaning of what they encounter in their religious lives. This aspiration includes not only the celebration of the mass, but other forms of religious piety as well. It is Romano Guardini who will give systematic and thorough expression to these forms of liturgical life.

¹⁴ Norman Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed & Ward; Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), 820-43.

¹⁵ *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was approved by a vote of 2,147 to 4 and promulgated on December 4, 1963 by Paul VI.

November 20, 1947.¹⁶ The encyclical is extremely important in the history of the Liturgical Movement because it was a milestone in liturgical awareness and at the same time offered a general acknowledgement of and slight corrective to the intentions of the Movement. The encyclical is not the first magisterial teaching on liturgy in the period of the Liturgical Movement,¹⁷ but it is the first of its kind to systematically present a liturgical theology and give an official response to certain ideas and efforts of the Movement.

Mediator Dei contains a significant idea on the relationship between liturgy and theology. The well-known adage of Prosper of Aquitaine, “*lex orandi, lex credendi,*” or in its complete form, “*legem credendi, lex statuat supplicandi,*” had been referred to without any notable modifications over the centuries. Surprisingly, *Mediator Dei* makes a significant change to Prosper’s axiom with important consequences not only for the understanding of the relationship between liturgy and theology, but also for the understanding of liturgical reform. After a brief presentation of the original meaning of the adage, I will show how the liturgical-theological consequences of this change by Pius XII might represent a dividing line between Guardini and Ratzinger.

¹⁶ Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*: Encyclical Letter on the Sacred Liturgy (Boston, MA: St. Paul Editions, 1948).

¹⁷ From the period before *Mediator Dei* we can refer, for example, to Leo XII’s encyclical *Mirae Caritatis* on the Holy Eucharist or Pope Pius X’s *motu proprio* on Sacred Music, *Tra le sollecitudini*.

1.1.1 The Original Meaning of Prosper of Aquitaine's Adage

Paul De Clerk¹⁸ and Geoffrey Wainwright,¹⁹ both rooted in the historical-theological research of Klaus Federer,²⁰ help us discover that the *lex orandi - lex credendi* relationship has undergone a radical change in its interpretation and theological use. According to the common contemporary interpretation, the adage conveys the idea that the content of prayer is consistent with the faith of the one praying, and therefore the faith of the church can be understood by examining the liturgical rubrics and texts in use. The *lex orandi* is most commonly understood as referring to the prescribed liturgical text, which serves as a theological lens for interpreting the *lex credendi*.²¹ This interpretation does not correspond with the original meaning of the axiom as it appears in Prosper of Aquitaine's writings, however. Prosper's original texts containing the adage are the *Capitula Coelestini*²² and *De vocatione omnium gentium*.²³

Prosper of Aquitaine's axiom is originally developed as an argument against the Pelagians, who deny the necessity of divine grace in the first step of conversion. Prosper refers to 1 Timothy 2:1-6, in which Paul urges prayers for all, so that everybody is saved and comes to the knowledge of truth. Prosper turns this request of Paul into a law and

¹⁸ Paul De Clerk, "Lex orandi, lex credendi: The Original Sense and Historical Avatars of an Equivocal Adage," *SL* 24 (1994): 178-200.

¹⁹ Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life* (London: Epworth Press, 1980).

²⁰ Klaus Federer, *Liturgie und Glaube. «Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi»* (Tiro Prosper von Aquitanien): Eine theologische Untersuchung, Paradosis 4 (Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1950).

²¹ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 218-24.

²² Prosper Aquitanus, *Opera Omnia*, PL 51 (Paris, 1846), 205-12. It was published under the title *Præteritorum Sedis Apostolicæ Episcoporum Auctoritates, De gratia Dei et libero voluntatis arbitrio*.

²³ Prosper, *De Vocatione Omnium Gentium*, CSEL 97 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009).

names it *lex supplicandi*.²⁴ He explains that prayer is already generally present in the Church to all the ends of the earth. The criteria for something to become law are that it has been believed always, everywhere, and by everybody (*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*).²⁵ Or as Wainwright expresses it: the origin, spread and ethical correspondence has to be examined.²⁶ The first criterion of faith can therefore be referred to as *sensus fidei*.²⁷ De Clerk explains that in the adage *lex* means law or command to pray, while in the common interpretation *lex* is often understood as liturgical usage or custom, or sometimes even refers to the liturgical text itself.²⁸

The content of this prayer, mentioned in the first place by Prosper, is very general: it is the *lex supplicandi* itself, concretely the prayer for the unfaithful.²⁹ Later, he lists the textual content as well: the prayers are offered for Jews, heretics, schismatics and catechumens. The liturgical praxis of praying for those who are not on the way to Christianity shows Prosper that divine grace is necessary for conversion.³⁰ Consequently, the Pelagians' argumentation is incorrect. Federer summarizes the original historical meaning of the axiom by referring to Pelagianism: "The necessity of prayer for grace is a proof for the necessity of grace."³¹ Consequently, when we affirm that *lex orandi* is able to show what *lex credendi* is, it means at the same time that the

²⁴ *Lex supplicandi* therefore refers to the act of prayer and not the content of the prayer.

²⁵ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 226. 243. Martin Stuflesser, *Memoria Passionis: Das Verhältnis von lex orandi und lex credendi am Beispiel des Opferbegriffs in den Eucharistischen Hochgebeten nach dem II. Vatikanischen Konzil* (Münsteraner Theologische Abhandlungen 51. Altenberge: Oros Verlag, 1998), 26.

²⁶ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 245.

²⁷ De Clerk, "Lex orandi, lex credendi," 188.

²⁸ De Clerk, "Lex orandi, lex credendi," 187.

²⁹ Prosper, *De vocatione*, 89. Federer, *Liturgie und Glaube*, 14-5. *Lex supplicandi* is for Federer: "Der Befehl des Apostels Paulus, für alle Menschen zu beten." Stuflesser, *Memoria Passionis*, 24.

³⁰ Federer, *Liturgie und Glaube*, 13.

³¹ Federer, *Liturgie und Glaube*, 16 (my translation). "Die Notwendigkeit des Gebetes um die Gnade ist ein Beweis für die Notwendigkeit der Gnade."

content of the Church's prayer must be examined, and not only its liturgical praxis. At this point we do not forget that Prosper, in contrast to Augustine who used the prayers of the faithful to support the doctrine on grace, uses the prayers to support the doctrine on the Church, because it is the Church that prays for all the people mentioned.³²

Prosper does not speak only in general terms on how the formulation of prayer determines the rule of faith, but sets some limits to it. He insists that "liturgical formulas have value as a theological argument only insofar as they are founded on scripture and attested by tradition."³³ This means that they must be founded on some rule given by an apostle, must be practiced since the time of the apostles, and must be respected and followed by all.³⁴ Isolated worship experiences cannot provide a norm for the *lex credendi*, which is based only on universally present liturgical praxis. This criterion is what we referred to earlier, expressed by *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Nevertheless, this is not the only criterion. Federer clarifies that the adage speaks not about liturgy in general, but liturgical prayer. This is not the case for every liturgical prayer, but particularly the prayers of the faithful (*Fürbitten*) because he believes these to be handed down from the apostles and prescribed by Saint Paul.³⁵

For Prosper, liturgy is a *locus theologicus*. It is the living tradition of the Church; therefore one can go far back into the past to resolve a problem with the certainty that it corresponds to the biblical foundation of Christian teaching. "The liturgy is a 'theological locus' to the degree that it is founded on scripture and gives of the living

³² Alexander Y. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 224.

³³ De Clerk, "Lex orandi, lex credendi," 192.

³⁴ As it is expressed by *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. De Clerk, "Lex orandi, lex credendi," 192.

³⁵ Federer, *Liturgie und Glaube*, 15.

tradition its peculiar echo, which is poetic, symbolic, and existential much more than rational.”³⁶ Wainwright adds that “the liturgy which may serve as a doctrinal locus is the liturgy understood as a total ritual event, not simply a liturgy reduced to its verbal component.”³⁷ He suggests moreover that liturgy and Magisterium are mutually confirmatory in the texts of Prosper and discovers no suggestion that the authority of liturgy derives from the Magisterium.³⁸

After this historical research, we now see that the original meaning of the adage is not how it is generally understood today, i.e. that liturgy has a ruling authority over the dogmatic content of faith. Prosper does not allow liturgy to completely overtake the definition of *lex credendi*.

1.1.2 *Lex Orandi – Lex Credendi* in Pope Pius XII’s Encyclical *Mediator Dei*

Omitting here the development of the *lex orandi – lex credendi* axiom in subsequent historical periods, we arrive at one of the most important moments of the Liturgical Movement, the publication of Pius XII’s *Mediator Dei* in 1947.

1.1.2.1 *The Teaching of the Encyclical*

This papal encyclical contains significant affirmations regarding the relationship between liturgy and theology and it interprets Prosper’s adage in a special way. In it, Pius XII clearly states that liturgy has a doctrinal content: “In the sacred liturgy we

³⁶ De Clerk, “Lex orandi, lex credendi,” 193.

³⁷ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 227.

³⁸ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 226.

profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly. [...] The entire liturgy, therefore, has the Catholic faith for its content, inasmuch as it bears public witness to the faith of the Church.”³⁹ Faith becomes explicit in the liturgy through the sacrifice of the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, the recitation of the symbol of faith and the reading of the Scriptures. At the same time, liturgy is not only an expression of the *depositum fidei*, but it is its source as well. Pius XII refers to the Marian dogma of the Immaculate Conception, a case where important proof for the truth of the dogma is provided by its liturgical usage. This is where Wainwright suggests that at a certain point of history the task of liturgical praxis is to “justify doctrinal positions and developments which Protestants have considered unacceptable.”⁴⁰

Explaining the liturgy-theology connection, Pius XII wants to provide a solid foundation for the doctrinal control of the liturgy. Referring to the adage of Prosper, Pius XII writes:

The sacred liturgy [...] does not decide or determine independently and of itself what is of Catholic faith. More properly, since the liturgy is also a profession of eternal truths, and subject, as such, to the Supreme Teaching Authority of the Church, it can supply proofs and testimony, quite clearly, of no little value, towards the determination of a particular point of Christian doctrine. But if one desires to differentiate and describe the relationship between faith and the sacred Liturgy in absolute and general terms, it is perfectly correct to say, “*Lex credendi legem statuat supplicandi*”—let the rule of belief determine the rule of prayer.⁴¹

Prosper’s axiom is here simply reversed and it is now the *lex credendi* that determines the *lex orandi*. Liturgy is expression and proof of dogmatic truths. Pius XII

³⁹ Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, §47.

⁴⁰ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 219. Walter Dürig, “Zur Interpretation des Axioms «Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi».” in *Veritati Catholicae: Festschrift für Leo Scheffczyk zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Anton Ziegenaus, Franz Courth and Philipp Schäfer (Aschaffenburg: Pattloch Verlag, 1985), 226-36, especially 232.

⁴¹ Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, §48.

rejects the idea that liturgy determines “independently and of itself what is of Catholic faith.”⁴² But this is not the original meaning. Pius XII’s position is based on an inaccurate historical interpretation of Prosper’s adage. Then, turning the adage around, he expounds a theology which is also untraditional, namely the almost complete submission of liturgy to theology.⁴³ What might be the reason for such a change in the encyclical? Even though we do not have the necessary proof for this, it can be assumed that certain tendencies in the Liturgical Movement gave cause for serious alarm, as is apparent in *Mediator Dei* §46.⁴⁴

In the following, Pius XII explains that liturgy is a source for dogmas and theological developments, but it is not the only source or source *par excellence*. The role of liturgy is that it supplies proofs and testimony of doctrine.⁴⁵ There is a certain difficulty in the language used here because being a source and being a proof differ slightly. A source gives inspiration to new ideas, to that which was not there before, or was there in a different way, while a proof simply sustains an idea born in another milieu. Liturgy is inspirational in its nature, but it needs the guidance of doctrine, especially when liturgy is undergoing a period of significant changes. At the same time, liturgical forms follow doctrinal development. Even in *Mediator Dei*, Pius XII gives an example, that of the sacrament of penance, and explains that when the theological

⁴² Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, §48.

⁴³ De Clerk, “Lex orandi, lex credendi,” 198.

⁴⁴ “We refer to the error and fallacious reasoning of those who have claimed that the sacred liturgy is a kind of proving ground for the truths to be held of faith, meaning by this that the Church is obliged to declare such a doctrine sound when it is found to have produced fruits of piety and sanctity through the sacred rites of the liturgy, and to reject it otherwise. Hence the epigram, ‘*Lex orandi, lex credendi*’—the law for prayer is the law for faith.”

⁴⁵ Dürig, “Zur Interpretation,” 233.

understanding of sin and forgiveness changed, the Church tried to find a liturgical form that reflected the new understanding.⁴⁶

De Clerk's opinion on this shift in *Mediator Dei* is disapproving:

What is regrettable is that rejecting a one-sided understanding of the dogma-liturgy relationship, the encyclical had purely and simply reversed it, in wrongfully calling upon a traditional adage which it made to say the opposite of its obvious meaning, and at the same time in not allowing itself to be instructed by the living tradition.⁴⁷

Summarizing the meaning of the shift in the encyclical, we can say that it presents liturgy as authoritative only if it participates in the authority of the Magisterium.⁴⁸ With regard to the reform of the liturgy, Pius XII concentrates on the binding of liturgy to the Magisterium and emphasises papal authority over it.⁴⁹ *Mediator Dei* therefore gives the magisterial response to the theological discussion on the relationship between theology and liturgy. The question appears again in the conciliar discussion, as we will see in Chapter 3.

1.1.2.2 Liturgical and Theological Consequences

The change realized by *Mediator Dei* not only has liturgical theological importance, but also ecclesiological significance. The encyclical affirms the idea that the pope and the bishops hold authority over liturgy because of the inner connection with dogma.⁵⁰ It is especially interesting when considering how peculiar the role of papal authority is in the definition of liturgical forms. We can take as an example the dogma of the

⁴⁶ Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, § 53.

⁴⁷ De Clerk, "Lex orandi, lex credendi," 198-9.

⁴⁸ Stuflessner, *Memoria Passionis*, 47.

⁴⁹ Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, § 57.

⁵⁰ Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, § 49. Wainwright, *Doxology*, 223.

Immaculate Conception. Pius IX explains in *Ineffabilis Deus*⁵¹ that his predecessors introduced new liturgical texts on the Immaculate Conception in order to provide the necessary *lex credendi* to the dogma. Pius XII, however, referring to this usage defines the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. What we can see here is a circular argument. A liturgical basis is created to support a dogma, and then a dogma is defined based on the liturgical evidence.⁵² This way not only is the mutual influence of *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* acknowledged, but so too the papal authority over both, although of course with limitations. Later we will face Ratzinger's interpretation of papal authority in liturgical matters.⁵³

Wainwright understands the liturgical-theological relationship to mean that the authority of liturgy derives from the fact that it is primarily God's action, his redeeming act, and does not originate in human initiative. Liturgy is a source for doctrine as far as God is present in it and offers his salvation to everybody. Every word and gesture in the liturgy is a tool for God who communicates himself, or is a response of the human community to God's initiative inspired by the Holy Spirit. According to Prosper and Augustine, the Holy Spirit in the Church is the guarantee of the holiness of the Church and this holiness gives authority to liturgy as source for doctrine.⁵⁴ At the same time, there is historical evidence that the Magisterium also exercised authority over liturgy in history when it introduced certain liturgical feasts to promote teaching.⁵⁵ Therefore, we

⁵¹ Pius IX, *The Immaculate Conception: The Bull "Ineffabilis Deus"* (Mazenod, Basutoland: Catholic Centre, 1954).

⁵² Wainwright, *Doxology*, 238.

⁵³ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 142-3.

⁵⁴ Wainwright, *Doxology*, 242-50.

⁵⁵ Such feasts are, for example, the Immaculate Conception, Corpus Christi or Christ the King. Wainwright, *Doxology*, 259-61.

can see that it is the particular viewpoint that gives priority to one or the other interpretation and prefers the primacy of either doctrine or cult. The choice is a subjective one, even though *Mediator Dei* means a significant impetus toward the doctrinal theological interpretation.

The fear of liturgy taking complete control of dogma is, in my opinion, completely unfounded. The specific genre of liturgy has to be remembered here, because as Lambert Beauduin explains it, it is “*ars, non scientia*.”⁵⁶ Liturgical texts are not scientific explanations of the Catholic faith. The genre of liturgy as art defines the interpretation of its role and texts. Liturgy expresses and celebrates these truths in a symbolic way and does not seek to explain them in a rational or logical way. Liturgy must lead to the scientific explanation of the faith, but does not itself do that.

There are certain consequences of the two ways of interpreting the *lex orandi – lex credendi* relationship. Prosper’s adage does not speak primarily about changes in the liturgy or liturgical development, rather about the development of the *depositum fidei*. He emphasises that the content of the faith can be inspired by the liturgy of the Church and liturgy can provide proof for the existence of a certain theological truth in praxis or text. Further, liturgy can inspire and promote dogmatic development. The criteria for this set by Prosper, namely historical, biblical and ecclesiological adequacy, will at the same time promote the historical and biblical research of rites and texts. In order to prove a future dogmatic truth, research of the liturgical past that helps to discover the origin of the liturgical rites and elements is necessary. Prosper does not speak about these questions because this is not the main point of his argument.

⁵⁶ Lambert Beauduin, *La piété liturgique* (Montreal: Fides, 1947), 136-7.

Mediator Dei turns around the meaning of Prosper's adage and prompts concerns about the magisterial control of the liturgy, and therefore reform becomes involved in the question. Even though the encyclical does not speak explicitly of the consequences of such a shift for liturgical reform, the authority of the Magisterium expressed in the document implies that liturgical reform can be realized only under the authority of the Magisterium. Texts and rites can develop and change only when changes are officially recognized and accepted by the competent authority. This is a canonical principle and it does not necessarily state that other principles cannot be involved in or initiate the reform of the liturgy. Maintaining liturgy as a source for dogmatic theology means that liturgy has to have an effect on dogmas and this is already a methodological principle.⁵⁷

The change in the interpretation of the relationship between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* is extremely important for research on Guardini and Ratzinger for two reasons. Firstly, it is the magisterial declaration of an idea during the time of preparation for the reform of the liturgy that was understood differently. Secondly, Guardini completed most of his liturgical writings long before the publication of *Mediator Dei*, and therefore was not influenced by its specific understanding of the relationship between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*.⁵⁸ Unlike Guardini, Ratzinger has probably been under the influence of this papal document throughout his entire theological career. Not only the importance accorded magisterial teachings in his theology, but also the precedence he gives to the *lex credendi* in his theology of the liturgy, serves to confirm that we find here a

⁵⁷ Nicholas A. Jesson, "Lex orandi, lex credendi: Towards a Liturgical Theology," http://ecumenism.net/archive/jesson_lexorandi.pdf [Access: July 23, 2016]

⁵⁸ In the period after *Mediator Dei*, he made some revisions to his previous writings, but they were only of a stylistic kind; substantial changes to the content were not made.

significant point regarding the relationship *lex orandi – lex credendi* that is given different emphases in Guardini and Ratzinger’s liturgical thought.⁵⁹

1.1.3 The Understanding of Prosper’s Adage in the Liturgical Movement

The question necessarily emerges whether the shift in the understanding of the *lex orandi – lex credendi* adage occasioned by *Mediator Dei* was indeed as radical as assumed. The answer to this question requires a more profound study than the limits of this work permit. Therefore I limit myself to the person who is considered by many to be the initiator of the Liturgical Movement: Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875), and to another important theological figure: Odo Casel (1886-1948), before, in the next section, considering Romano Guardini’s thinking on this problem.

Guéranger “makes the adage the heart of his argument in favor of the restoration of the liturgy.”⁶⁰ In his *Institutions liturgiques*, Guéranger affirms that liturgy has a dogmatic character.⁶¹ However, he interprets this character by explaining that liturgy is the primary instrument of Church tradition.⁶² He even refers to the adage of Prosper, but explains that liturgy is the “authentic expression of the faith.”⁶³ Guéranger uses the term

⁵⁹ Gerard Mannion, “Liturgy, Catechesis and Evangelisation,” in *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey*, ed. Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 225-56, especially 228.

⁶⁰ De Clerk, “Lex orandi, lex credendi,” 194.

⁶¹ Prosper Guéranger, *Institution liturgiques*, 4. vols. (Paris: Société Générale de Librairie Catholique, 1885). Here: Guéranger, *Institution 4*, 334.

⁶² Guéranger, *Institution 4*, 341. Cuthbert Johnson, *Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875): A Liturgical Theologian. An Introduction to his Liturgical Writings and Work*, Studia Anselmiana 89 (Roma: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1984), 283.

⁶³ Guéranger, *Institution 1*, 124 : “expression authentique de la foi.”

“tradition,” but he understands it as *depositum fidei*.⁶⁴ Guéranger experienced the multiplicity of local rites, especially in France, with the neo-Gallican liturgies. These local rites provided the occasion for deepening the importance of multiple liturgical forms as equal expressions of faith, but his ultramontane ecclesiology impeded him from doing this.⁶⁵ For Guéranger, the Roman liturgy expresses the Catholic faith, since it is the official liturgy of the Roman pontiff who is the guarantee of its veracity. Liturgy is the principal instrument of the tradition, but it is not an authority in itself. He acknowledges, however, that liturgy is a source for tradition and explains that liturgy has never been changed in order to bring it into line with the Church’s teaching.⁶⁶ “On the contrary, the Church has looked to the liturgy as to the living expression of her faith; to see herself clearly, the Church looks at herself in the Liturgy as it were in a mirror.”⁶⁷ Liturgy confesses the tradition in order to help the faithful enter the mysteries of God.

Speaking about the changes in the liturgy, Guéranger refers to the authority of the bishop in liturgical matters. He explains that bishops do not have the right to change the liturgy of the Church on their own initiative, because they are bishops of the Church, but they are not the Church.⁶⁸ Because liturgy is the most important instrument of tradition, it is not possible for the essence of the liturgy to change.⁶⁹ This does not mean that Guéranger represents the idea of an unchangeable liturgy, but it is nevertheless true that

⁶⁴ Guéranger, *Institution 4*, 337-40. Louis Soltner, *Solesmes and Dom Guéranger 1805-1875* (Orleans, MA: Paraclete Press, 1995), 112-3.

⁶⁵ De Clerk, “Lex orandi, lex credendi,” 194-5.

⁶⁶ “L’Eglise, dans sa pratique, a reconnu et sanctionné ce principe, que la Tradition est contenue dans la Liturgie. [...] L’Eglise jamais [...] n’a réformé la Liturgie pour la mettre en rapport avec ses décisions.” Guéranger, *Institution 4*, 372. Johnson, *Prosper Guéranger*, 318. Soltner, *Solesmes*, 90-1.

⁶⁷ Johnson, *Prosper Guéranger*, 318.

⁶⁸ Guéranger, *Institution 4*, 429.

⁶⁹ Guéranger, *Institution 1*, 150, 226.

for him changes in the liturgy are connected to the development of dogma. He lists some criteria for such changes: it cannot cause chaos and destruction, only the pope and the council have the right to change or modify it, and the faithful must be prepared for every change. A false secularization and ecumenism cannot change anything and the mystical and symbolical character of the liturgy has to be maintained.⁷⁰

De Clerk summarizes that “the adage, utilized by Guéranger in the broad sense which it had for Augustine, and inserted into a polemical ecclesiology, came to justify some theses which are not very traditional. The liturgy is given no value as an expression of the *sensus fidei*. It becomes on the contrary a vehicle of the Roman Magisterium.”⁷¹

In his *Mysterientheologie*,⁷² Odo Casel explains his position regarding the liturgy-theology relationship. For Casel liturgy is *locus theologicus*.⁷³ Liturgy mediates the encounter with the Lord and theology has a mystagogical character that leads to the encounter with the Lord.⁷⁴ Therefore there is a circular movement from liturgy to theology and from theology to liturgy.⁷⁵ Liturgy is a central component of Church tradition, and therefore together with the Scriptures it is normative. Under liturgy, however, not only liturgical texts are understood, but liturgical practices as well. Stuflesser sees in this the danger that the meaning of the Scriptures might be overshadowed because “the more theology is inspired by the presence of Jesus Christ in

⁷⁰ Guéranger, *Institution* 3, 492; 4,419-20; 3,589; 2,183; 2,387. Johnson, *Prosper Guéranger*, 333-6.

⁷¹ De Clerk, “Lex orandi, lex credendi,” 195.

⁷² Wainwright, *Doxology*, 222.

⁷³ Arno Schilson, *Theologie als Sakramententheologie: Die Mysterientheologie Odo Casels*, Tübinger Theologische Studien 18 (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1982), 126.

⁷⁴ Odo Casel, *Mysterientheologie: Ansatz und Gestalt* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1986), 89. Odo Casel, *Das christliche Kultmysterium* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1960), 62-3.

⁷⁵ Casel, *Das christliche Kultmysterium*, 71-4.

the liturgy, the more Scripture and tradition recede by contrast into the background.”⁷⁶

Stuflessner and Schilson state that Casel created a new understanding of theology which can be described as mystagogy. In mystagogy, however, liturgy has a decisive role.⁷⁷

That is why liturgy is not only *locus theologicus*, but at the same time *theologia prima* as well.⁷⁸

We could add more theologians to Guéranger and Casel, e.g. George Tyrrell, for whom liturgy and piety are a kind of revelation and a proving ground for theology. Therefore for Tyrrell, Prosper’s adage seems to be “*lex orandi est lex credendi*.”⁷⁹ But already from these few examples some very different interpretations of the connection between liturgy and theology are apparent. Liturgy is generally a very important theological tool, but it is wedged within limits determined by the Magisterium. Liturgy was used by systematic theology to express and teach dogmatic truths and therefore liturgy’s inspirational character was merely catechetical or mystagogical. Liturgy is relevant to the *lex credendi* inasmuch as it offers proof for dogmatic truths in its praxis or texts. Stuflessner, though, points out that while the cooperation between dogmatics and liturgy was a positive fact, the understanding of liturgy was more problematic. That is, liturgy appears as a collection of rites and texts that were approved by the Magisterium

⁷⁶ Stuflessner, *Memoria Passionis*, 41 (my translation). “Je mehr Theologie aus der Gegenwart Jesu Christi in der Liturgie lebt, desto mehr treten auf der anderen Seite Schrift und Tradition in den Hintergrund.”

⁷⁷ Casel, *Das christliche Kultmysterium*, 60-74.

⁷⁸ Stuflessner, *Memoria Passionis*, 41. Schilson, *Theologie als Sakramententheologie*, 126.

⁷⁹ George Tyrrell, *Through Scylla and Charybdis or The Old Theology and the New* (London: Longmans, Green, 1907), 103.

and analyzed according to its dogmatic usability in some kind of systematic-theological utilitarianism.⁸⁰ Liturgy itself was not an object of theological discussion.

1.1.4 Liturgy and Theology in the Time of the Liturgical Reform of Vatican II

In times of liturgical reform, the reasoning of Prosper's adage is usually reversed and the primacy goes to the content of the faith. It must be proved, then, whether or not new or developed liturgical forms and praxis correspond to the Church's faith. The *lex credendi* is a proving ground in which temporary ideologies cannot effect changes in the tradition or liturgical development. The question of new liturgical forms in these periods of reform should thus be: "Is it not in terms of certain new or renewed ideas that one intends to revise practices or texts which no longer, or badly, correspond to them?"⁸¹ Stuflessner points out that the catchphrase 'reform of the liturgy' marks and clarifies the mutual interdependence of *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* as it is expressed in the liturgical document of Vatican II.⁸²

We need to see the opinion of Vatican II on this question, especially in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC), as this is the core of the conciliar liturgical reform. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* does not directly discuss the question of the liturgy-theology connection, but in many points of the document there can be found allusions to this relationship. Stuflessner's analysis can help in discovering this connection.⁸³ I want to

⁸⁰ Stuflessner, *Memoria Passionis*, 42-3.

⁸¹ De Clerk, "Lex orandi, lex credendi," 179.

⁸² Stuflessner, *Memoria Passionis*, 48.

⁸³ Stuflessner, *Memoria Passionis*, 48-54.

emphasise here some points of the conciliar document that are significant in relation to this question.

Sacrosanctum Concilium 5 makes reference to the biblical text used by Prosper of Aquitaine (I Tim 2:4), even though the passage does not refer to the theological question, while SC 7⁸⁴ speaks about the dignity of the liturgy. This dignity is bestowed by the fact that Christ is “especially” present in the liturgical celebrations. For this special presence of Christ, every liturgical celebration surpasses all other activity of the Church.⁸⁵ “No other activity of the church equals it in terms of its official recognition or its degree of effectiveness,” says the Council. In this passage one can see the Council’s appreciation of liturgical celebrations, which are the ecclesial actions *par excellence* and precede everything else, even theology.

In SC 9, however, the Council anticipates an important issue when it says: “Before people can come to the liturgy, they must be called to faith and conversion.” With this it is affirmed that the act of faith precedes liturgy. Faith requires evangelization, and the content of this evangelization is the announcement of the faith and forgiveness, preparation for the sacraments and the life according to Christ’s commandments, consisting in charity, piety and all other activities of the apostolate. The Council wants to speak about the ways through which one can arrive at the most perfect encounter with

⁸⁴ SC 7: “Christ is always present to his Church, especially during the liturgy, so that this great task can be fully accomplished. [...] every liturgical celebration, inasmuch as it is the act of Christ the priest and his body which is the church, is above all an activity of worship. No other activity of the church equals it in terms of its official recognition or its degree of effectiveness.”

⁸⁵ Reiner Kaczynski, “Theologischer Kommentar zur Konstitution über die heilige Liturgie *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,” in *Herder Theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, Vol. 2, ed. Peter Hünemann and Bernd Hilberath (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2004), 1-227, especially 66-8.

Christ.⁸⁶ With this, however, it differs slightly from the previous sections, and affirms that finding the importance of the liturgy includes a prior systematic explanation of the content of the faith.

In SC10 is found one of the most quoted affirmations of the entire document: “The liturgy is, all the same, the high point toward which the activity of the church is directed, and, simultaneously, the source from which all its power flows out.” This idea is very similar to that of Odo Casel mentioned in the previous section. It expresses a circular movement, which binds liturgy closely to all other activities of the Church, even theology.

In SC 21 the Council speaks about the elements of the liturgy. There are two kinds: the “part that cannot be changed, insofar as it has been divinely laid down” and “parts that are subject to modification.” Even though this is not expressed in a sufficiently clear way, it seems that for the Council it is the task of the Magisterium to define these elements and determine which are appropriate to the nature of the liturgy. The same section defines the goal of the liturgical reform. Texts and rites must “express more clearly the holy things which they represent, and so that thus the Christian people, insofar as this is possible, will be able to understand these things easily, and to enter into them through a celebration that is expressive of their full meaning, is effective, involving, and the community’s own.” It seems that the ultimate purpose of the reform of the liturgy is the full, active and common participation of the faithful.

The connection between liturgy and Magisterium is addressed in SC 22 1, but is not entirely clear whether liturgy has its own authority or whether it participates in the

⁸⁶ Kaczynski, “Theologischer Kommentar,” 72.

authority of the Magisterium.⁸⁷ In SC 23 the revision of each part of the liturgy is ordained according to theological, historical and pastoral criteria. This, however, does not necessarily mean the priority of theology over liturgy, because reading this together with the next section it is evident that they wish to emphasise the importance of Scripture and tradition in the reform of the liturgy. Then SC 33 seems to support the idea that liturgy is the place where that apostolic tradition is handed down. *Dei Verbum* 8 confirms this idea.⁸⁸

The Council does not give a clear interpretation of the relationship between liturgy and theology. At the same time, the conciliar document provides theological principles according to which the reform of the liturgy must be realized (SC 10; 21; 33). The goal of the reform is to help liturgy to become again *theologia prima* (SC 21).⁸⁹

Thus “reform of the liturgy” is a code that stands for the *lex orandi - lex credendi* relationship and that determines that liturgy and Magisterium be in a mutual exchange, the goal of which is a liturgy that makes possible the “full, active and common participation” (SC 21) of the faithful and thus becomes “font” (fons) and “summit” (culmen) of the whole ecclesial activity (SC 10; LG 11).⁹⁰

⁸⁷ An explanation of this point of the document can be found in Kaczynski, “Theologischer Kommentar,” 87-9.

⁸⁸ “The Church, in its teaching, life and worship, perpetuates and hands on to every generation all that it is and all that it believes.”

⁸⁹ Stuflesser, *Memoria Passionis*, 54.

⁹⁰ Stuflesser, *Memoria Passionis*, 54 (my translation). “Liturgiereform ist somit eine Chiffre, die für das Verhältnis von *lex orandi* und *lex credendi* steht, und die es dahingehend bestimmt, daß Liturgie und Lehramt in einem Wechselseitigen Austausch stehen, dessen Ziel eine Liturgie ist, die die “volle, tätige und gemeinschaftliche Teilnahme” (SC 21) der Gläubigen ermöglicht und somit zur “Quelle” (“fons”) und zum “Höhepunkt” (“culmen”) des gesamten kirchlichen Tuns wird (SC 10; LG 11).”

1.2 Theology and Liturgy by Romano Guardini

Romano Guardini is considered one of the leading figures of the Liturgical Movement, one whose writings had significant effect on the conciliar liturgical reform and its implementation.⁹¹ Joseph Ratzinger, however, is generally presented as a rather conservative thinker, especially in matters of liturgy.⁹² In the following chapters I will examine and compare their conceptions of liturgical reform and their criteria for such reform, but before that I will point out some characteristics of their thinking that are significant for liturgy and theology.

1.2.1 An Important Category: *Der Gegensatz*

Guardini's thought on the liturgy has a special character that made it unique in Germany in his time. He was not interested in rubrics or ceremonial elements and his main purpose was not to explain how these should be realized in praxis. Guardini's scholarship did not involve this kind of research. Neither did he work to provide theological grounds for the liturgy. He wanted to speak about the spirit of the liturgy and not its details, as the title of his most important liturgical work, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, suggests.⁹³ Early in his career he discovered the anthropological character of the liturgy, acknowledgement of which is a prerequisite for any kind of liturgy or liturgical

⁹¹ Annibale Bugnini, *La riforma liturgica* (Roma: CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1983), 21-28.

⁹² Anselm J. Gribbin, *Pope Benedict XVI and the Liturgy: Understanding Recent Liturgical Developments* (Leominster, UK: Gracewing, 2011), vi.

⁹³ Martin Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten: Romano Guardini - Denker liturgischer Erneuerung* (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1986), 51.

theology. Human nature is therefore fundamental in his thinking. As he expresses it: “In the liturgy the voice of the nature makes itself heard clearly and decisively.”⁹⁴

Martin Marschall’s summary of Guardini’s scholarship is important for any evaluation of his work on liturgy:

Guardini is not a systematic theologian. This assertion is valid for his liturgical opus as well. It does not offer a comprehensive and closed theory. It is composed instead almost exclusively of essays that were written about certain individual problems. Nonetheless Guardini wants always to proceed from concrete questioning—corresponding to his universal way of thinking—and keeping in view the liturgy as a whole, while his different themes offer essential aspects that complement each other.⁹⁵

Before discussing Guardini’s liturgical work in detail, it is necessary to address an important point that is basic for the correct interpretation of his entire opus, and so also for the discussion on liturgy and the relationship between liturgy and theology. This important point is the category of *der Gegensatz*, or opposition. The idea of the *Gegensatz* is explained most thoroughly in his book *Der Gegensatz: Versuche zu einer Philosophie des Lebendig-Konkreten*,⁹⁶ published in 1925. Frédéric Debuyst affirms this book assists us in reaching a holistic picture of Guardini’s thought.⁹⁷ The *Gegensatz* is a metaphysical and methodological category that perceives two opposite poles in all

⁹⁴ Romano Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald; Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1997), 28. English translation: Romano Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1998), 32.

⁹⁵ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 53, my translation. “Guardini ist kein Systematiker. Dieser Satz gilt auch für sein liturgisches Werk. Es bietet keine umfassende und geschlossene Theorie. Es besteht vielmehr fast ausschließlich aus Aufsätzen, die zu bestimmten Einzelfragen geschrieben sind. Gleichwohl bemüht sich Guardini – seiner universalen Denkweise entsprechend – vor der konkreten Fragestellung her immer auch das Ganze der Liturgie in den Blick zu bekommen, und seine verschiedenen Themen bieten wesentliche Aspekte, die einander ergänzen.” See also Helmut Kuhn, *Romano Guardini: Der Mensch und das Werk* (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1951), 57. “Er [Guardini] hat nie daran gedacht, die ihn leitenden Prinzipien also solche herauszuarbeiten und in ihrem Zusammenhang darzustellen.”

⁹⁶ Romano Guardini, *Der Gegensatz: Versuche zu einer Philosophie des Lebendig-Konkreten* (Mainz: Matthias Grünwald Verlag, 1985).

⁹⁷ Frédéric Debuyst, *L’entrée en liturgie. Introduction à l’œuvre liturgique de Romano Guardini* (Paris: Cerf, 2008), 17.

created beings and in all their activities. The two poles are not compatible, but not contradictory either; rather they are indissolubly bound to each other.⁹⁸ The *Gegensatz* follows a typology of clear categories. Examples of such categories are dynamic act (*Akt*) and static structure (*Struktur*); anomy (*Anomie*), that is, the spontaneous explosion that is exempt from rules, and nomy (*Nomie*), the direct confession of a rule. Guardini explains the need for such oppositions in two short statements, in which he affirms that “only what is true is whole” and “truth is polyphone.”⁹⁹ He also applies such oppositions to his liturgical thought, explaining that even the life of prayer of the individual moves between two poles: the objective (*die Objektive*) and the subjective (*die Subjektive*). The objective component is the liturgy itself, because it does not deal in religious fantasies or aesthetical desires. It concerns reality, determined by grace and revelation, and at the same time by nature through the essence of entities and human beings.¹⁰⁰ The typical form of the subjectivity of the life of prayer is personal prayer, in which one can find more freedom, and in which the personal characteristics of the one who prays are more significant.¹⁰¹ Oppositions can be found in other contexts as well, such as the dichotomy between liturgy and forms of popular piety; between the subjectivity and objectivity of the liturgy; between the use of body and thought (the material and the spiritual); and in the importance of both *logos* and *ethos* in the liturgy.

The importance of such oppositions for Guardini probably derives from his personal life. Living in a German culture with an Italian family caused a constant tension. He

⁹⁸ Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 16. Walter Birnbaum, *Die deutsche katholische liturgische Bewegung* (Tübingen: Katzmann-Verlag, 1966), 99-101. Kuhn, *Romano Guardini*, 17-19.

⁹⁹ Quoted by Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 17.

¹⁰⁰ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 55.

¹⁰¹ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 17.

experienced this tension in his work and spiritual life as well, for example, in Beuron, where he constantly returned, in order to have personal experience of the sacred (*Sakrale*) and the wholly other (*ganz Anderen*).¹⁰²

1.2.2 References to Liturgy and Theology

The relationship between liturgy and theology is not explicitly elaborated in Guardini's writings, but we can certainly identify his understanding thereof. We need to take a closer look at the *Gegensatz* of the objectivity and the subjectivity of prayer life, because this opposition provides the necessary framework for the establishment of the liturgy-theology relationship. According to Arno Schilson, Guardini expressed a longing for the objective.¹⁰³ One of his main goals was to satisfy this longing, and lead human beings through this knowledge to the encounter with God. For Guardini liturgy is clearly objective and therefore a source for the faith.¹⁰⁴ Liturgy, that is, gives the opportunity for the faith to be expressed and experienced, because liturgy already contains these truths received in revelation.¹⁰⁵ At the same time liturgy inserts the individual in a given context and therefore has a serious subjective effect. Liturgy is not something abstract, but a concrete reality, something that is alive and that can be captured by the

¹⁰² Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 19.

¹⁰³ Arno Schilson, "Romano Guardini: Wegbereiter und Wegbegleiter der liturgischen Erneuerung," *LJ* 36 (1986): 3-27, especially 18-9. Schilson identifies three longings: that for the objective (*die Objektive*), for the community, and for transcendence. I speak here only about the first longing because it is important for our question.

¹⁰⁴ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 16.

¹⁰⁵ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 17-20. Hansruedi Kleiber, *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung bei Romano Guardini*, FThS 130 (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1985), 219.

Gegensätze.¹⁰⁶ Guardini explains that the efficacy of liturgical prayer derives from the fact that it is founded in truth. In all this Guardini seems to identify truth with dogma.¹⁰⁷ He affirms that “the prayers of the liturgy are entirely governed by and interwoven with dogma.”¹⁰⁸ Prayer life is not determined by our own arbitrariness, but by the truth that is given by God.¹⁰⁹ Therefore liturgy is not only *lex orandi*, but *lex credendi* as well. Only when liturgy is founded in the truth, can it be captured. He concludes that liturgy is “truth expressed in terms of prayer,”¹¹⁰ which, however, must embrace the whole revelation and not only a part of it.

The liturgy is connected to legality (*Gesetzmäßigkeit*), which means that liturgy is determined by the grace of the revelation and by the objective essence of things and human beings.¹¹¹ As Guardini explains, in the liturgy, transcendence steps into nature, while mundane realities come into a strong connection with supernatural realities and primarily with God. If liturgy is determined by revelation, the interpretation of this revelation also has an effect on how liturgy understands itself. Liturgy is not the revelation of the past; it is itself the actualization of the revelation, in which Christ is present and active. The determinative effect of human beings and mundane things on the

¹⁰⁶ Romano Guardini, “Über die systematische Methode in der Liturgiewissenschaft,” *JLW* 1 (1921): 97-108, especially 97.

¹⁰⁷ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 20. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 23. The English translation of the book inserts an explanation after the word *truth*, which is not to be found in the original German text. The original version says: “Die Wahrheit macht das Gebet kräftig.” The translation, however, says: “It is only truth—or dogma, to give it its other name—which can make prayer efficacious.” The translator’s explanation is correct, even though it cannot be found in Guardini’s text.

¹⁰⁸ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 18. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 21.

¹⁰⁹ Kleiber, *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung*, 222.

¹¹⁰ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 21. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 24. The original German expression is “gebetete Wahrheit” which slightly differs from the English translation. The original form expresses that this truth is prayed through, and prayer is not only its exterior form, as the English version suggests.

¹¹¹ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 56. Schilson, “Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter,” 20-1.

liturgy represents the whole of creation. This effect is not arbitrary, however, but an effect that corresponds to their essence. In the liturgy the creation finds and expresses its existence. For Guardini the objective side of prayer life is the *lex orandi*, towards which even the subjective forms of the prayer life have to be oriented, in order not to become undisciplined and unfruitful.¹¹²

At the beginning of *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, Guardini immediately establishes the relationship between liturgy and the other forms of popular devotions, and explains that it is the liturgy that is the *lex orandi*, because by its nature it precedes popular devotions and personal prayers. Therefore, liturgy is a model for non-liturgical prayer.¹¹³ The fundamental laws of liturgy are “eternally and universally unchanging.”¹¹⁴ He acknowledges that liturgy is *lex credendi* as well, but he interprets this affirmation saying that this is because liturgy is “the treasure-house of the thought of Revelation.”¹¹⁵ The importance of dogma in liturgy does not deny the significance of emotions. Dogmatic truth helps to avoid the trap of subjective emotionalism and makes prayer intelligible and efficient in everyday life. Emotions must be “guided, supported and purified”¹¹⁶ in order to find their place in liturgical celebrations. With the help of dogma, liturgy is not surrendered to momentary caprice and individual arbitrariness. From *lex orandi* we learn that liturgy is actively progressive.¹¹⁷ The objectivity of the liturgy is

¹¹² Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 62.

¹¹³ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 18.

¹¹⁴ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 18. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 21.

¹¹⁵ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 19. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 22.

More exactly, the original German text says: “Sie [Liturgie] ist vom Wahrheitsgut der Offenbarung ganz erfüllt.”

¹¹⁶ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 19. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 22.

¹¹⁷ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 27. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 31. Kuhn, Romano Guardini, 33-4.

therefore in close connection with its subjectivity, which helps liturgy not become merely a structure of forms.¹¹⁸ Guardini tries to reach a certain balance between the objectivity and the subjectivity of the liturgy, but he is always tempted to dissolve the objectivity in its subjectivity.¹¹⁹

In one of his articles he defines liturgical theology as “*scientia theologica stricte dicta*.”¹²⁰ Here liturgy is closely connected to historical research, without which it would “become arbitrary and prejudiced.”¹²¹ Historical research of the liturgy serves to reveal what faith meant in certain periods, because liturgy cannot signify what *lex credendi* contravenes, otherwise the Church would be in contradiction with itself.¹²² With this, however, he allows history to exercise authority over liturgical development. Trying to balance the authority of historical research, Guardini affirms that liturgical forms must be understood in the present time as well. Liturgy expresses a principle for life and it is connected to a theology that is “a teaching on supernatural revelation and communication of life.”¹²³ “Guardini not simply dissolves the tense connection between the manifold forms of the liturgy and the theology as reflection on the faith, between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*. He rather maintains the tension more and makes it fruitful for both sides.”¹²⁴

¹¹⁸ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 67. Schilson, “Vom Geist der Liturgie – Versuch einer Relecture von Romano Guardinis Jahrbuchenschrift,” *LJ* 51 (2001): 76-89, especially 83-4.

¹¹⁹ Kleiber, *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung*, 223.

¹²⁰ Guardini, “Über die systematische Methode,” 108.

¹²¹ Guardini, “Über die systematische Methode,” 100. My translation of “willkürlich und vorurteilvoll.”

¹²² Guardini, “Über die systematische Methode,” 101.

¹²³ Guardini, “Über die systematische Methode,” 104, (my translation). “Lehre von der übernatürlichen Offenbarung und Lebensmitteilung.”

¹²⁴ Stuflesser, *Memoria Passionis*, 39.

1.3 Liturgy and Theology by Joseph Ratzinger

1.3.1 The Meaning of Theology

Turning to Ratzinger, I want to identify his understanding of theology in order to understand correctly each part of the expression ‘theology of the liturgy’ and to situate it in a wider picture of his thinking. Because of the complexity of the question and the need to touch upon many theological disciplines, it is not possible to present here an overall and holistic picture of Ratzinger’s thinking.¹²⁵ I deal only with questions that are important concerning his theology of the liturgy. These are the purpose of theology, the role of the theologian, and the role of the Magisterium.

We need primarily a clear view of how Ratzinger understands the role of theology and of the theologian and that of the Magisterium in the life of the Church. This will be important, especially in light of the second section when I will discuss the relationship between the Magisterium and the liturgy. In this present section I rely especially on three writings by Ratzinger. The first is *Theologische Prinzipienlehre: Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie*, first published in 1982.¹²⁶ The second is his *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie: Versuche zu ihrer Ortsbestimmung im Disput der Gegenwart* of 1993.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ One can find many excellent books that introduce the reader to the theology of Joseph Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI. One of the most complex is that of Aidan Nichols, *The Thought of Pope Benedict XVI: An Introduction to the Theology of Joseph Ratzinger*, new ed. (London, New York: Burns & Oates, 2007).

¹²⁶ Joseph Ratzinger, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre: Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie* (München: Erich Wewel Verlag, 1982). English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1987).

¹²⁷ Joseph Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie: Versuche zu ihrer Ortsbestimmung im Disput der Gegenwart* (Einsiedeln, Freiburg: Johannes Verlag, 1993).

The third important work is the instruction *Donum Veritatis*, on the ecclesial vocation of the theologian, published by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 1990.¹²⁸ Even though this document was published under the authority of the Congregation, it is signed by then Cardinal Ratzinger and, as will be seen, contains significant elements of Ratzinger's personal theological ideas. I will not refer in detail to criticisms of these ideas, because what is important is to provide *his* concept of theology and Magisterium in order to understand why he explains the development of the liturgy in a certain way.

If we want to find the meaning of theology in the life of the Church, Ratzinger offers us two affirmations at the beginning of any discussion: "(1) Theology has to do with God; (2) theological speculation is linked to philosophical inquiry as its basic methodology."¹²⁹ Theology that depends on philosophy represents a search for the truth that is indispensable to the humanity of every human being. According to Ratzinger, a crisis is developing both in the Church and in humanity, caused by the common understanding that God cannot be "a topic with which reason can properly be concerned."¹³⁰ Accepting this argument, however, means that theology falls into historicism and sociologism. Theology has to do primarily with God and not with Church or community. Philosophy precedes theological research and enters it.

¹²⁸ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990).

¹²⁹ Ratzinger, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre*, 332. English translation: Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 316.

¹³⁰ Ratzinger, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre*, 332. English translation: Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 316.

After the Council, theology was considered to be in need of reorientation in light of the two expressions of orthodoxy and orthopraxis.¹³¹ The radical interpretation of orthopraxis can lead to the opinion that truth cannot precede praxis; that truth can only be established based on a correct praxis. In this case truth becomes a human product and theology is only a reflection on different forms of praxis, and is constantly seeking to develop new forms of praxis.¹³² Ratzinger refers to Romano Guardini and how he affirmed the primacy of *logos* over *ethos*, a position that reflects Guardini's Thomistic understanding of theology as *scientia speculativa*. In the centre of this Christocentric theology stands the encounter with the being of God.¹³³ In order to understand the meaning of Christology, it is necessary to break away from history and anthropology and make it a science dealing with God himself. The truth is self-subsistent and therefore the correct interpretation of theology is *scientia speculativa*. Theology is ecclesial by its nature and it must be practiced always for the Church.¹³⁴ It has a missionary dynamism. Scott Hahn points out that Ratzinger does not impose his own ideas on theology, but that they are a logical consequence of his position on the historical nature and mission of the Church.¹³⁵

¹³¹ Ratzinger makes the interesting comparison between this problem and that of the Middle Ages, when the main point of difference between Thomists and Franciscans concerning the nature of theology was whether it was *scientia speculativa* or *scientia practica*.

¹³² Benedikt XVI, "Vom Auftrag der Theologie," *Mitteilungen: Institut Papst Benedikt XVI*, ed. Rudolf Voderholzer, Christian Schaller and Franz-Xaver Heibl (Regensburg: Verlag Schnell & Steiner, 2011), 40-2, especially 41. James Corkery, *Joseph Ratzinger's Theological Ideas: Wise Cautions and Legitimate Hopes* (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), 31-3. Nichols, *The Thought of Pope Benedict XVI*, 183. Emery De Gaál, *The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI: The Christocentric Shift* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 184.

¹³³ Corkery, *Joseph Ratzinger's Theological Ideas*, 31-2.

¹³⁴ Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 92-3. Scott Hahn, *Covenant and Communion: The Biblical Theology of Pope Benedict XVI* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009), 68.

¹³⁵ Hahn, *Covenant and Communion*, 69.

Touching upon scientific method, we discover that in the modern sciences every science has its own norms, otherwise it would have to submit to an external power and therefore cease to be science. Some affirm that the Catholic Magisterium plays the role of such an external power. No wonder Magisterium and Church are often regarded obstacles and even enemies of scientific research and development. Present-day controversies between Church and theologians are rooted in the overreaching application of scientific methods to theology and the presumption of a dialectical opposition between Church and the Gospel.¹³⁶ The Church provides the grounds for theology: “Faith is not to be placed in opposition to reason, but neither must it fall under the absolute power of enlightened reason and its methods.”¹³⁷ Contemporary methods try to divide in two what has to be one. Theology becomes the philosophy of religion, which places Christianity on the same level as other world religions (Ratzinger calls this theological pluralism),¹³⁸ and downgrades Christianity “from the level of a spiritual reform of values to that of symbol.”¹³⁹ The second element into which theology is split is a kind of historical analysis of significant texts which converts Christianity into some sort of historical science.

Scott Hahn affirms, further, that speaking about the science of theology, Ratzinger’s goal is to “reappropriate the essential shape of primitive Christianity”¹⁴⁰ and identify it as a normative criterion for the understanding of theology. Hahn emphasises that this is

¹³⁶ Hahn, *Covenant and Communion*, 69.

¹³⁷ Ratzinger, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre*, 342. English translation: Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 324.

¹³⁸ Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 63.

¹³⁹ Ratzinger, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre*, 345. English translation: Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 328. Other reference: Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 11.

¹⁴⁰ Hahn, *Covenant and Communion*, 63.

not a primitivist turn, but a return to the sources, especially to those of the Scriptures, in order to provide a foundation for theological and hermeneutical methods. The work of theology is a response to the encounter with the Logos, and is characterized by mutual dialogue.¹⁴¹

Theologizing is strictly connected to the Magisterium because the latter provides the framework within which theology interprets revelation in accordance with Catholic faith and tradition. To speak about the importance of the Magisterium of the Church in Ratzinger's thought, is a difficult task, however, for he was part of that teaching authority as the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith between 1981 and 2005. He was sometimes accused of forcing his theological vision onto the whole Church through the channels of the Congregation of which he was head. Gerard Mannion remarks that Ratzinger often made private comments in magisterial decisions or documents and in this way the line between the Church official and the private theologian became indistinct.¹⁴² As head of the Congregation he published an instruction on the ecclesial vocation of the theologian in 1993, a document often referred to by its shorter title: *Donum Veritatis*. The meaning of the Magisterium becomes evident in this document, in which Ratzinger also published his personal comments. The role of the theologian is not to be an alternative Magisterium, but to serve the Church and its teaching office in favour of the laity. Refusal to correct the errors identified by the Magisterium means the loss of Catholic character for the theologian.

¹⁴¹ Hahn, *Covenant and Communion*, 65-6.

¹⁴² Gerard Mannion, "Teaching and Authority: Dimensions of Magisterium," in *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey*, ed. Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 179-223, especially 180.

According to this instruction, the role of the theologian is “to pursue in a particular way an ever deeper understanding of the Word of God found in the inspired Scriptures and handed down by the living tradition of the Church. He does this in communion with the Magisterium which has been charged with the responsibility of preserving the deposit of faith.”¹⁴³ The proper task of theology is to understand the meaning of revelation and to provide “a solid and correct understanding of man, the world and God.”¹⁴⁴ The document emphasises the importance of philosophical and historical disciplines and methods and those of the human sciences in accomplishing this. The freedom of the theologian and of theological research is exercised within the Church’s faith. The object of theology is revelation as it is handed on and interpreted under the authority of the Magisterium. Therefore theologians must take into account the specific character of a magisterial teaching. All acts of the Magisterium derive from one source which is Christ, therefore not even infallible teachings are without divine assistance. Half the document concentrates on the relationship between the Magisterium and the theologian. This is the part that received much criticism, because according to many it represents the total submission of the theologian to the Magisterium and the limitation of the freedom of theologians.

Theological individualism stands in confrontation with the guiding role of the Magisterium. There are several sociological and cultural factors that have significant influence on theological ideas. One of these explicitly mentioned by the document is

¹⁴³ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Instruction*, § 6.

¹⁴⁴ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Instruction*, § 10.

“the ideology of philosophical liberalism,”¹⁴⁵ in which a judgement is given greater authority the more it proceeds from an individual relying on his or her own authority and power. In this ideology—according to the document—freedom of thought is opposed to the authority of tradition which is represented as limit and oppression. In the end freedom of judgement becomes more important than the truth itself. The Magisterium serves as the standard for theology, protecting theologians from vulnerability to short-lived ideas.

Ratzinger personally interpreted the document several times. The fact that these interpretations are merely comments and not criticisms, indicates that his personal opinion coincides with his official interpretation of the document.¹⁴⁶ He agrees with the document that dogma should not be considered a prison, but a living source. Liturgy and tradition are the two main sources for experiencing Church. In the discussion with theologians he emphasises that theologians have to be aware that “it is his Church and not ours.”¹⁴⁷ Theologians should therefore not seek to realize their own ideas, but must be embedded in tradition and Magisterium. The Magisterium exercises its function in favour of the ecclesial community to allow the act of faith to be in agreement with revelation. In this way revelation can indeed be revelation.¹⁴⁸ The document explains the meaning of the “*sensus fidei*,” the concept so important in the discussion in the first part

¹⁴⁵ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Instruction*, § 32.

¹⁴⁶ Joseph Ratzinger, introduction to *Istruzione Donum Veritatis sulla vocazione ecclesiale del teologo*, by Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1993), 9-14. Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 89-107.

¹⁴⁷ Joseph Ratzinger, *Salz der Erde: Christentum und katholische Kirche an der Jahrtausendwende: Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1997), 85-6. English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, *Salt of the Earth: Christianity and Catholic Church at the End of the Millennium* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1997), 80.

¹⁴⁸ De Gaál, *The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI*, 105.

of this chapter.¹⁴⁹ Ratzinger adds that dogmas become possible because the *sensus fidei* discovered them, and the Magisterium and theological research follow this.¹⁵⁰

Ratzinger seeks to give an explanation of some contemporary difficulties within the Church: the Magisterium has lost its positive character in today's theology because ecclesial authority appears as a judging tribunal. Of course, in his view this idea is foreign to the relationship between theology and Magisterium.¹⁵¹ The relationship does not consist in a limitation, as if dogma would set limits to the freedom of thought. In this, Ratzinger agrees with Guardini, who discovered and criticised this understanding in his professors during the time of the modernist crisis.¹⁵² Ratzinger offers the example of Guardini as the person "who transformed two events in his intellectual development into personal experience. Kantianism had shattered the faith of his childhood, but his conversion allowed him to surmount Kant. This, in turn, was a fresh start for his thinking, which obeyed a word spoken with authority by a living other, namely, the

¹⁴⁹ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Instruction*, § 35. "Actually, the opinions of the faithful cannot be purely and simply identified with the 'sensus fidei.' The sense of the faith is a property of theological faith; and, as God's gift which enables one to adhere personally to the Truth, it cannot err. This personal faith is also the faith of the Church since God has given guardianship of the Word to the Church. Consequently, what the believer believes is what the Church believes. The 'sensus fidei' implies then by its nature a profound agreement of spirit and heart with the Church, 'sentire cum Ecclesia.'

Although theological faith as such then cannot err, the believer can still have erroneous opinions since all his thoughts do not spring from faith. Not all the ideas which circulate among the People of God are compatible with the faith. This is all the more so given that people can be swayed by a public opinion influenced by modern communications media. Not without reason did the Second Vatican Council emphasize the indissoluble bond between the 'sensus fidei' and the guidance of God's People by the magisterium of the Pastors. These two realities cannot be separated. Magisterial interventions serve to guarantee the Church's unity in the truth of the Lord. They aid her to 'abide in the truth' in face of the arbitrary character of changeable opinions and are an expression of obedience to the Word of God. Even when it might seem that they limit the freedom of theologians, these actions, by their fidelity to the faith which has been handed on, establish a deeper freedom which can only come from unity in truth."

¹⁵⁰ Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 92-3. De Gaál, *The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI*, 228.

¹⁵¹ Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 40-1.

¹⁵² Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 41. Romano Guardini, *Berichte über mein Leben: Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1984), 33.

Church.”¹⁵³ Therefore Ratzinger affirms that faith and conversion are necessary prerequisites of theology.¹⁵⁴

Exploring these views of Ratzinger on the role of the Magisterium we gain an insight into his ecclesiology. Here too Ratzinger does not see Church primarily as an institution. Church is the body of Christ, the liturgical and sacramental communion with God and humanity. There is an essential unity between Church and Christ. Ratzinger’s understanding of the Magisterium corresponds to this concept of Church.

It is not possible to undertake any deep criticism of Ratzinger’s idea on the role of the Magisterium here. I refer simply to a work of Thomas P. Rausch that can provide a good basis for further research in this area.¹⁵⁵

1.3.2 Theology, Magisterium and Liturgy

Like Guardini, Ratzinger does not deal explicitly with the relationship between theology and liturgy. I will therefore apply his concept of theology—as explained in the previous section—to the liturgy of the Church. As we have seen, the Magisterium has a defining role in the process of doing theology. Because every theology is for the Church, the Church reserves the right to decide what meets its criteria and what does not. The same principle has to be applied to liturgy, which guarantees a liturgical development

¹⁵³ Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 42. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Nature and Mission of Theology*, 48-9. Guardini, *Berichte*, 32. Joseph Ratzinger, “Von der Liturgie zur Christologie. Romano Guardinis theologischer Grundansatz und seine Aussagekraft,” in *Wege zur Wahrheit. Die bleibende Bedeutung von Romano Guardini*, ed. Joseph Ratzinger (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985), 121-44, especially 128-33.

¹⁵⁴ Ratzinger, *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie*, 48-50.

¹⁵⁵ Thomas P. Rausch, *Pope Benedict XVI: An Introduction to his Theological Vision* (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), especially 57-60.

that corresponds to the nature of the liturgy and ensures that erroneous elements do not enter the liturgy. While the Magisterium has authority over theologians and in setting the parameters for theology, it does not have the same authority over liturgy. For Ratzinger, liturgy seems to have its own rules that cannot be overwritten by ecclesial authorities. This idea is explained the most thoroughly when Ratzinger addresses papal authority in liturgical matters, affirming that the task of the Magisterium is not the invention of the liturgy, but its protection.

In *Der Geist der Liturgie*, Ratzinger writes about the development of rites. He points to a difficulty in the field of liturgy that led to an incorrect understanding. In the Catholic Church certain factors (e.g. increased significance of papal authority) have meant that in the liturgical field after Vatican II, it was believed that the pope could do anything in the matter of rites and liturgical celebrations. As a consequence, it was forgotten, says Ratzinger, that liturgy is not created by the Church, but is given by God. In contrast to the modern understanding of the papacy, according to which the authority of the pope is unconditioned, the pope is a servant of the development of Church tradition, of its integrity and identity. Changing and reorganizing liturgical rites is incompatible both with the nature of the liturgy and the papal authority. “Only respect for the liturgy’s fundamental unspontaneity and pre-existing identity can give us what we hope for: the feast, in which the great reality comes to us that we ourselves do not manufacture but receive as a gift.”¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁶ Ratzinger, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 144. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 168. For a more accurate understanding I would quote here Ratzinger’s original words: “Nur der Respekt vor der Vorgänglichkeit und vor der grundsätzlichen Unbeliebigkeit der Liturgie kann uns schenken, was wir von ihr erhoffen: das Fest, in dem das Große auf uns zutritt, das wir nicht selber machen, sondern eben

The nature of liturgy hinders such a direct intervention from the ecclesial authority because liturgy is given by God, and therefore it is above papal authority. One of the Church's most important tasks must be the preservation and protection of liturgy. Liturgy is not a human invention; therefore it is not within the authority of human beings to change anything arbitrarily. The rules for the development of the liturgy are also very strict in Ratzinger's view, leaving no room for personal choices or preferences, not even those of the pope.¹⁵⁷ The role of the pope is to promote the preservation of liturgical tradition and a liturgical praxis that is faithful to both the nature and the rules of the liturgy. From this we can see that Ratzinger's thinking is radically based in a Christocentric view of the liturgy. Christ is in its centre, not the celebrating community or individual, therefore the divine institution radically limits human authority over liturgy. It is, however, not entirely clear what is divinely instituted and what is a human addition to the liturgy, and therefore what is changeable and what is not.

The question of authority and competence does not apply only to the relationship between liturgy and Magisterium, but to liturgy and theologians as well. Even though I will speak about this second relationship in Chapter 3, I want to mention here the presence of this debating point in Ratzinger's thought. Following German historian Klaus Gamber,¹⁵⁸ Ratzinger explains that after the Council liturgical scholars attributed

als Geschenk bekommen." The original German text clearly indicates that Ratzinger does not speak primarily about creativity, which is completely rejected by him in connection to liturgy, but about the given nature of the liturgy, which, because of its divine origin, is not submitted to human arbitrariness. The acknowledgement of this characteristic of the liturgy enables it to become what it is given for: to be a feast of the encounter between God and humans.

¹⁵⁷ Joseph Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt. Glauben und Leben in unserer Zeit: Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (München: Knaur, 2005), 445-6.

¹⁵⁸ Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background* (San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press; Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993), 27-39.

to themselves an authority that was not theirs. They felt authorized to implement any changes they wanted, and so they side-stepped a long period of organic growth.¹⁵⁹ They were mostly influenced by theological ideas considered modern and progressive at the time that these were introduced into the liturgical practice. This amounted to a failure to acknowledge the nature of the liturgy, where, according to Ratzinger, organic development belongs.

Liturgy must not be a terrain for experimenting with theological hypotheses. Too rapidly, in these last decades the ideas of experts have entered into liturgical practice, often also by-passing ecclesiastical authority, through the channel of commissions which have been able to diffuse at an international level their «consensus of the moment», and practically turn it into laws for liturgical activity. The Liturgy derives its greatness from what it is, not from what we make of it.¹⁶⁰

The question of authority in matters of liturgy appears on other occasions as well. In 2001, Ratzinger published an article entitled “Um die Erneuerung der Liturgie,”¹⁶¹ which is a response to the article of Reiner Kaczynski.¹⁶² In this article Ratzinger defends a document of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments on liturgical translations that bears the title “*Liturgiam Authenticam*.” In the article one finds again the idea that, contrary to the will of Vatican II, it is the experts that make decisions about liturgical translations, rather than the bishops or conferences of bishops, although the bishops are usually given the opportunity to accept what the

¹⁵⁹ Joseph Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens: Versuche zur Theologie des Gottesdienstes* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1993), 73. English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith: Approaches to a Theology of the Liturgy* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1986), 81.

¹⁶⁰ Joseph Ratzinger, “Theologie der Liturgie,” in Ratzinger, Joseph, *Gesammelte Schriften* Vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010), 639-56, especially 656; English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, “The Theology of the Liturgy,” in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger: Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*, ed. Alcuin Reid (Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael’s Abbey Press, 2003), 18-31, especially 30.

¹⁶¹ Joseph Ratzinger, “Um die Erneuerung der Liturgie: Antwort auf Reiner Kaczynski,” *StdZ* 219 (2001): 837-43.

¹⁶² Reiner Kaczynski, “Angriff an die Liturgiekonstitution? Anmerkungen zu einer neuen Übersetzer-Instruktion,” *StdZ* 219 (2001): 651-68.

experts have presented. Ratzinger refutes Kaczynski's argument and calls this praxis a betrayal of the Council.¹⁶³ For Ratzinger, the question here is again the correct interpretation of the conciliar documents and the exaggerated authority of liturgical experts who appropriate such authority for themselves.

In the discussion following the publication of Ratzinger's *Der Geist der Liturgie*, the meaning of authority became a constant point of debate. Ratzinger, responding to Pierre-Marie Gy's,¹⁶⁴ who accuses him of devaluing papal authority with regard to liturgy, emphasises again in his article "*Der Geist der Liturgie oder: die Treue zum Konzil*"¹⁶⁵ that his experience shows that a significant number of liturgical scholars are concerned with constantly proposing new texts and liturgical forms, causing some kind of wild liturgical growth that impedes the general and positive acceptance of Paul VI's missal. Ratzinger explains that he absolutely accepts papal liturgical decisions,¹⁶⁶ and that liturgical scholars should not think that they surpass them either. In this article we can see confirmation that Ratzinger relies on papal authority when the wild growth caused by some liturgical scholars needs to be held back and corrected, but at the same time goes beyond it when he wants to preserve a liturgical development that is traditional and corresponds to the specific nature of the liturgy. In Chapter 3 I will expand upon the kind of liturgical development that Ratzinger considers acceptable.

¹⁶³ Ratzinger, "Um die Erneuerung der Liturgie," 840.

¹⁶⁴ Pierre-Marie Gy, "L'Esprit de la liturgie du Cardinal Ratzinger est-il fidèle au Concile ou en réaction contre?" *LMD* 229 (2002): 171-8.

¹⁶⁵ Joseph Ratzinger, "'Der Geist der Liturgie' oder: die Treue zum Konzil. Antwort an Pater Gy," *LJ* 52 (2002): 111-5.

¹⁶⁶ Ratzinger, "Antwort an Pater Gy," 112.

1.4 Conclusion of Chapter 1

About the understanding of the relationship between liturgy and theology one can find several opinions. The relationship as it is expressed in Prosper of Aquitaine's axiom *lex orandi – lex credendi* originally upholds the authority of liturgy against theology, an authority which is not, however, unconditioned. It has to meet certain criteria that guarantee its accordance with Catholic faith and tradition. Liturgy can influence and inspire doctrinal development and it can provide proof of dogmas. The publication of *Mediator Dei* in 1947 reversed Prosper's adage in order to establish doctrinal and magisterial control over the liturgy. Any change (or reform) in the liturgy now needed to be ordained by the Magisterium and its head, the Roman Pontiff. With this, liturgy was completely submitted not only to theology, but to papal authority as well. This idea is, however, very untraditional.

The teaching of the Second Vatican Council tries to reach a certain balance between liturgy and theology, acknowledging their interdependence. It leaves room for liturgical development, but this too must meet some criteria and find the consent of a competent authority. Given that along with this *Sacrosanctum Concilium* orders many liturgical changes, it can rightly be assumed that the effects of *Mediator Dei* are still perceptible.

Romano Guardini seems to hesitate in trying to reach a balance between the objectivity and subjectivity of the liturgy. Even though he affirms that the prayers of the liturgy are governed by dogma, liturgical praxis seems to be something that influences the *lex credendi*, giving room for human nature to step into humanity's liturgical awareness and the mundane things of the liturgy. Guardini implies, like Odo Casel, a

circular movement from theology to liturgy and from liturgy to theology. Guardini does not say that liturgy is unchanging, but rather that the fundamental laws of liturgy are unchanging. Liturgy is *lex credendi* because it contains the fullness of revelation.

In Joseph Ratzinger's understanding, theology must serve the community of the Church, therefore theology and theologians are not the main authorities in ecclesial life. They are submitted to God's revelation and the institution that preserves, and with divine help, interprets it. From this almost complete submission of Church life to Magisterium, liturgy seems to be an exception. Ratzinger, that is, acknowledges that liturgical development has its own rules that cannot be changed or ignored by the Magisterium. Even papal authority has its limits with regard to liturgy. Therefore any change in the liturgy can only be accepted if it has developed organically and corresponds to the proper nature of the liturgy. What exactly organic development means, we will discover in Chapter 3.

The following points were highlighted in this chapter: (1) The interpretation of the *lex orandi – lex credendi* relationship underwent a significant change in history. (2) This change influenced liturgical theology, especially in the twentieth century. (3) Even in recent times, there have been different interpretations of how liturgy develops and the extent to which this development is influenced by theology and dogma.

As a consequence we can now see that a subjective element also has a major part to play in the application of a certain kind of liturgical theology. This element is a precondition for any further argumentation. Now we are aware of Guardini and Ratzinger's theological preferences, we can turn to their interpretations of liturgical

reform, not forgetting the liturgical-theological frameworks from which their ideas arose.

2. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL TURN IN ROMANO GUARDINI'S INTERPRETATION OF LITURGICAL REFORM

In the previous chapter it was noted that the understanding of the relationship between liturgy and theology underwent a significant change in the twentieth century. This change was connected to the Liturgical Movement, in which Guardini took part, and to the encyclical *Mediator Dei*, which had become a benchmark for future liturgical theological development. We have already seen that Guardini and Ratzinger placed different emphases in their approaches to the relationship between liturgy and theology. The issue is significant in connection with the reform of the liturgy because the interpretation of this basic relationship defines how liturgy is understood and the extent to which it can undergo essential or subsidiary changes. We will now see how the two theologians, using this relationship as a precondition, understand the nature of the liturgy and the essence of liturgical reform. In the end, I will identify some general criteria for the reform of the liturgy.

I turn first to two significant letters in which Romano Guardini raises the topic of liturgical reform. These two letters represent two different periods, not only in Guardini's life, but in the development of the Liturgical Movement itself. The first letter is from 1940, the period before *Mediator Dei*, and its style is defensive rather than explanatory. The second letter is written in 1964, after the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, and in it he seeks to identify the direction in which the implementation of the conciliar reform must point. By analyzing these two letters and placing them within a

holistic understanding of Guardini's liturgical theology, I intend to show what he considers to be the basis of liturgical reform and what exactly this means for the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform.

2.1 False Paths of Liturgical Renewal: The 1940 Letter *Ein Wort zur liturgischen Frage*

In the 1930s and 40s the developing Liturgical Movement naturally had its opponents, among whom one can find influential thinkers of the time. One of these critics was Max Kassiepe OMI, who expressed his concern about certain ideas and practices of the Liturgical Movement. He published a booklet in 1939 under the title *Irrwege und Umwege im Frömmigkeitsleben der Gegenwart*.¹⁶⁷ In it Kassiepe notes that an elite body of liturgists are initiating a certain liturgism, and spreading emotional and irresponsible liturgical forms. They do this, continues Kassiepe, without ecclesiastical approval and with no respect for liturgical rubrics. He lists concrete examples of such behaviour, such as variations in liturgical texts, the celebration of the Easter Vigil on Saturday evening, the use of German instead of Latin, and the discouragement of private devotions during Mass.¹⁶⁸

Kassiepe's criticism won many over, including a number of bishops. For this reason, even German bishops were unsure about the path to follow with regard to the

¹⁶⁷ Max Kassiepe, *Irrwege und Umwege im Frömmigkeitsleben der Gegenwart* (Kevelaer: Butzon&Bercker, 1939)

¹⁶⁸ Arno Schilson, "Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter und Wegbegleiter der liturgischen Erneuerung," *LJ* 36 (1986): 3-27, especially 11.

Liturgical Movement. The bishop of Mainz, Albert Stohr, thus asked Guardini to write a letter explaining what the liturgical renewal was about. Guardini accepted the bishop's request and in 1940 published the letter entitled "Ein Wort zur liturgischen Frage."¹⁶⁹ The tone of the letter is rather defensive in that Guardini seeks to explain what the Liturgical Movement is not, rather than what it is. He encourages the bishops to give further support to the Liturgical Movement and asks them not to make any hasty decisions. "What the liturgical work needs is time. A lot of work must be done and the tasks are difficult. [...] It is certainly very desirable to leave everything floating for the moment. Otherwise the outcome cannot be anything good."¹⁷⁰ He acknowledges certain exaggerations in the Liturgical Movement caused by the fact that the movement itself is not uniform. At the same time he repeatedly affirms that the movement was born out of necessity, that is, the desire to lead liturgy back from the sphere of private devotion to its original meaning and importance, and to give it back its purity and meaningfulness.¹⁷¹ Guardini acknowledges that the rubrics have not always been respected, even though, in his view, Kassiepe offers only extreme examples of this and does not even try to insert the ideas of the movement into a systematic whole or to consider the proposals of the representatives of the movement.

Defending the Liturgical Movement, Guardini explains that certain methods that were effective in earlier periods are no longer effective because many external factors

¹⁶⁹ Romano Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald; Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1992), 171-89.

¹⁷⁰ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 185, my translation. "Was die liturgische Arbeit braucht, ist Zeit. Sehr viel muß getan werden, und die Aufgaben sind schwer. [...] Es ist sicher viel verlangt, alles noch in der Schweben zu lassen; anders kann aber etwas Gutes nicht entstehen."

¹⁷¹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 172. Frédéric Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie. Introduction à l'œuvre liturgique de Romano Guardini* (Paris: Cerf, 2008), 84-5.

have changed, such as the way of thinking and cognition. It would be a mistake to affirm that only those methods that concentrate on external changes constitute something essential for the Church. The research must not concentrate exclusively on praxis. It is imperative that the whole of revelation is expressed in the liturgy and at the same time it must be directed to the spiritual welfare of the faithful.¹⁷² With these words Guardini rejects the idea of a liturgical renewal that concentrates only on ritual elements. This is evident even in the words he uses—"pure" and "purity" (*rein, Reinheit*)—to point to the central attribute of the liturgy. The task of the renewal is to regain the purity of the liturgy. The liturgy is pure when it can fulfill what is included in its nature: when it can offer the place for the encounter with God; a place where everything is directed to this goal and serves its perfect realization.

Guardini expounds on four tendencies that should be avoided in liturgical renewal in order to demonstrate that inappropriate liturgical theological hermeneutics can transform the liturgy into a praxis that does not correspond to its nature. He acknowledges that these four positions were present in the early phase of the Liturgical Movement,¹⁷³ and that they are sometimes represented even by those who oppose the Liturgical Movement. Looking at these four tendencies that he opposes can help us discover what liturgical renewal meant for Guardini during this period. The 1940s do not represent the initial phase of Guardini's liturgical work, therefore he is able to exercise

¹⁷² Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 173.

¹⁷³ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 174. We see here that Guardini's main goal in this letter is to defend the Liturgical Movement, even though he acknowledges some of its mistakes or exaggerations. He points out that what the Liturgical Movement is accused of is present also in the thinking of the opponents of the Movement. Therefore his presentation of the four tendencies to avoid is a strong criticism against a liturgical-theological thinking that does not correspond to the nature of the liturgy. This is the reason why we need to understand how Guardini speaks about liturgy and what his motives are for speaking thus.

self-criticism against the Liturgical Movement. More than two decades from the culmination of the Movement in Vatican II, his ideas are not as developed here as in his later writings. Here he is concerned with the past and the present, while in his letter of 1963 he will be more concerned about the future of the liturgical renewal. At the same time, while his approach here is defensive, explaining what not to do in renewing the liturgy, the second letter has a positive tone, explaining the things to be done.

In the following I will explore the meaning and importance of these four tendencies for liturgical reform in general. It would be interesting to explore their opposites too, because I suppose that when Guardini names tendencies to avoid, their contraries are the desirable ideas to be followed in the process of reforming the liturgy. I am aware that such philosophical terms do not necessarily have opposites that can be clearly expressed or that are adequate in their meaning. I nevertheless wish to offer a possible counterpoint for each, in order to reveal Guardini's reasoning in more depth. With the help of this method, I will identify some general criteria for the reform of the liturgy at the end of the chapter.

2.1.1 Liturgicism: Liturgy for the Sake of Liturgy

The first tendency Guardini suggests avoiding is liturgicism (*Liturgismus*), which is a tendency to seek to recover the primary intentions and forms of the liturgy, but at the same time fail to learn from actual parish worship. Guardini argues here that liturgical development is not merely theoretical, directed only by historical or theological methods, but that it must look to those who take part in liturgical celebrations, the

celebrating Church as it concretises in local communities.¹⁷⁴ It was clear to representatives of the Liturgical Movement that liturgy must be renewed because of an exaggerated individualism and rationalism about which I intend to write later. According to these representatives, such ideologies were present in the Church's liturgy of that time, forcing it to withdraw to the subjective and private sphere. For this reason the justifiable wish for renewal was born.

Ideas about how to renew liturgy were not unified and therefore the Movement took several directions. The trap of liturgicism is that it wants to attribute to liturgy a meaning it did not originally possess. This tendency appears when something important is not given due attention over a long period, and then, after the discussion about necessary changes begins in a subsequent period, the newly rediscovered idea is overestimated, and it is forgotten that liturgy has other forms as well. One example of this is when the monastic liturgy was set forth as the most authentic form of Christian liturgy, with liturgical reformers intending to follow the monastic liturgy as a pattern. That the parish community might have different needs and possibilities was not considered.¹⁷⁵ It is therefore important not to forget popular devotions or personal experiences in the act of prayer,¹⁷⁶ because liturgical texts and rituals cannot be the only foundation for the prayer life of the individual. Liturgicism does not see the needs of the individual or the local community, especially when it is characterised by an aesthetic sentimentality. It must

¹⁷⁴ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 175.

¹⁷⁵ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 175-6. Throughout his writings Guardini is very sensitive to the anthropological character of the Church. No wonder that when he speaks about liturgy, he always refers to its anthropological importance.

¹⁷⁶ Henri Engelmann and Francis Ferrier, *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*. *Giornale di teologia* 22, trans. Giuseppe Bugatti (Brescia: Queriniana, 1968), 163-4.

again be remembered that the emergence of the importance of the individual does not necessarily equate to individualism.

Addressing the tendency to liturgicism, Guardini incorporates the question of the meaning of the liturgy. It seems that he is suggesting that in this tendency the meaning of liturgy in the life of the Church becomes unbalanced: liturgicism expresses the idea that liturgy has to do exclusively with God. In the following section it will be seen that Guardini clearly affirms that liturgy must give something also to humans, so that through the encounter with God in liturgical actions people can be conformed to Christ.

2.1.2 Dilettantism: Liturgical One-Sidedness

The second tendency to be avoided Guardini calls dilettantism (*Dilettantismus*). This approach appropriately seeks to bring the liturgy nearer to everyday life, but is intolerant of practices that do not fit its subjective view of worship. Explaining this tendency, Guardini offers the example of those who want to abolish certain forms of popular devotions, such as the rosary, or the Stations of the Cross, or who misjudge the importance of German hymns. He argues that these people forget that single elements of prayer life have a value and constitute not only a part of the whole, but are themselves living realities. It is true, however, that such elements cannot be kept under control as easily as liturgical rubrics and therefore they can seem more independent, which is perhaps the reason why some scholars want to abolish them.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁷ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 176-8. As we will see, the role of popular devotions is crucial for Guardini, because beside the objectivity of the liturgy, popular devotions give warmth and

Thanks to the Liturgical Movement, it was rediscovered that at the heart of Church life is the liturgy, which is the centre of prayer life. Some scholars wanted to shape liturgy around this renewed emphasis on liturgical celebrations and emphasize popular devotions less. In this endeavour they forgot that many liturgical forms and customs have been formed over the centuries and that these are dear to the faithful and cannot be ignored. They have become part of religious and cultic life and any change in them or abrogation would cause confusion and puzzlement among the faithful. The intentions of the protagonists can be justified and their changes might be correct theologically, but pedagogically they are unwise, because completely new forms of liturgy, developed by individuals in a scholarly way, cannot easily be inserted into the prayer life of the praying faithful or the community. Although aware of this, the advocates of this sort of change sought to adjust the community rather than adjust their liturgical ideas.¹⁷⁸

Through the Liturgical Movement some significant reform moves were realised, e.g. the vernacular was introduced in chants or hymns, the participation of the faithful was recognised as important, new emphasis was laid on symbols, the power of Gregorian chant was acknowledged, and appropriate German texts were prepared and set to the Gregorian melodies. All these changes served one purpose: the creation of the

heart to the prayer life of the individual. Therefore they are necessary for a healthy balance. This is probably the reason why he offers this example when he speaks about liturgical dilettantism.

¹⁷⁸ The note on this by the editor of the German edition of Guardini's book seems to me significant at this point. He says: "It seems that today—after the Council—there is again occasion to warn against a liturgical dilettantism. Too many who resisted all real liturgical reform up to the present, are now pursuing—with and without official permission—activities in this field for which they totally lack expertise and professional competence, as is proved by the results of their activities.." Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 177, my translation. "Es scheint, daß heute – nach dem Konzil – erneut Anlaß besteht, vor einem liturgischen Dilettantismus zu warnen. Allzu viele, die sich noch bis gestern gegen jede echte liturgische Reform gesträubt haben, entwickeln nun – mit und ohne offiziellen Auftrag – auf diesem Feld eine Aktivität, für die ihnen Sachkenntnis und handwerkliches Können, wie sich an den Ergebnissen dieser Aktivität erweist, durchaus abgehen."

Volksliturgie. The intention was good, but there were definitely problems with the realisation. It must be acknowledged that some changes were made arbitrarily and without paying attention to the context. There were significant differences in praxis from one location to another and this caused difficulty. The actual liturgical forms were chosen according to personal taste, without considering the complexity of the liturgical action. Giving the example of the translation of liturgical texts, Guardini emphasises that sometimes necessary pre-conditions were not even present—pre-conditions such as adequate philological, theological and linguistic knowledge. Similarly, some preliminary theological, pedagogic or musical abilities are necessary to involve people in liturgical action, to teach them what liturgy is about. The Liturgical Movement was condemned by many, primarily because those who did not recognize all these important factors started the renewal according to their personal feelings, causing confusion in the Church.¹⁷⁹

We can see here that Guardini acknowledges that liturgical development must be taken into consideration and does not allow a complete turning away from tradition. At the same time he emphasises that liturgical renewal cannot happen by shaping liturgy to the desires of contemporary society and culture, because then its eternal values will be lost. The renewal is not the task of individuals seeking to generalise their personal opinions. He nevertheless does not deny the possibility of changes in the liturgy, but these must be preceded by careful study and preparation in order to safeguard the integrity of liturgy, and by an accurate preparation of the faithful so that they can

¹⁷⁹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 178. In the next chapter we will discover a very similar thought by Ratzinger, who says that the most important mistake in the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform was that it was made by scholars who promoted their own ideas and ignored the organic development of the liturgy, which derives from the very nature of the liturgy.

recognise the continuity with previous liturgical praxis. In general, we can say that what is needed before the liturgy is humility: the human person must know his or her place and role in front of the great mystery of liturgy and deal with it as one of the most precious treasures of the Church.

2.1.3 Pragmatism: Realizing Only the Doable

A third danger in liturgical renewal, according to Guardini, is pragmatism (*Praktizismus*), which means being concerned especially with what is feasible now, while failing to respect the liturgy as an activity undertaken for its own sake. Representatives of this tendency say that the main goal of liturgy is education and therefore it must be derived from the present times. The only liturgy that is appropriate is one that has an immediate practical or even moral effect. It follows from this thinking that the contemplative stance in the liturgy is deemed ineffective and useless.¹⁸⁰ There are some positive aspects to this pragmatic tendency, because it rejects a conception of liturgy that is far removed from the life of the participants. Liturgy indeed has to do with the everyday life of the faithful. The danger, however, is more significant, because pragmatism allows liturgy to be influenced by social, financial or even political ideologies, with the main purpose of liturgy now being to serve the people in order to help them to overcome their personal or social problems in a Christian way. This approach fosters a spirituality that focuses primarily on mundane realities and forgets liturgy has a dignity that is not subordinated to any purpose, because it is primarily the

¹⁸⁰ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 180.

place for the encounter with God.¹⁸¹ Consequently, the celebration of the liturgy can appear obsolete and superfluous. With this, the most important meaning of liturgy is destroyed: the glorification of God and the sanctification of humans. The concern of liturgy becomes statistically measurable data, rather than transformation in the depth of human beings.

One must acknowledge that liturgy is not merely a place for catechetical or moral teaching and it is not only effective when there is a visible and measurable effect. Liturgy is the place for a deep union with God and the levels of this union are mysterious. The pragmatic view of the liturgy must be changed for a spiritual or even mystical one in order that it be transformative in the depth of the human being.

2.1.4 Conservatism: Inaccurate Concept of History and Development

The fourth liturgical tendency deemed inadequate by Guardini is conservatism (*Konservativismus*). Conservatism wants to preserve the tradition's truth, but since it has an inadequate grasp of history, gives primacy to practices that are secondary within the history of liturgy itself.¹⁸² It is important to understand clearly that viewing conservatism as a negative tendency does not mean that Guardini considers the preservation of

¹⁸¹ One of Guardini's best known thoughts is about the purposelessness of the liturgy, which he compares to art or the play of the child. He dedicates a whole chapter to this theme in *Vom Geist der Liturgie*. It is here that he writes: "The liturgy has no purpose, or, at least, it cannot be considered from the standpoint of purpose. It is not a means which is adapted to attain a certain end—it is an end in itself." Romano Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald; Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1997), 61-2. English translation: Romano Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1998), 66. This is the reason why Guardini finds pragmatism dangerous and adheres instead to the idea that liturgy should have no defined purpose.

¹⁸² Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 175-84. Robert A. Krieg, *Romano Guardini: A Precursor of Vatican II* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 83.

liturgical heritage unnecessary. Instead, he speaks about those who impose one historical period on another, mostly an ancient one on a more modern one, and do not allow liturgy to form and change naturally. It is primarily in this sense that Guardini sees conservatism as a negative tendency.

Guardini notes that twenty-five years before his letter, one would have thought that the Liturgical Movement was centred on historical research with its main goal the excavation of ancient liturgical texts and rituals. But liturgy is not about the intentions of those who want to build a parallel religious world for themselves for merely aesthetic reasons. None of these tendencies can be acceptable at the more developed stage of the Liturgical Movement, since “liturgy is not an historical or aesthetic hobby.”¹⁸³ He acknowledges that liturgy is a reality within history with all the attributes that belong to historicity: it develops and changes. It must be a constant question in liturgical historiology and theology, whether liturgical forms or texts of a certain period are valid for subsequent times, or whether certain motives can result in false interpretations in different periods.¹⁸⁴ During the earliest period of liturgy, two tendencies were present in parallel. On the one side, there was the prayer life of the congregation and the single faithful in which the religious experience (*Empfinden*) found expression. On the other side, there was the liturgy and its development, the official cult of the Church, as it were, constantly changing and forming.¹⁸⁵ These two forms complement each other. Guardini wants to lay double emphasis on these two strands. A healthy balance between the two is

¹⁸³ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 172. My translation: “die Liturgie keine historische oder ästhetische Liebhaberei [...] ist.”

¹⁸⁴ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 174.

¹⁸⁵ More on this: Guardini, “Der Gesamtzusammenhang des christlichen Gebetslebens in unser Gottesdienst,” in *Unser Gottesdienst: Überlegungen und Anregungen: Ein Werkbuch*, ed. Alfons Kirchgässner (Freiburg: Herder, 1961), 85-94, especially 85.

the guarantee for the preservation of the objective character of the liturgy, and for the fulfillment of the subjective longings of the praying individual and community.

Conservatism has positive aspects also, because it acknowledges that liturgy has a contemplative character and that it is efficacious being primarily about God. Conservatism looks behind things and discovers the value of non-practical liturgical elements, such as art and even the meaning of rubrics. What is more problematic in this tendency, however, is that it tends to reject everything unusual. According to Guardini, conservatives appreciate everything that is transmitted and label all new things as anti-liturgical. Everything must be done as it has been done up until now. They do not consider if a liturgical form is meaningful today or if fruitful ancient forms have been suppressed by unfruitful newer rituals. They do not recognize that liturgical texts do not have their original power because they have been worn out in their use over the centuries. Important to conservatives are age and origin. They often refer to the *lex credendi* and reject any change or development, forgetting that there is also a *lex orandi*. *Lex orandi* does not mean the observation of rubrics or having them observed. It is instead an order of life (*Lebensordnung*) that leads to the deeper understanding of God's truth.¹⁸⁶ The plurality of liturgical life and the inner dynamism of liturgy disappear here and a spiritual monotony develops. Conservatives think that the faithful do not understand these things, and do not even try to explain them to them. They do not see the problems of contemporary people. At the root of all such tendencies and ideas is not merely an exaggerated liturgical subjectivism, but the fact that representatives of this tendency cannot give a clear answer to the question of what liturgy is.

¹⁸⁶ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 182.

I think Guardini makes a clear and justified point here. Something cannot be considered more valuable simply because of its age, and subjective visions cannot suppress the objective character of the liturgy. He wants everyone to allow liturgy to be what it is, and to develop according to its own internal laws.¹⁸⁷ But we must not forget that the often referenced method of the Liturgical Movement, *ad fontes*, is also an approach in which the return to a previous historical period is desired, while omitting subsequent historical development. Even though the origins of liturgy offer us a precious form that can even influence our contemporary celebrations, one can easily fall into antiquarianism when considering any age as a golden age for liturgical history. What we see here is the confrontation of historical, theological, liturgical, cultural and anthropological principles.

2.1.5 Elements of Liturgical Renewal

The concrete consequences of Guardini's letter in relation to liturgical reform are as follows. First of all, it is noteworthy that in the Liturgical Movement Guardini does not use the expression "reform." Instead he speaks about renewal (*Erneuerung*). This term indicates to me that Guardini does not propose radical change, or indeed any change in the first instance. What is needed, he believes, is the renewal of already existing realities. He desires the formation of a liturgical consciousness in all those involved in the liturgical act: clergy and faithful alike.

¹⁸⁷ A similar idea to this appears again in Ratzinger, for whom an important criterion of liturgical development is its independence from subjective ideologies and from external interventions in its development in history. I will elaborate on this in the next chapter.

Guardini himself confirms this idea when he explains that the work of the renewal “must not be realized according to subjective judgement and preference, but conforming to the *lex orandi* of the Church; at the same time however with a real freedom of creation and formulation, where the law of the Church makes this possible.”¹⁸⁸ Even though Walter Birnbaum interprets these phrases of Guardini's as the first reference to the need for a liturgical reform,¹⁸⁹ I doubt that in this usage reform means anything similar to contemporary understandings. Guardini mentions here only the law of the Church, but we have seen that the proper nature of the liturgy also sets some limits to a subjective renewal. We will see shortly that the preservation of the objective character of the liturgy is one of Guardini's main concerns. Arno Schilson confirms that Guardini tries to find the middle way between extreme positions (*Gegensätze*) and looks at the essential characteristics of liturgy.¹⁹⁰ The identification of these essential elements is at the centre of Guardini's liturgical research in subsequent decades. He comes to the core of the question in a letter written in 1964, to be explored in the next section.

¹⁸⁸ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 188, my translation. “Darf nicht nach subjektivem Ermessen und Belieben, sondern nur in Einordnung in die *lex orandi* der Kirche geschehen; zugleich aber auch mit einer echten Freiheit des Schaffens und Gestaltens überall da, wo dieses Gesetz der Kirche erlaubt.”

¹⁸⁹ Walter Birnbaum, *Die deutsche katholische liturgische Bewegung* (Tübingen: Katzmann-Verlag, 1966), 105.

¹⁹⁰ Schilson, “Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter,” 14.

2.2 Enabled to Perform the Liturgical Act: The Letter *Der Kultakt und die gegenwärtige Aufgabe der liturgischen Bildung* 1964

When the third national liturgical conference was held in Mainz in 1964, Guardini could not participate because of ill health. The conference was very significant because it was the first national meeting of German liturgists after the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Guardini wrote a letter to the participants on the real essence of liturgical reform, addressing the most important tasks of the implementation of the conciliar reform. In this letter Guardini adopts a different tone from that of 1940 and for that reason the letter was received with astonishment and puzzlement. The letter is entitled: “Der Kultakt und die gegenwärtige Aufgabe der liturgischen Bildung.”¹⁹¹

Guardini begins with a call to consider how to implement the conciliar liturgical reform in practice:

The liturgical work, as we all know, is at an important point. The Council laid the foundations for the future—and the way in which this came to pass so that the truth was proclaimed, will always be a model example of how the Holy Spirit acts in the Church. But now the question arises, how is the work to start, so that truth becomes reality.¹⁹²

¹⁹¹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 9-17.

¹⁹² Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 9, my translation. “Die liturgische Arbeit, das wissen wir alle, steht an einem wichtigen Punkt. Den Grund zum Künftigen hat das Konzil gelegt – und wie dieses zu Stande gekommen ist und Wahrheit kundgetan hat, wird immer ein Schulbeispiel dafür bleiben, wie der Heilige Geist in der Kirche wirkt. Nun aber stellt sich die Frage, in welcher Weise die Arbeit ansetzen müsse, damit die Wahrheit die Wirklichkeit werde.”

2.2.1 Rediscovering the Centrality of the Liturgical Act

Guardini feared that liturgists wanted to begin the implementation of the conciliar reform with textual and ritual changes and not with an examination of the anthropological, cultural and religious context in which the liturgical reform would be realized.¹⁹³ He affirms that after the liturgical reform of the Council, post-conciliar liturgists need to be aware of the importance of the question of the *Kult-Akt*, or more precisely, the importance of the liturgical act over ritual or textual problems.¹⁹⁴ According to Krieg, in this period Guardini “felt alienated from contemporary society [...] [he] feared that the emphasis upon individualism and self-sufficiency would make it difficult for people to worship appropriately.”¹⁹⁵ The ancient idea according to which the liturgical act itself is prayer and has a definitive role in the individual's prayer life must be recovered. It is not only and not primarily something merely exterior or of secondary importance. Guardini explains that he still feels the presence of an individualistic spirituality that was so characteristic of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹⁹⁶ Guardini asks in light of the Council, if, when liturgy is bound too tightly to ancient historical forms, it should be given up as a whole and a new way found in which contemporary people can participate. This question is perhaps surprising, but Guardini's goal is not of course the abrogation of liturgical tradition, but the promotion of liturgical

¹⁹³ Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 92.

¹⁹⁴ Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 92. Hanna Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini: Konturen des Lebens und Spuren des Denkens* (Kevelaer: Topos plus Verlagsgemeinschaft, 2005), 257-8.

¹⁹⁵ Krieg, *Romano Guardini*, 89.

¹⁹⁶ Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 92-3.

research, and not only or primarily historical research, in order to get closer to liturgy itself.¹⁹⁷

In Guardini's view, the typical man or woman of the nineteenth century was not capable of understanding and performing the liturgical act. This lack was probably caused by the significant impact of technological culture on people's ability to engage in communal activity.¹⁹⁸ Religious life had become primarily individual inner life, and its official celebration was the liturgy. That is why liturgy had become a celebratory but private act, with all the efforts for the liturgy seeming to be the efforts of aesthetes, and through this had lost its meaning. The Council helped with a turn to the essential elements of liturgy. Everyone needs to be aware that the celebrating individual is at the same time part of the whole that is the Church, and liturgy involves the entire reality of the human and the Church: material and spiritual, individual and communal, natural and transcendental. Guardini senses in the liturgical theological discussion of his time that theologians refer almost exclusively to the sociological and ethnological moment: the participation of the congregation and the vernacular. However, it is about something more: an *Akt-Welt* that has degenerated.¹⁹⁹ Guardini's most important question is whether people are still capable of a liturgical act.²⁰⁰ The implementation of the conciliar reform must focus therefore on learning once again to perform liturgy: to become capable of the liturgical act as human beings.

¹⁹⁷ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 16.

¹⁹⁸ Krieg, Romano Guardini, 88.

¹⁹⁹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 9-10. David A. Stosur, "Liturgy and (Post) Modernity: A Narrative Response to Guardini's Challenge," *Worship* 77 (2003): 22-41, especially 24.

²⁰⁰ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 15.

What is this liturgical act? Guardini offers the example of the preparation of the gifts for the Eucharist. This can be considered by the faithful as a merely practical act in which altar servers bring the offering to the altar so that they can be offered to God. But there is another way of understanding the same action, whereby the faithful can understand this whole process as a prayer, as readiness for God, and as something spiritual. This spiritual process can also involve something material, such as bread and wine, money, liturgical buildings, or time, all of which realise and concretise this act. This liturgical act can merely be a looking at things (*Schauen*) in which more happens than seeing, because the whole person is involved in the act.²⁰¹ *Schauen* means to read what we see, to decode its meaning and to see behind the visible. With the help of this argumentation, many liturgical gestures and movements can be explained and understood with ease. The simple explanation and intellectual understanding is not enough, however. The liturgical act must be performed and understood as a liturgical act.

The community has a special importance in the liturgical act, for it is carried by the individual, but always as part of the larger whole. For this reason people can speak in liturgical texts as *we*. The celebrating individual involves everybody around in the personal liturgical expression of the self, overcoming cultural and sociological trends such as individualism. This way the individual can learn and experience in what the

²⁰¹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 12. Stosur, "Liturgy and (Post) Modernity," 25. I can refer here again to Ratzinger, who similarly emphasises that liturgical participation means not necessarily doing or speaking. It can even be a silent prayer, though it is active participation. The liturgical act is properly done even if it is seen as a mere presence. In the depth of the person more important events can take place: the transformation of the heart is a proper liturgical act, even though it does not perhaps meet the commonly represented practical criteria. I will explore in the next chapter how Ratzinger addresses the same question.

Church consists.²⁰² I will return the question of the relationship between the celebrating individual and community in more depth in the section 2.3.3.

2.2.2 Consequences of Guardini's Approach

The signal for liturgical renewal that touches upon essential elements is—according to Guardini—the liturgical crisis that arises. As long as liturgical rites and texts are only *persolviert*, everything goes right. However, as soon as they are taken seriously as something that reaches out to human existence and truth, everything that cannot be realized and lived in the liturgy will be visible.²⁰³

One can implement the intention of the Council in praxis, with continual preparation and formation, and with a suitable practice through which the act of worship is learned. Besides actions, we must learn to see, to look at things, explains Guardini, using again his notion of *Gegensätze*. Unless one learns this, a reform of texts and rites will be useless. Guardini is aware that purely ceremonial changes are not enough and liturgical reform must not consist exclusively in changes of this kind. What he mentions as decisive in the reform of the liturgy is the *Erziehung*, the appropriate formation of the clergy and of the celebrating community. To explain he offers the example of the procession. He says the important thing is not organizing a procession better, but rather that the act of walking should become “a religious act, a retinue of the Lord processing

²⁰² Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 13. Stosur, “Liturgy and (Post) Modernity,” 24.

²⁰³ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 11.

through his land, so that an epiphany may take place.”²⁰⁴ Liturgy is thus about the encounter with God and this encounter has the character of an epiphany.²⁰⁵ Such a formation must be realized as formation for the liturgy and formation of the liturgy, maintaining liturgy's didactic character. To become didactically fruitful, some ritual changes are to be made in liturgical celebrations at the time of reform. But before dealing with these, liturgists have to answer a most important question, without which they cannot lay the foundation for the post-conciliar liturgical reform. Guardini asks:

Is perhaps the liturgical act, and with it at all what we generally call liturgy, so much bound to history—ancient or of the Middle Age—so that by reason of honesty we should give it up? Should we perhaps admit that the human being of the industrial age, of technology and the psychological-sociological structures that are bound up with it, is simply not capable of performing a liturgical act? And should we not instead of speaking about renewal, consider how the holy mysteries should be celebrated so that this contemporary human being can stand in them with his own truth?”²⁰⁶

What does Guardini want to suggest? Giving up the historical tradition of the liturgy? Or giving up liturgical renewal entirely because humans are not capable of performing a liturgical act? Stosur suggests that Guardini, again using his *Gegensätze*, sets up an opposition between traditional Christianity and a modern Christianity that has left it behind because of the influence of the world, and between traditional and modern

²⁰⁴ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 11-2. Everyday things and actions receive a new symbolic meaning in the liturgy, realized through God's epiphany and the encounter with God. The individual must learn these ways of God's revelation in order to be able to recognize him and become one with him.

²⁰⁵ Hansruedi Kleiber, *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung bei Romano Guardini*. Freiburger Theologische Studien 130 (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1985), 225-8.

²⁰⁶ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 15, my translation. “Ist vielleicht der liturgische Akt, und mit ihm überhaupt das, was Liturgie heißt, so sehr historisch gebunden – antik, oder mittelalterlich –, daß man sie der Ehrlichkeit wegen ganz aufgeben müßte? Sollte man sich vielleicht zu der Einsicht durchdringen, der Mensch des industriellen Zeitalters, der Technik und der durch sie bedingten psychologisch-soziologischen Strukturen sei zum liturgischen Akt einfach nicht mehr fähig? Und sollte man, statt von Erneuerung zu reden, nicht lieber überlegen, in welcher Weise die heiligen Geheimnisse zu feiern seien, damit dieser heutige Mensch mit seiner Wahrheit in ihnen stehen könne?”

Christians. According to Stosur, Guardini wants to shed light on the fact that humans are not capable of the liturgical act, yet they still participate in liturgies, and he seeks to highlight the importance of such people in the process of liturgical renewal. We see that Guardini's approach is here anthropological and pastoral. Stosur calls this Guardini's postmodern challenge.²⁰⁷ Ratzinger thinks that these questions are the basic questions about the human being and the possibility of human beings finding faith. He asks how radical the alienation of the human being might be in the future.²⁰⁸ Ernst Tewes thinks that Guardini wanted to describe the future and most important task of liturgical renewal with the question on the *Liturgiefähigkeit*. According to Tewes, Guardini's opinion was that contemporary people *are* capable of performing the liturgical act.²⁰⁹

Guardini's letter sounds a little pessimistic, and indeed, at the conference in Mainz it was understood that Guardini might have regretted what the Liturgical Movement had achieved. Yet it seems that its pessimistic tone—if there is such a tone at all—is caused rather by his general dissatisfaction with the state of civilization and culture, especially if we take into consideration his *Briefe vom Comer See*.²¹⁰ I agree with Stosur that Guardini was replaying the *Gegensätze*. Robert Krieg observes: “Prior to Vatican II, Guardini questioned the prevailing view of things, and he continued to do so after the

²⁰⁷ Stosur, “Liturgy and (Post) Modernity,” 27, 31.

²⁰⁸ Joseph Ratzinger, “Von der Liturgie zur Christologie. Romano Guardinis theologischer Grundansatz und seine Aussagekraft,” in *Wege zur Wahrheit. Die bleibende Bedeutung von Romano Guardini*, ed. Joseph Ratzinger (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985), 121-44, especially 125.

²⁰⁹ Ernst Tewes, “Romano Guardini: Eine Gedenkrede zu einem Tod,” *LJ* 19 (1969): 129-49, especially 137.

²¹⁰ Romano Guardini, *Briefe vom Comer See* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1953), 24. Here Guardini says: “The sphere in which we live is becoming more artificial; less human and—I have to say—more barbaric” (my translation). “Immer künstlicher wird die Sphäre, in der wir leben; immer weniger menschlich, immer—ich kann mir nicht helfen—barbarischer!” Alfons Knoll, “Die Seele wiederfinden – Romano Guardini auf der Suche nach einer anderen Theologie,” in *Konservativ mit Blick nach Vorn. Versuche zu Romano Guardini*, ed. Arno Schilson (Würzburg: Echter, 1994), 11-31, especially 21.

council.”²¹¹ On the other hand, the question of human ability to engage in the liturgical act and the influence of culture on the celebrating community is not a new topic in Guardini's work. He examines the question as early as 1918 in *Vom Geist der Liturgie*.²¹² After the Council he is aware of the danger of technological society hindering the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform.

Guardini returns to this topic later, in 1965, in a short book *Die Kirche des Herrn. Meditationen über Wesen und Auftrag der Kirche*. Here he returns to the basic idea of Vatican II: opening to the world, which according to him begins inside the Church.²¹³ “For example, with regard to the relationship between the priest and laypeople, the new possibility of celebrating the Eucharist facing the people, and also the increasing use of the vernacular, seem like symbols for the self-consciousness of the congregation, so that they as a congregation enter the liturgy.”²¹⁴ In this book Guardini goes further, however, and requests that “the Church respects the judgement of those to whom responsibility in the world is given, the laypeople, and it hands over to them what belongs to them.”²¹⁵ So

²¹¹ Krieg, Romano Guardini, 88.

²¹² Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 93-4.

²¹³ Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 94.

²¹⁴ Romano Guardini, *Vom Sinn der Kirche: Fünf Vorträge. Die Kirche des Herrn. Meditationen über Wesen und Auftrag der Kirche* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1990), 111. “For example, with regard to the relationship between the priest and laypeople. The new possibility of celebrating the Eucharist facing the people, and also the increasing use of the vernacular, seem to symbolize the fact that the congregation becomes conscious of itself and enters into the liturgy as a congregation. What we understand by the expression ‘liturgical renewal’ implies that while the implementation of a liturgical service proceeds from the office of the priest, it is at the same time everybody's affair (my translation), “...zum Beispiel mit Bezug auf das Verhältnis des Priesters zum Laien. Die neue Möglichkeit, die Eucharistie zum Volk hin zu feiern, ebenso wie der zunehmende Gebrauch der Landessprache, erscheinen wie Symbole dafür, daß die Gemeinde ihrer selbst bewußt wird und als Gemeinde in die Liturgie eintritt. Was wir als »liturgische Erneuerung« verstehen, bedeutet, daß der Vollzug des heiligen Dienstes wohl aus dem Amtsauftrag des Priesters hervorgehen, aber zugleich Sache Aller sein soll.” Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 94.

²¹⁵ Guardini, *Vom Sinn der Kirche. Die Kirche des Herrn*, 112, (my translation). “Die Kirche jenen, dem die Welt in die Verantwortung gegeben ist, den Laien, in seinem Urteil achtet und hört, und daß sie ihm übergibt, was seine Sache ist.” Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 95.

we can say that in the question of liturgical renewal, the question of the Church is incorporated, and that liturgy can help in understanding the Church and ecclesiology can help the liturgical renewal inasmuch as both return to a communitarian understanding of Church and liturgy wherein every member has their own role.

As explained earlier, in this document Guardini summarizes his research of the previous two decades. All the questions that appear in relation to the essential elements and characteristics of the liturgy in *Ein Wort zur liturgischen Frage* are here explained more thoroughly and in more depth. The main purpose of this letter is not the defence of something as it was in the 1940s. This letter focuses rather on what is essential in the liturgy. In Guardini's view, the conciliar reform offered the opportunity to focus more intensely on these elements.²¹⁶

The fact that Guardini's letter was not received with unanimous enthusiasm at the liturgical congress²¹⁷ shows that the goal of many liturgists present there did not coincide with that of Guardini. While some of them wanted to focus primarily, or even solely, on ritual and rubrical reform, Guardini offered a more complex and deep vision of the liturgy, including anthropological, historical, cultural and theological aspects and asked that all these might be taken into consideration.²¹⁸ Guardini's observations therefore must always be taken seriously when the need for liturgical reform arises.

²¹⁶ Schilson, "Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter," 14-5.

²¹⁷ Guardini's letter and even his person underwent serious criticism. Some suggested that Guardini regretted what the Liturgical Movement had attained, while according to others, the letter is a product of Guardini's dementia. Schilson, "Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter," 15.

²¹⁸ Schilson, "Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter," 15.

2.3 Liturgical Formation as the Kernel of Liturgical Reform

As we have seen, the most important task for the liturgist after the conciliar liturgical reform is to restore the importance of the liturgical act. The way to achieve this goal is through the formation of both the clergy and the faithful. We will now see what liturgical formation is, what its content is, and how it can be realized in praxis. The idea of formation is explained most thoroughly in the 1966 edition of *Liturgische Bildung*,²¹⁹ a book originally published in 1923. The latest edition was revised by Guardini, but without significant changes in the content. It clearly shows, however, that the topic of liturgical formation was constantly present in Guardini's mind. In this book he explains that the purpose of formation is to lead individuals and communities into a way that corresponds with the essence of liturgical life. An example of this kind of formation is the liturgical movement itself, which was not imposed by the Magisterium, but was born among Christian people who wanted to live a conscious Christian-Catholic life. The main question is, how can this liturgical life be realized?²²⁰ When Guardini wants to identify those ideas for liturgical formation that would ensure it becomes most effective, he uses his *Gegensätze* again. We can identify five points that can be understood as criteria for liturgical formation and therefore the main content and precondition of every liturgical reform.²²¹

²¹⁹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 19-110.

²²⁰ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 24-5.

²²¹ These five points appear with different emphases in Guardini's work. What I want to do in this section is to apply Guardini's general ideas on the question of liturgical reform, maintaining at the same time the original meaning and intention of his thought.

2.3.1 Recognition of the Connection between Spiritual and Material Existence

In the process of liturgical formation, people require that the body be formed through the soul. It must be evident that the whole human person is involved in liturgical action. Soul is the spiritual substance that makes the body capable of any action.²²² The formation of the body must happen through the soul and is not connected merely to the physical organs, for the purpose of this process is spiritualization (*Beseelung*, *Vergeistigung*). That is, the whole of bodily existence must be governed by soul and mind. A perfect example of this would be the resurrected body, which is fully spiritual because it is the expression of the soul, and in its case the soul becomes indeed *forma corporis*.²²³ The process of spiritualization has two directions: from inside to the outside and from outside to the inside. It involves the ambiguity of giving and receiving: inner reality is communicated to the outside, while another reality is received from and through the outside. This is a connection between symbols that exist in giving and receiving, in revealing and recognizing.²²⁴

The soul is expressed in the material world through the body. Human beings participate in the liturgy as creators of symbols (*symbolschaffend*) and as receptors of symbols (*symbolschauend*) because they pray with the spiritualized body and with the soul that is present in and expressed through the body. The primary way in which the

²²² Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 28. Walter Dirks, "Guardini als Führer zur Liturgie," *LJ* 10 (1960): 202-10, especially 204.

²²³ Martin Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten: Romano Guardini - Denker liturgischer Erneuerung* (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1986), 64.

²²⁴ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 34. Engelmann and Ferrier, *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*, 152. Kleiber, *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung*, 221.

soul becomes realized is when humans speak and listen, express themselves and understand.

The first task of liturgical formation with regard to symbols is to make human beings capable of perceiving them. In modern times, the incarnational nature of symbol has been forgotten and the abstract concept has been substituted for the spiritual. Therefore symbols are not understood anymore and the relationship between soul and body has lost its meaning. Soul has been almost completely disappeared, while body is understood merely as a biological concept.²²⁵ One must learn to stand in a religious relationship as a whole human being; to make the body an expression of the soul, to see behind the visible reality and to understand what one perceives. One must learn to pray with the body: with corporeal positions and gestures. We must learn to express our inner life and be able to find the inner content in the external things. Losing the capability to perceive symbols, humanity loses a part of its culture, such as art, play or even talk. In the case of the liturgy, this situation causes it to become something connected merely to the spiritual sphere with its external forms appearing as ceremonial elements only, disconnected from life. In such a case liturgy is not able to form, look at things or talk, because it is simply carried out without the possibility of any deeper implication.

Matter is a medium in the communication of spiritual realities. A spirituality that wants to ignore everything that is connected to matter will have serious difficulties with liturgy. It is a real task to unite the spiritual and the material. They must not be

²²⁵ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 36-7. Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini: Konturen*, 144.

considered a limitation to each other.²²⁶ People often find it difficult to find any significance beyond the visible, or to express themselves in non-material forms. They especially have difficulty when they have to interpret a spiritual reality expressed in matter that was created by somebody else. According to Guardini, the main problem is that they are not able to weld spiritual contents to material realities, even though they can sometimes clearly mark the limits between the two. The ability to do this welding is, however, basic for the creation of symbols. A symbol is created “when that which is interior and spiritual finds expression in that which is exterior and material.”²²⁷ Therefore spiritual and material existence must be connected as two realities deeply bound in the liturgical action and the creation of symbols. A symbol must be expressed in clear terms that can be interpreted by anybody. Liturgy is not only the place where symbols appear; it is itself a unique symbolic action in which the faithful are and act as Christ's symbols. They act visibly and invisibly in their inner realization of Christian existence.²²⁸

The people who really live by the liturgy will come to learn that the bodily movements, the actions, and the material objects which it employs are all of the highest significance. It offers great opportunities of expression, of knowledge, and of spiritual experience; it is emancipating in its action, and capable of presenting a truth far more strongly and convincingly than can the mere word of mouth.²²⁹

Guardini remarks in a footnote: “In the liturgy the soul forms itself, not by means of deliberate teaching and the exercise of virtue, but by the fact that it exists in the life of

²²⁶ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 50-1.

²²⁷ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 52. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 57. Schilson, “Vom Geist der Liturgie: Versuch,” 85.

²²⁸ Schilson, “Vom Geist der Liturgie: Versuch,” 85. Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 54.

²²⁹ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 55-6. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 60.

eternal Truth, and is naturally and supernaturally robust.”²³⁰ It is in the end the divine presence and authority that forms humans through the ritual action of the liturgy.

At the end of *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, Guardini places an important emphasis on the fact that what liturgy offers to those who participate in it, cannot necessarily be translated into actions or a visible result. “The liturgy, on the contrary, is primarily occupied in forming the fundamental Christian temper.”²³¹ What is expressed here is the primacy of the Logos over the Ethos. In following individualist philosophies, Guardini explains, knowledge itself became questionable and a certain shift occurred from knowledge to the will. As a consequence of this, the actions of the individual have become important and truth itself has become questionable and unknowable. With this shift, knowledge is opposed to faith. Following Kantian ideas, Ethos has obtained primacy over Logos. This is the origin of pragmatism, in which truth is not an independent value, but “the expression of the fact that a principle or system benefits life and actual affairs,”²³² and a moral fact. In such a case religion is nothing more than the elevation of human existence, of which the goal is sociological rather than eschatological. It must be recognized that the will cannot recognize truth. Only the divine will is in perfect relation to the truth. We have seen in the first chapter that dogma cannot be based exclusively on praxis, but only on truth. A Catholic stance is the

²³⁰ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 62. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 67.

²³¹ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 79. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 86.

²³² Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 82. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 88.

primacy of the Logos over the Ethos.²³³ This is a significant point for Pope Benedict XVI, and one that is, according to him, very characteristic of Guardini.²³⁴

It is interesting to refer at this point to Pope Benedict's personal experience. He admits that he and other young people were impressed by Guardini's approach because they did not want to speak about Christian truth, but about what is true. "We wanted to know what 'is'."²³⁵ Ratzinger explains the most important aspects of Guardini's liturgical thought emphasise the duality of body and soul; the spiritual and the material; and the symbol and the reality.²³⁶

What follows from Guardini's reasoning is summarized by Martin Marschall in two points as follows: (1) Since in the liturgy the spiritual obtains material form, the invisible becomes visible and the inner realities gain external expressions, liturgy cannot be merely spiritual. It needs forms of expression (*Ausdrucksformen*) such as matter, or time, because all these become symbols of spiritual realities. From this it follows that

²³³ Arno Schilson, "Vom Geist der Liturgie: Versuch einer Relecture von Romano Guardinis Jahrhundertsschrift," *LJ* 51 (2001): 76-89, especially 88. Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 65. Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini: Konturen*, 88-9. Engelmann and Ferrier, *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*, 154-5.

²³⁴ Benedetto XVI, "Discorso al Convegno della Fondazione Romano Guardini," http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2010/october/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20101029_fondazione-guardini_it.html. [Access: July 23, 2013] English translation: Zenit, <http://www.zenit.org/article-31063?l=english> [Access: May 20, 2013]

²³⁵ Benedetto XVI, "Discorso al Convegno della Fondazione Romano Guardini," English translation: Zenit, <http://www.zenit.org/article-31063?l=english> [Access: May 20, 2013]

²³⁶ Ratzinger, "Von der Liturgie zur Christologie," 124. Here he says: "Wiederentdeckung der Liturgie ist Wiederentdeckung der Einheit von Geist und Leib in der Ganzheit des einen Menschen, denn liturgisches Verhalten ist leib-geistiges Verhalten, Wegkommen von einer ins bloß Geistige und Seelische hinein verengten Frömmigkeit zu einem Beten, das im leiblichen und in gemeindlichen Tun Einheit aller Wirklichkeit ist. Liturgisches Verhalten ist demgemäß näherhin symbolisches Verhalten, das die Welt und das eigene Sein als Symbol zu fassen vermag, weil das Symbol der eigentliche Inbegriff der Einheit des Geistigen und Materiellen, das Geistigsein der Materie und das Materieein des Geistigen ist. Symbol geht verloren, wo beides auseinanderfällt, womit auch Liturgiefähigkeit endet, weil die Welt in Geist und Körper, in Subjekt und Objekt dualistisch zerspalten wird. Wenn aber der eigentliche Selbstvollzug des Christlichen das Liturgische ist, wenn seine Weise des Verstehens der Wirklichkeit sich zentral im Symbol darstellt, dann steht im Ringen um Symbol und Liturgie das Wesentlich-Werden des Menschen – ein Lieblingswort von Guardini – auf dem Spiel."

even human beings must involve their entire human existence in liturgical actions, namely both their spiritual and material existence. (2) Every spiritual state that rejects or excludes the body and matter is inappropriate for liturgy. The creation of symbols can happen only in the tension between monism and dualism.²³⁷ We must admit that a certain tension will remain always between human being and things. Human beings acknowledge the things present in their lives as objects that have meaning and significance. At the same time they know that they are different and extraneous. Therefore human essence, the soul, can never express itself completely in things.²³⁸

2.3.2 The Recovery of the Interrelationship between Human Being and Things

In order to express the fullness of personal spiritual realities, the body is not sufficient. The things that surround the human being are also necessary, such as clothing, devices or space. They can all become an expansion of the personal forms of expression. The soul can be challenged through such things to express itself. They make the soul understand that it does not stand alone before the chaos of a world which lacks sense. All existing realities take part in the creation to which God gave order at the beginning. The restoration of this order is a service rendered to God. Spiritual realities need these things in order to be expressed, even if it remains a constant danger that spiritual realities will become too much connected to the things and through this be

²³⁷ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 78-81.

²³⁸ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 74.

materialized. Without this connection, however, religion cannot survive.²³⁹ When the human beings involve the realities around them in the expression of the spiritual, they do this in obedience to the world order or things given by God. This is like the creation of new symbols: the spiritual draws the material things and provides them with a higher power.²⁴⁰

In the process of liturgical formation the explanation of symbols cannot be forced. There is the adequate natural process for such an explanation and it does not involve simply the affirmation or rational explanation of symbols. The phase of learning is not about learning new things and is not about knowledge, but is about the experience of how the spiritual and the material come into connection and how a symbol arises. It needs to be understood that this is a chance for people to express their own spiritual inner world.²⁴¹

Human beings and things are not only liturgical expressions because they have their own objective existence independent from the liturgy. Therefore liturgy not only must be aware of their objectivity, but must maintain it. Their nature is transformed in the liturgy and this transformation is not arbitrary, such that it would force them to express that which contradicts their nature. The liturgy must express, with the help of revelation, the deepest uniqueness of the human being, namely that it is the image and likeness of God. Liturgy is the place where natural and transcendental meet in one focal point that is

²³⁹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 55.

²⁴⁰ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 59.

²⁴¹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 62.

Christ. He is the guarantee of the objectivity of revelation and of all existing things as they appear in the divine plan.²⁴²

2.3.3 Living out the Tension between Individual and Community in the Liturgy

When we say that the bearer of the liturgical act is the human person, we know that this person is part of a larger reality that is humanity. In the religious context this means that real Christian humanity exists only where there is Church and where the individual is in interrelationship with the Church. Every human community is like that: the individual is directed to the community and the community is built up and fulfilled through the individuals. For Guardini the regular ways in which one can come into contact with humanity (*Menschheit, Menschheitsgesamt, Menschheitganzen*) are through family, country and nation.²⁴³ At a higher level, the relation of the individual to the whole of humanity becomes concrete in relation to nation and state. In recent times (*Neuzeit*) an opposition has grown up between the notion of personality and the idea of an objective common identity, so that members of a particular nation no longer emphasize their difference from the rest of humanity. Culture became fragmented; the individual lost his or her connection to the whole and tradition dissolved, because historical continuity dissolved. It was replaced by constant creation and experimentation in the present, ignoring any prior tradition.²⁴⁴

²⁴² Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 58.

²⁴³ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 63.

²⁴⁴ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 67.

Something similar happens with the Church that becomes concrete in the diocese or parish. In order to live according to the intention of its founder, Christians constantly need to see its universality, to love it and to insert the experience of their particularity into its whole reality. In the liturgy, both community and individual encounter God.²⁴⁵ The Church is the bearer of the liturgy, therefore a profound understanding of the essence of the Church is necessary in the formation of liturgical behaviour. This appropriate liturgical behaviour dissolves as soon as the understanding of the Church becomes overly individualized or is interpreted as having merely ethical or pedagogical purposes. The same happens if the Church is seen only as an organisation of the faithful.

In this case liturgical formation “must educate the consciousness of the religious community.”²⁴⁶ The faithful must extend their liturgical *I* toward a *We*, where the subject of the prayer and the sacramental action is the *We*. “They must increasingly overcome individualistic separation and sentimental-romantic subjectivity, and so place themselves fully through prayer, sacrifice and sacramental action in the larger community of the Church.”²⁴⁷ The individual must do this in his or her own community. It does not matter whether the individual feels the community emotionally or not, because it is not about experience, but a conscious stance that can and must be learnt. The individual must be interested in the other person in order to become capable of assuming his or her

²⁴⁵ Alfons Knoll, “Die Seele wiederfinden – Romano Guardini auf der Suche nach einer anderen Theologie,” in *Konservativ mit Blick nach Vorn. Versuche zu Romano Guardini*, ed. Arno Schilson (Würzburg: Echter, 1994), 11-31, especially 26-7.

²⁴⁶ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 76, my translation: “soll zum religiösen Gemeinschaftsbewußtsein erziehen.”

²⁴⁷ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 76, my translation. “Der Gläubige muß sein religiöses Bewußtsein, sein Gebets-Ich fortschreitend ausweiten. Er muß die individualistische Absonderung, die sentimental-romantische Subjektivität überwinden und sich in Gebet, Opfer und Sakramentalhandlung ganz in die große Gemeinschaft der Kirche stellen.” Further: Romano Guardini, *Vorschule des Betens* (Einsiedeln, Zürich, Köln: Benziger, 1954), 256-7.

intentions, sufferings and whole existence. The individual does not dissolve in the liturgy, but is transformed by its objective content.²⁴⁸ However, this liturgical *We* does not mean only the community present at the celebration of a concrete liturgy, but the whole Church, because the whole Church is the subject of the liturgy. This implies, however, that the liturgy oversteps not only the boundaries of space, but those of time as well. Therefore every participant in the liturgical action is in communion with Christians of all places and all times, even with those living in eternity.²⁴⁹

Guardini describes a little exercise to expand involvement in the liturgical act from the individual to the communitarian level. The praying person must first list those people connected to his or her personal community: those present, and not present, the sick, and any needs and problems. The praying person then extends his or her vision into a larger field: the bishop and his intentions, and the whole diocese. Finally the person includes the whole Church: countries, nations, cultures, the poor, the sick, the dying, the pope, priests, laypeople, missionaries, and problems in the Church and in the world.²⁵⁰ This conscious mental exercise will help the individual to think in terms of a broader horizon than that of their personal life, because it will direct their attention away from personal issues to communitarian ones.

The Church, and therefore the liturgical community, is not simply a gathering of people. This is not unity. Unity implies common goals, principles, means and activities, rules and institutions. In the Church the faithful are united by these common principles

²⁴⁸ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 66-7.

²⁴⁹ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 32. Eva-Maria Faber, "Das Kirchenbild Guardinis: Impulse und Grenzen." in *Konservativ mit Blick nach Vorn. Versuche zu Romano Guardini*, ed. Arno Schilson (Würzburg: Echter, 1994), 68-80, especially 72. Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 62-3. Kleiber, *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung*, 220-1.

²⁵⁰ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 77.

that are in the end Jesus Christ himself. Here Guardini applies the concept of the Church as the mystical body of Christ.²⁵¹ It is a living organism in which all members, having their own responsibilities, are united by the head Jesus Christ and empowered by the Holy Spirit. It is especially in the liturgy that this unity of Christian individuals can be expressed and experienced because liturgy addresses God as unity. This unity requires two things from the individual, however: the sacrifice of everything that excludes the other participants and the production of something in favour of the community. These are two requirements that are difficult for modern people. To deny themselves, to favour others over themselves, to feel involved in activities and thoughts that are not their own, to live out the unity that is perhaps not experienced by them at all, to act and to pray without knowing the deeper meaning and significance of their actions and words, all these can be accepted only if the person is humble. Therefore liturgical formation is at the same time formation in humility; more concretely, in a humility that means not only the acceptance of the unavoidable, but the total and positive acceptance of everything and everyone, and of all the principles involved in the liturgical action.²⁵²

The most serious problem in the formation for liturgy is individualism, which sometimes prevents people from demolishing the walls between them and being open to others. Individualism can be overcome by sacrifice: “renouncing the right of self-determination in spiritual activity” and “renouncing spiritual isolation.”²⁵³ Overcoming individualism must not mean the elimination of all personality from the liturgy or the

²⁵¹ Faber, “Das Kirchenbild Guardinis,” 72. Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 62-4.

²⁵² Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 32-3. Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 67-8.

²⁵³ For both of the quotations: Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 35. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 40.

dissolution of the individual in the unity. The guarantee that this will not happen is that full unity among human beings cannot be accomplished merely through human actions.

Their fellowship consists in community of intention, thought and language, in the direction of eyes and heart to the one aim; it consists in their identical belief, the identical sacrifice which they offer, the Divine Food which nourishes them all alike; in the one God and Lord Who unites them mystically in Himself. But individuals in their quality of distinct corporeal entities do not among themselves intrude upon each other's inner life.²⁵⁴

In this way Guardini intends to maintain the sensitive balance between individual and communal participation. One cannot deny the serious difficulty that liturgy is not adaptable to every individual. Many people would prefer a liturgy that responds more to the particular living situation of the individual. Contemporary people want to find in liturgy the expression of their own feelings, thoughts, actions and lives, and find the existing liturgy rather general and undemanding.²⁵⁵

It is liturgy's basic characteristic that it is a constitutive action of and for the community.²⁵⁶ This is true also when we speak about liturgical formation. As Guardini expresses it, speaking about the nature of the liturgical act that is by its nature communitarian:

The primary and exclusive aim of the liturgy is not the expression of the individual's reverence and worship of God. It is not even concerned with the awakening, formation, and sanctification of the individual soul as such. Nor does the onus of liturgical action and prayer rest with the individual. It does not even rest with the collective groups, composed of numerous individuals, who periodically achieve a limited and intermittent unity in their capacity as the congregation of a church. The liturgical entity consists rather of the united body of the faithful as such—the Church—a body which infinitely outnumbers the mere congregation.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁴ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 38. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 42.

²⁵⁵ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 43.

²⁵⁶ Schilson, "Vom Geist der Liturgie: Versuch," 82.

²⁵⁷ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 17. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 19.

Arno Schilson remarks that, according to Guardini, we find here that in the centre of the liturgical action is the communal action of the Christian. In Guardini the subject of the liturgy is not the individual Christian, but the community of the faithful: not those participating at a concrete celebration in a concrete church, but the whole community of the faithful, the Church. The life of the faithful is one, since all participate in the life of Christ.²⁵⁸ As has been said, the individuality of the subject in the liturgy does not dissolve in the community, because liturgical community is created not through the dissolution of the individual, but through the common goal and means: God, confession, sacrifice and sacraments.²⁵⁹ According to Schilson, it is important to emphasize that for Guardini no other community in the world than the Church is able to form the individual, that is, the community that is given and can be experienced in the liturgy. In other words the Church offers a *Lebensraum* in which the whole of humanity is present and in which the individual can overcome his or her limits in an objective context.²⁶⁰

2.3.4 Maintaining the Objective Character of the Liturgy

Already in *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, Guardini explained how important it is to acknowledge and maintain the objective nature of the liturgy. Liturgy develops “in accordance with all places, times and types of human culture.”²⁶¹ As noted in the previous section, liturgy is not based on the individual's reverence for God, or on the

²⁵⁸ Schilson, “Vom Geist der Liturgie: Versuch,” 82. Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 32-3.

²⁵⁹ Schilson, “Vom Geist der Liturgie: Versuch,” 84. Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 37.

²⁶⁰ Schilson, “Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter,” 23.

²⁶¹ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 16. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 18.

sanctification of the individual. It is the action of the whole Church and its main purpose is to give honour to God. From this act human sanctification is derived.²⁶² Liturgy in its deepest essence is objective because it is given by God. Its structure is not devised theoretically, but has developed in history, with its starting point the foundation of Christ. The objectivity becomes concrete in "history, law, tradition and authority."²⁶³ The objectivity of the liturgy is guaranteed by the divine grace of revelation and by nature as it is expressed through the essence of things and especially the human being. These two challenge each other: divine grace enters the human world and existence, while human nature longs for transcendence. The objectivity of the liturgy is built on the tension between these two.²⁶⁴

As has been said in the previous section, the great danger for liturgy is that it be dissolved in subjectivity. Subjectivity builds on personal experience and feelings, and it can be exaggerated to the extent that even community appears as an extended *I*. In objectivity, truths, realities and essences of realities are characteristic. Only in this objective way of thinking and praying can the *I* find the reason for its own existence (*Eigen-Sinn*). The *I* must be an objective expression of itself (*objektiver Selbstaussdruck*) reaching beyond emotions to the roots of being. Subjective experience interprets realities only in connection to its own singular existence. Humans must emerge from closeness to themselves and discover that they can find themselves in an even broader horizon. The subject can stand among objective realities when it dedicates itself to service. This

²⁶² Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 17. Engelmann and Ferrier, *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*, 153-4.

²⁶³ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 57.

²⁶⁴ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 56.

means obedience to the real nature of the soul, to things, the community, the world, and, in the end, obedience to God. Objective realities are values that are directed to connection/context, tradition, balance or unity. The task of formation is in this area: “to bind the originality of experience, power of personality, peculiarity of emotion with discipline and obedience toward objectivity.”²⁶⁵

Liturgy is objective because it expresses not the emotions of the praying individual, but the emotions he or she should have. It expresses not the human being, but the human being as it should be. The individual will have the right emotions if he or she becomes the image of Christ who is the essence of all existing things. Liturgy itself forms humans through words, gestures, and bodily positions in order that they become the clear image of Christ. The important outcome is that the attitude of obedience develops. The Church alone will lead us to obedience, and for this reason we must overcome our prejudices and distrust. Liturgy helps human beings to recognize and appreciate the order of the world given by God and to find their own place in this world in the adoration of God, and in faith, charity, penance and sacrifice. Only the objective liturgy can help in correctly internalizing this.²⁶⁶ The objectivity of the liturgy is to find those contents and forms that confront the subject in order to challenge it and through this to transform this subject so that he or she can find the deep meaning of his or her existence.²⁶⁷

The question on the objectivity of the liturgy is important for Guardini, and he encounters it when reviewing Festugière's book. Guardini praises Festugière for his

²⁶⁵ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 90, my translation. “Ursprünglichkeit des Erlebens, Kraft der Persönlichkeit, Eigenheit des Gefühls mit Zucht und Gehorsam gegen das Gegenständliche zu verbinden.” Further on this: Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 60. Kleiber, *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung*, 223-4.

²⁶⁶ Schilson, “Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter,” 20.

²⁶⁷ Schilson, “Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter,” 21.

understanding of liturgy, according to which liturgy is not primarily about external performance, but inner life forms and preconditions, and ways of religious experience. Liturgy is authoritative in religious praxis. Guardini criticizes the book, however, for not balancing this idea with the individual and subjective side of spiritual life.²⁶⁸ Correcting Festugière's mistake, Guardini asks what the objectivity of the liturgy is and how it relates to its subjectivity. Answering his own question, he says that objectivity is about "the proper estimate of both aspects, the nature of the human being and the spirit of the revelation, and about insight into their proper relation to one another."²⁶⁹ The subjectivity and objectivity of the liturgy can be expressed by two oppositions: "liturgy and personal-individual prayer; and liturgy and popular devotions (*Volksandacht*)."²⁷⁰ The subjective way of prayer is important because it gives room for emotions, important personal events and things, and it interweaves prayer life with experiences and things that are significant for those who pray. Without it liturgy would be lacking one of its important parts.²⁷¹ Considering the objectivity of the liturgy means a holistic approach to liturgy: not only as sacrament or ceremonial form, but as a form of life, a way of thinking and the source of all ecclesial and religious activity. The objectivity of the liturgy is to find those contents and forms that confront the subject in order to challenge

²⁶⁸ Romano Guardini, "Das Objektive im Gebetsleben. Zu P.M. Festugières «Liturgie catholique»." *JLW* 1 (1921): 117-25. Here especially: 118-9. Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini: Konturen*, 94-5.

²⁶⁹ Guardini, "Das Objektive im Gebetsleben," 119, my translation: "die rechte, dem Wesen des Menschen und dem Geist der Offenbarung entsprechende Einschätzung beider Momente, und um die Einsicht in ihr rechtes Verhältnis zueinander."

²⁷⁰ Guardini, "Das Objektive im Gebetsleben," 119, my translation. "Liturgie und persönlich-individuelles Beten; Liturgie und volkstümliches Beten (*Volksandacht*)."

²⁷¹ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 61.

it, and through this to transform the subject so that it can find the deep meaning of its existence.²⁷²

2.3.5 Allowing Culture to Influence Religion

Culture or civilization cannot create a religion. But they are necessary for Guardini because culture is a *modus operandi* for liturgy.²⁷³ Culture gives form to those truths that reach humans in revelation and this form must be a form that is valid for a long period of time. Its durability is necessary in order to create a true foundation for a healthy spiritual and liturgical life. "Culture preserves spiritual life from the unhealthy, eccentric, and one-sided elements. [...] Culture enables religion to express itself, and helps it to distinguish what is essential from what is nonessential, the means from the end, and the path from the goal."²⁷⁴ Therefore prayer must also be related to today's world and life. It must however express itself in a way that is acceptable for the human being of a specific culture. Guardini does not mention that while cultures can change from country to country, liturgical forms do not change. Would this mean that culture influences merely the forms of popular devotions, but not those of the liturgy?

It is necessary to have a clear picture of which elements are eternal and which have existed or been made this way so far. All non-eternal things were once new and modern and influenced by outer realities. There is a natural development of both things and ideas which is a natural characteristic of all non-eternal realities. This, however, can also mean

²⁷² Schilson, "Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter," 21.

²⁷³ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 29.

²⁷⁴ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 30. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 34.

that a newly-introduced idea that is considered new right now, is an old and traditional truth, such as the dogmas of the twentieth century. They can be considered new by those who focus only on a certain period of history.

In a sense, Christianity stands in constant contradiction to modern times. This does not mean that modern times have nothing to give to religion and liturgy, however.²⁷⁵ Guardini sees that his contemporary thinkers favour concentrating on practical elements in the search for the essence, rather than engaging in theoretical discussion in small intellectual circles. There are some who take note of the discussions of an elite intellectual group in the Liturgical Movement, however. This is the reason why Guardini poses the most important questions in relation to liturgical formation:

Should educators strive for the quickest possible concrete successes or for formation of those fundamental concepts from which perhaps later, particular actions can proceed with some consistency? Should they make a standard out of the present situation with its needs, or look to that which remains over time? Should they make foundations out of that which is easily realizable and immediately understandable, or out of that which is valuable? Average or quality? Does the formative work look to a shorter or longer prospect? Should it concentrate on action or on being?²⁷⁶

Guardini recognizes that asking either-or questions is not correct when it comes to liturgical renewal. Nonetheless it is important to work for our present time, and to see what this time wants and requires. "It is always valid to work also for the average, because everyday life and reality is composed naturally for the most part from the

²⁷⁵ Knoll, "Die Seele wiederfinden," 22.

²⁷⁶ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 103, my translation. "Soll der Erzieher möglichst rasche und greifbare Erfolge anstreben oder aber die Formung der wesenbestimmenden Anlagen, aus denen dann, vielleicht spät, aber stetig die Einzelwirkungen hervorgehen? Soll er die augenblickliche Lage mit ihren Bedürfnissen zum Maßstab nennen oder aber das Überzeitlich-Bleibende? Soll er das leicht erfüllbare, unmittelbar Verständliche zur Grundlage wählen oder das Wertvolle? Durchschnitt oder Qualität? Gilt es erzieherische Arbeit auf kurze oder lange Sicht? Auf Tun hin oder auf Sein?"

average.”²⁷⁷ At the same time this can cause serious problems, to the extent that the accent is on a Christian life that is kept alive merely by organizations, or on superficial realities that do not reach down to the roots of Christian existence. It is not the symptoms that primarily need therapy, but the roots of the problem. Symptomatic treatment will not create lasting results, only temporary success. What is necessary to learn is that we should not prefer immediate success over lasting value, or passing actions over being. In learning this in a religious context, liturgy is fundamental. Guardini insists that liturgy needs to be supported by an authentic culture. Culture is not equivalent to knowledge, but is a way of thinking and living that is rooted deep in everything that has an effect on the individual from outside.²⁷⁸

2.4 Reform in Liturgical Praxis

Guardini was not only a theologian who spoke about liturgical renewal in theory, but also a priest who celebrated liturgy. Early in his career as a young priest, he had difficulties with certain liturgical experiences. Later, as university chaplain and leader of the youth movement at Burg Rothenfels, he was able to implement certain ideas in practice. I think it is important to take a quick look at Guardini's liturgical praxis because it can help us understand the direction that was considered desirable for the entire Liturgical Movement and the post-conciliar liturgical reform.

²⁷⁷ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 103, my translation. “Immer gilt es, auch für den Durchschnitt zu arbeiten, denn Alltag und Wirklichkeit bestehen natürlicherweise zum großen Teil aus Durchschnitt.”

²⁷⁸ Engelmann and Ferrier, *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*, 149.

Guardini experienced the power of the liturgy for the first time when visiting the Abbey of Beuron with his friend Karl Neundörfer. After the first visit in 1906 he was very moved by the celebrations of the monks, because their night prayer transmitted power and glory. What caught him was the mystery present in the church when the monks prayed. He felt it through the lights in the darkness and in the singing.²⁷⁹ This reveals on the one hand the importance of personal experience, and on the other the need for mystery in liturgical celebration, which therefore cannot be over-rationalized or simplified.

As a young priest in Mainz, Guardini had a negative liturgical experience. Every day he had to celebrate Mass in front of the exposed Sacrament, while people were praying their rosaries. He calls this senselessness (*Sinnlosigkeit*) and says that he could endure this practice only by ignoring it.²⁸⁰ The result was that the Mass was meaningless for the faithful and thus they could not discover the deep relationship in the liturgy between the individual and the community, or between liturgy and popular devotions.

Regina and Heinz Kuehn speak as eyewitnesses about their experiences of liturgies celebrated by Guardini in Berlin's Saint Benedict Chapel in the 1930s. At that time Guardini regularly celebrated the Eucharist for young people. The Kuehns describe the chapel as a simple and comfortable room, with only a cross and no significant decorations. There was a freestanding altar, around which the seating was formed in a circle. Students were prepared for such celebrations; therefore they used their bodies to express liturgical meaning with postures and gestures, giving silence its significance.

²⁷⁹ Romano Guardini, *Berichte über mein Leben. Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1984), 87-8.

²⁸⁰ Guardini, *Berichte*, 96.

The Eucharist was *missa recitata* which means a dialogue Mass. It was in Latin, but everybody was familiar with it. The students stood during celebrations. They had some theological knowledge of the liturgy: they were aware of its cosmic significance.²⁸¹

Heinz Kuehn adds that the Mass was celebrated *versus populum* and everybody gave the responses to the celebrant that were formerly given by the altar servers.²⁸² Regina recalls how scared Guardini was the first time he had to celebrate the Mass *versus populum* at the request of the student chaplain. He could not even imagine people staring at him during the celebration. Having done it however, he expressed the unexpected feeling of being connected with the others. “*Wir gehörten alle zusammen,*” he said.²⁸³

It was in 1923 that Guardini assumed leadership in the German youth movement called Quickborn.²⁸⁴ In this youth movement and especially in Burg Rothenfels, liturgy was always an important area of discussion and of course practice. We must not forget, however, that even in liturgical conferences and celebrations, Guardini's purpose was not merely the formation of the liturgical consciousness of young people, but the formation of their entire existence and essence. He wanted to form their desire for freedom and self-determination and develop in them a Christian way of thinking, a *christliche Weltanschauung*.²⁸⁵ The young people in Burg Rothenfels learnt the meaning

²⁸¹ Regina Kuehn, “Romano Guardini in Berlin,” in *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the Sacred in a Modern World*, ed. Robert A. Krieg (Chicago, IL: Liturgy Training Publications, 1995), 87-91, especially 88-9. Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini: Konturen*, 119.

²⁸² Heinz R. Kuehn, “Fires in the Night: Germany 1920-1950,” in *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the Sacred in a Modern World*, ed. Robert A. Krieg, 1-14, especially 6-8.

²⁸³ R. Kuehn, “Romano Guardini in Berlin,” 88-9.

²⁸⁴ Before this time he was involved in the youth movement *Juventus* from 1915 and participated at the first German Quickborn-day at Burg Rothenfels in August 1919. These indications show us that by 1923 he was already active in German youth movements. Tewes, “Romano Guardini,” 134.

²⁸⁵ Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini: Konturen*, 110. For more on this: Engelmann and Ferrier, *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*, 27-45.

of gestures and objects in the liturgy.²⁸⁶ These conferences given to the youth of Burg Rothenfels were later published in a book entitled *Vom heiligen Zeichen*.²⁸⁷ At Burg Rothenfels there was a celebration the night before Easter Sunday, even before the reform of the Easter vigil in 1951. It was not connected to the Eucharist, but had the character of a popular devotion. During the celebration and after the biblical readings Guardini said: "Now we should actually be able to celebrate the Easter Eucharist. We all know this is not possible. We accept this in obedience and in the hope that from our obedience will come blessing for the whole."²⁸⁸ These are significant words that express Guardini's faithfulness to liturgical law.

According to a personal witness, Guardini stated that he wanted to live to see the day when the whole liturgical community responded to his liturgical greeting *Dominus vobiscum*.²⁸⁹ This means, however, not only the active participation of the faithful, but the acknowledgement of its confines and to think at least to some extent in terms of the Latin.

For Robert Krieg, all these elements of Guardini's liturgical praxis point in one direction: the promotion of active participation.²⁹⁰ I think Guardini's way of celebrating liturgy indicates something much more: it is to open the treasure house of the liturgy for everybody, so that all participants can arrive at its heart: the encounter with the living God.

²⁸⁶ Gerl-Falkovitz, Romano Guardini: Konturen, 144-6.

²⁸⁷ Romano Guardini, *Von heiligen Zeichen* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald Verlag, 1936)

²⁸⁸ Tewes, "Romano Guardini," 141, my translation. "Nun müßten wir eigentlich die Oster-Eucharistie feiern können. Wir wissen, daß das nicht geht. Wir nehmen das in Gehorsam an im Vertrauen darauf, daß aus unserem Gehorsam für das Ganze Segen kommt."

²⁸⁹ Tewes, "Romano Guardini," 133.

²⁹⁰ Krieg, Romano Guardini, 70.

2.5 A Concluding Word on Liturgical Formation

A fair question can be raised at this point: are Guardini's ideas valid for the reform (or the reform of the reform) of the post-conciliar liturgy? Here we apply a separation between a pre- and post-conciliar period and a differentiation in the Roman Rite. We can refer here to Pope Benedict XVI's idea that history must be regarded as a continuous progress²⁹¹ and the post-Vatican II liturgy as a reformed version of the Roman Rite. Despite his criticism of the implementation of the conciliar reform, he affirms the unity of the pre- and post-conciliar liturgy. For this reason Guardini's criteria can be regarded as general criteria for reforming Catholic liturgy and especially the Roman Rite.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz's observation is correct: Guardini's liturgical work is not primarily about changing the liturgy, but about changing the spiritual stance of the faithful from which liturgy emanates. What is important is not detail primarily, but the whole of the liturgical act and its basis.²⁹² Guardini was not a reformer according to the traditional understanding of the word.²⁹³

The essence of liturgical formation is that humans learn again basic human capabilities that have been forgotten in modern times. We can express this in one word as *Liturgiefähigkeit*. Liturgical formation is therefore not a simple education. It is not teaching or explanation or transmission of certain knowledge, but formation of the

²⁹¹ Benedetto XVI, "Una giusta ermeneutica per leggere e recepire il Concilio come grande forza di rinnovamento della Chiesa," in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 1, 2005 (Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006), 1018-32. English translation: Benedict XVI, "A Proper Hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council," in *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, ed. Matthew L. Lamb, and Matthew Levering, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), ix-xiv.

²⁹² Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini: Konturen*, 86.

²⁹³ Tewes, "Romano Guardini," 139.

whole human being.²⁹⁴ Liturgical formation must be conducted parallel with formation in personal prayer, meditation, use of the Scriptures, the religious interpretation of everyday life and personal existence.²⁹⁵ In the centre of liturgical formation stands the learning of the cultic act.²⁹⁶ It can be learned only with practice. *Vital Schauen* must be learned.²⁹⁷

In *Von heiligen Zeichen*, Guardini explains his pedagogy in more depth. Developing a proper liturgical understanding in human beings does not involve historical or theological explanations. The appropriate method consists in helping “to read in the outward form the inner state; to read from the body what is in the soul; to read from the earthly process what is spiritual and hidden.”²⁹⁸ He adds: “The most important things to learn, then, are those living acts by which the believer grasps, receives and performs, the sacred ‘visible signs of invisible grace’.”²⁹⁹ Liturgical formation is therefore realized in and through the liturgy. Guardini starts with what is visible. Appreciating these things we can face an inner meaning that is expressed by an outer form and they can become symbols. The direction is from the outside to the inside.

The way to liturgical life does not go through mere teaching, but before all it goes through doing. Seeing and doing are the ground work on which the rest is founded. Illustrate it by clear doctrine; join in with Catholic tradition by historical teaching. That must come, of course. But it must be a doing—and a true doing, not mere practising that it may be well known. Doing is something elementary, in which the whole man must take his part, with all his creative powers: a living carrying out; a live experience, undertaking, seeing.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁴ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 102-3.

²⁹⁵ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 188.

²⁹⁶ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 11.

²⁹⁷ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 14.

²⁹⁸ Guardini, *Von heiligen Zeichen*, 10. English translation: Guardini, *Sacred Signs*, x. Further on this: Gerl, “Durchblick auf das Ganze,” 45.

²⁹⁹ Guardini, *Von heiligen Zeichen*, 10. English translation: Guardini, *Sacred Signs*, x.

³⁰⁰ Guardini, *Von heiligen Zeichen*, 13. English translation: Guardini, *Sacred Signs*, xiii-xiv.

Liturgical life is not only performed, but lived. Therefore liturgical formation is not about rules, but about how to look at things. It must come primarily from the personal experience and testimony of those who already live a liturgical and Christian life, and not from books which are only secondary tools. The task, to introduce the faithful into the liturgical life of the Church, is by no means less important than helping them to recognize Christian truth.³⁰¹

In liturgical formation, the importance of popular devotions must be recognized. These are communal and objective, and in this they are similar to the liturgy. Their development is, however, more than adequate for directing the attention of the faithful to the objectivity of the liturgy. Popular devotions were born among the faithful, coming from their hearts. Therefore they provide the perfect tool and opportunity for the practice of liturgical behaviour and through this, while recognizing their frequent deviation from their original importance and meaning, assimilate them to the objective nature of the liturgy and the nature of popular devotions themselves.³⁰² Popular devotions can, for example, help to get emotions under control. This is important for the complete performance of the liturgical act that must be independent of any individualism. "Liturgical emotion is [...] exceedingly instructive."³⁰³

Another tool might be written prayer.³⁰⁴ The significance of established prayers is that one can learn from them. Guardini gives the example of those psalms that tell us in

³⁰¹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 172.

³⁰² Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 17-8.

³⁰³ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 21-2. Quotation: 22. English version: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 25.

³⁰⁴ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 23.

clear words how we can reach God. Then there is the Lord's Prayer, which is the introduction to every other prayer. These written prayers not only teach us how to express our own thoughts, but they awaken in us thoughts and feelings.³⁰⁵

Liturgy is not about knowledge; it is about the fullness of reality.³⁰⁶ Therefore liturgical formation does not primarily involve research, such as historical research, in which scientific methods are applied. "It is about leading the individual and the community to that kind of religious-cultic behavior which constitutes the essence of liturgical life."³⁰⁷ Liturgy has a general validity (*Allgemeingültigkeit*) that is independent of historical periods or places. Because of this it is not necessarily good to concentrate exclusively on individual or particular questions.³⁰⁸ Guardini asks whether it would be more correct to not speak about renewal, but to consider instead how the holy mysteries should be celebrated, in order to make it possible for contemporary people to perceive them with their whole existence and in truth.³⁰⁹

Arno Schilson concludes one of his articles with a section in which he affirms that Guardini could become the "bad conscience"³¹⁰ (*schlechtes Gewissen*) of today's liturgical renewal. The author emphasizes that many of Guardini's principles have not been realized yet, such as a more intensive experience of the community of the whole Church in the liturgy, the capability to perceive symbols, and the importance of popular devotions.

³⁰⁵ Guardini, *Vorschule des Betens*, 256-7.

³⁰⁶ Guardini, *Von heiligen Zeichen*, 9.

³⁰⁷ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 24, my translation. "Es geht darum, daß Einzelner und Gesamtheit zu jener Weise religiös-kultischen Verhaltens geführt werden, wie sie das Wesen liturgischen Lebens ausmacht."

³⁰⁸ Marschall, *In Wahrheit beten*, 59.

³⁰⁹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 16.

³¹⁰ Schilson, "Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter," 25-6.

Ratzinger discovers a certain development or change in Guardini's thought. While in and before *Liturgische Bildung* Guardini's writings are characterized by the expectation of a new beginning and change of times, after its publication one can feel the shock he experienced from the radical changes in culture; the breakthrough of technical civilisation, for example. His vision became darker and his trust and hope disappeared. This change is probably the reason why at first glance one can find a different Guardini in his letter of 1964. What he wants to achieve is to find again the essence, "to go back to what is real and essential."³¹¹ It is therefore time to turn to Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI and see how he approaches the question of liturgical reform.

³¹¹ Ratzinger, "Von der Liturgie zur Christologie," 127, my translation. "...eine Rückführung auf das Eigentliche, das Wesentliche."

3. JOSEPH RATZINGER AND THE NEW LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

The goal of this chapter is similar to that of the previous one: it is to analyze Ratzinger's thought on the reform of the liturgy and to identify some basic criteria which represent the main principles for any liturgical reform in the future, thereby indicating the direction in which liturgy must develop. The method in this chapter is necessarily different from that of the previous one. While Romano Guardini explained the basis of the liturgical renewal in several studies, Ratzinger does not provide such a systematic elaboration.³¹² Identifying his idea of liturgical reform must begin by collecting all the necessary information. This is not easy, because the relevant writings must be gathered from Ratzinger's pre-papal bibliography which contains approximately 1300 records and from the similarly numerous papal writings and speeches. Furthermore, much of the data must be gleaned from non-liturgical writings, because while the theme of the liturgy is present throughout Ratzinger's entire output, the number of publications that deal explicitly with liturgical themes is modest. Most of his publications can be understood as responses to certain liturgical questions or abuses and that is why they ignore many issues of importance (such as the consequences of the liturgical reform in the development of the liturgy of the hours or the sacraments). I will refer largely to his criticism of the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform, because in this he

³¹² Ricardo Blázquez Pérez, "Liturgia y Teología en Joseph Ratzinger," in *El pensamiento de Joseph Ratzinger: Teólogo y Papa*, ed. Santiago Madrigal (Madrid: San Pablo, Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2009), 295-319, especially 297.

indicates the hermeneutical principles employed in the implementation did not, in his judgement, correspond with the will of the Council. He makes some suggestions concerning ways of correcting such inappropriate implementation. In these writings it is possible to discover the method of reform that is acceptable to Ratzinger: one that is valid not only for the future, but also for the liturgical renewal of the present, and in which the wrongful implementation is corrected and a new liturgical awareness built.³¹³ Following this path, we are able to identify in Ratzinger's liturgical thought and praxis some general criteria for the reform of the liturgy in general.

Ratzinger's testimony on the reform of the liturgy is especially important because his life encompassed the period surrounding the Second Vatican Council. He witnessed the Liturgical Movement as it culminated in Vatican II. He worked at the Council as a *peritus* and therefore had first-hand experience of the conciliar discussions. After the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform began, he was saddened by its application. He followed and took part in intensive discussion on the Council and the theology of the liturgy,³¹⁴ and expressed his opinion several times in a number of publications.

³¹³ Joseph Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie: Eine Einführung* (Freiburg: Herder, 2002), 8; English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2000), 8-9; Joseph Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Perspektiven," in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften* Vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010), 657-82, especially 674-7. English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*, ed. Alcuin Reid (Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2003), 145-53, especially 150-2. Joseph Ratzinger, *Aus meinem Leben: Erinnerungen 1927-1977* (München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2006), 173-4.

³¹⁴ Ratzinger deliberately favours the term *theology of the liturgy* over *liturgical theology*. In his view every theology can be liturgical, because the term means that a specific theological question is discussed from the viewpoint of the liturgy. The term *theology of the liturgy*, however, indicates discussion on liturgy in which the theological net behind liturgy is systematically elaborated. More on this question in Chapter 4 and Helmut Hoping, "Kult und Reflexion: Joseph Ratzinger als Liturgietheologe," in *Der*

There are many introductions to Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy that offer a general view of his most important theological ideas and of the connections with other theological disciplines, especially his Eucharistic ecclesiology.³¹⁵ A number of questions are raised in these studies, but none focus on Ratzinger's understanding of the nature of liturgical reform, only on his criticism of the post-conciliar liturgical reform. In order to explore this unelaborated area in sufficient depth, I will refer to many points in these studies, but I will explain basic concepts of Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy only where these are relevant to the question of the liturgical reform. I want to offer a view of Ratzinger's criticism of the post-conciliar liturgy, focusing not on liturgical praxis, but instead on the hermeneutical principles according to which the conciliar reform was implemented. This was done—according to Ratzinger—in a manner that did not correspond to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* or to the nature of the liturgy itself. I then identify those hermeneutical principles that are acceptable to him, finding the notion of liturgical formation to be the central concept of any liturgical renewal. After a brief look at his liturgical praxis, I identify some general criteria for the reform of the liturgy.

Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger, ed. Rudolf Voderholzer (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009), 12-25.

³¹⁵ John F. Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 69-77.

3.1 On the Implementation of the Vatican II Liturgical Reform

Very soon after the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and the first reformed liturgical books, a certain criticism arose regarding post-Vatican II liturgical reform.³¹⁶ This criticism did not refer only or primarily to ceremonial changes, but rather to the understanding of the most important principles governing the reform. Among the critics one can find prominent Church people, such as cardinals, who expressed their criticism during and after the preparation of the new liturgical books.³¹⁷ In the ensuing decades, the historical and theological criticism gained ground. The main concern was that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was not taken as a whole, but that certain points were considered more important than others and some points were ignored completely. The critics noted that the natural development of the liturgy implies continuity in liturgical history, and the nature of the liturgy itself prevents radical changes.³¹⁸ They referred often to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 23, according to which “there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.” This sentence became like a motto for this group. The criticisms of this group are important when analysing Ratzinger, because many of their elements appear in his thinking as well. I will therefore refer often to this group of critics, not

³¹⁶ A good summary of the years after the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: Christophe Geffroy, *Benoît XVI et “la paix liturgique”* (Paris: Cerf, 2008), 111-61.

³¹⁷ One can refer here to the debate on §7 of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* that was prepared by 1969. Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci supported a group that prepared a document for Pope Paul VI in which they explain and show that the *Novus Ordo* was moving away from the Catholic theology on the Mass. More on this: Geffroy, *Benoît XVI et “la paix liturgique,”* 124-9.

³¹⁸ E.g. Klaus Gamber, *Ritus modernus: gesammelte Aufsätze zur Liturgiereform*, SPL 4 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1972).

forgetting of course that there were many who welcomed the renewed liturgical rites and books and saw in them a new way of thinking about and doing liturgy, and a return to sacramental integrity.³¹⁹ This second group includes both clergy and the faithful.

3.1.1 Position on the Liturgical Reform

Ratzinger's criticism on the post-conciliar liturgical reform is in my opinion often generalized and even misinterpreted.³²⁰ A very important distinction made by Ratzinger

³¹⁹ E.g. Piero Marini, *Serving the People of God: Remembering Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Ottawa: Novalis, 2006).

³²⁰ We must touch upon the question here of whether or not there is a change in Ratzinger's liturgical thinking. It has been a constant issue for scholars who want to indicate that at the time of the Council a different Ratzinger was very excited about the reform. This Ratzinger even spoke about the pre-conciliar form of the liturgy as follows: "The baroque high Mass became kind of sacred opera [...] The endeavors of the Sacred Congregation of Rites to preserve old forms had obviously resulted in the total impoverishment of the liturgy. If Church's worship was once again to become worship of God in the fullest sense [...] then it had to get away from fixed forms. The wall of Latinity had to be breached." Ratzinger, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (New York, Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009), 131-2. Comparing these remarks with more recent ones, such as "The Catholic liturgy was [...] reduced to the level of a mere product of modern times" or the repeated use of concepts like continuity, and organic development, we can ask why there is this difference in Ratzinger's evaluation of the liturgical development after the Council. Joseph Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens Versuche zur Theologie des Gottesdienstes* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1993), 77. English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1986), 86. In the field of liturgy especially, the nature of this change is a serious question. There is no room for a detailed explanation here, but analyzing his publications from that time we discover that their main terminology does not differ too much from his later publications. One can find similar ideas with different emphases. In 1966 many categories are already present in his thinking that later pass into his entire approach to liturgy. These concepts include the importance of the historical development of liturgy and tradition, as well as the emerging importance of the theological meaning of liturgy, according to which the celebration itself must be performed. It is, however, true that some ideas represented by the young Ratzinger are incompatible with the liturgical ideas of the more developed theologian. The question remains: are there two Ratzingers, or does this shift represent only the process of natural development of personal thinking? I intend to interpret this distinction as the maturation of the theologian. He explains, for example, that "I was not able to foresee that the negative sides of the liturgical movement would afterward re-emerge with redoubled strength, almost to the point of pushing the liturgy toward its self-destruction." (Ratzinger, *Aus meinem Leben*, 64; English translation: Ratzinger, *Milestones*, 57.) It seems that Ratzinger acknowledges some negative effects of the Liturgical Movement, without concretizing those that reappeared after the Council and caused the decay of the liturgy. At that time he was not able to foresee the consequences in advance. Unfortunately, he does not explain these negative effects, but what we can find here is the acknowledgement that before and during the Council he could not see certain dangers with regard to liturgy and the theology of the liturgy. Other scholars draw

between the liturgical reform sought and promoted by the Second Vatican Council and the implementation of the conciliar reform after the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* is often unrecognised. According to Ratzinger, these two works diverge, and while the liturgical document is completely adequate, its implementation did not always faithfully follow the will of the conciliar fathers.³²¹ Speaking about the implementation of the conciliar reform, Ratzinger picks up ideas from German scholar Klaus Gamber (1919-1987), first of all with regard to the development of the Roman Rite and the coexistence of the pre- and post-Vatican II liturgical rites. Ratzinger praises him as “the one scholar who, among the army of pseudo-liturgists, truly represents the thinking of the center of the Church.”³²² It is important to note here that we can assume correctly that Gamber has been the main influence on Ratzinger’s thinking on liturgy. Gamber’s influential role is confirmed by Patrick Prétot.³²³ We can strongly affirm this influence despite some differences, primarily with regard to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* about which Gamber passes a slight judgement.

Ratzinger’s criticism does not touch primarily upon practical elements. Changes in the rite are for him a sign that the wrong hermeneutics have been applied in the process

different conclusions from mine, for example, Hansjürgen Verweyen, who calls such differences in Ratzinger’s thinking contradictions (*Widersprüche*). More on this can be found: Hansjürgen Verweyen, *Joseph Ratzinger – Benedikt XVI.: Die Entwicklung seines Denkens* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2007); Avery Dulles, “From Ratzinger to Benedict,” *First Things* 160 (2006): 24-9; Emery de Gaál, *The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI: The Christocentric Shift* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 247-50; and Blanco Sarto, Pablo, *La teología de Joseph Ratzinger: Una introducción* (Madrid: Ediciones Palabra, 2011), 64-7.

³²¹ Joseph Ratzinger, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn: Christusglaube und Liturgie in der Gegenwart* (Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 169-70. Joseph Ratzinger, *The World Over: Cardinal Ratzinger Interview with Raymond Arroyo on EWTN* (September 5, 2003), <http://www.ewtn.com/library/issues/ratzintv.htm> [Access: July 23, 2016].

³²² Joseph Ratzinger, introduction to *La réforme liturgique en question*, by Klaus Gamber, trans. S. Oddi (Le Barroux: Éditions Sainte-Madeleine, 1992), 6-8.

³²³ Patrick Prétot, “La réforme de la semaine sainte sous Pie XII (1951-1956), Enjeux d’un premier pas vers la réforme liturgique de Vatican II,” (paper presented in Leuven, Belgium, 18-19 May 2012).

of implementation, or that there has been a misconceived interpretation of the concept of liturgy.³²⁴ Before analyzing thoroughly the theological problem raised by Ratzinger, I want to show a few examples from liturgical praxis that will lead us to the theology beyond them. All these points will appear again later in this chapter, therefore I will make only a short presentation here.

The position of the priest in the Eucharist is of great importance in the understanding of the liturgy. His position facing the people helped to further the idea that liturgy is a matter of a community which is enclosed in on itself. It follows that when liturgy belongs to the community, this community can form and change its celebration. At the same time the change in priestly position led to the emphasis of the celebration moving to the priest, who everyone must now see and hear, since the priest is not supposed to do anything privately. Ratzinger claims, however, that the Council did not prescribe this direction of the celebration. The position of the priest *versus Orientem* is not only an ancient tradition, but expresses the direction of the entire liturgical prayer: it is directed to God. With the priest and faithful facing the same direction, the community opens up to the cosmos, which then becomes involved in the celebration. In order to maintain the cosmic character of the liturgy, the position of the priest is extremely important.³²⁵

In the case of liturgical language and music, he simply sees that the conciliar decision was revised by those who did not have the authority to do so. He asks how we

³²⁴ Ratzinger, *The World Over*.

³²⁵ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 65-73. Joseph Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Perspektiven," 676-7. Joseph Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," 151-2. Joseph Ratzinger, "Versus Deum per Iesum Christum," in Uwe Michael Lang, *Turning Towards The Lord. Orientation in Liturgical Prayer* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press 2004), 9-12. More on the question: Louis Bouyer, *Architecture et liturgie* (Paris: Cerf, 1967)

can affirm the observance of what the Council asked for, given that the language of the Roman Rite is Latin,³²⁶ and its music is Gregorian chant,³²⁷ when these have almost completely disappeared from our liturgies and have been replaced completely by the vernacular and devotional songs. The wide use of the vernacular caused another difficulty with regard to the translations of Latin liturgical texts. Ratzinger affirms that in many cases certain ideological trends were given greater consideration than the *editio typica* of a liturgical book. Even though Ratzinger acknowledges that it is not possible and not desirable that the entire liturgy be celebrated in Latin, he wants to preserve at least some Latin in every celebration.³²⁸ Ratzinger especially highlights one concrete example of an incorrect translation that results in theological error, namely the words of consecration for the wine in the Eucharist. He adheres to the preservation of the formula *for many* in order to safeguard the form and theological meaning of the original Latin expression.³²⁹

³²⁶ *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 36. § 1. “The use of the Latin language is to be maintained in the Latin rites, except where a particular law might indicate otherwise.”

³²⁷ *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 116. “The church recognises Gregorian chant as something special to the Roman liturgy, which should thus, other things being equal, be given a place of primacy in liturgical activity.”

³²⁸ Joseph Ratzinger, *Rapporto sulla fede: Vittorio Messori a colloquio con Joseph Ratzinger* (Cinisello Balsamo, Milano: Edizioni Paoline, 1985), 125-7. Joseph Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt: Glauben und Leben in unserer Zeit: Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (München: Knauer, 2005), 450. Ratzinger, “Bilanz und Perspektiven,” 676. Ratzinger, “Assessment and Future Prospects,” 151.

³²⁹ The formula *for many* includes the necessity that human beings respond to Jesus’ sacrifice which can be effective in their lives when they accept it. There are people who do not accept Jesus’ redemptive work; therefore it cannot be fruitful in their lives. More on this: Joseph Ratzinger, *Gott ist uns nah Eucharistie: Mitte des Lebens* (Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich Verlag, 2005), 33-6. Tracey Rowland, *Ratzinger’s Faith: The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 137. Michael K. Magee, “Receiving the Tradition: Three Windows into the Thought of Pope Benedict XVI on the Liturgy,” *Antiphon* 12 (2008):107-25, especially 110-8. Pope Benedict XVI issued a letter in April 2012 to the German bishops who did not reach unanimity on the introduction of the *pro multis* formula. In the letter he gave several historical, biblical and theological reasons for the literal translation of the Latin formula. He even offered some catechetical suggestions. The letter is a good summary of Pope Benedict’s position on this specific question. The letter in German: Papst Benedikt XVI, *Shreiben an den Erzbischof von Freiburg und Vorsitzenden der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz, Dr. Robert Zollitsch*,

One example of a point missed by the reformers, according to Ratzinger, is the post-conciliar liturgical calendar. He is convinced that in the process of the reform, basic connections between the rhythm of human life and the rhythm of time as it must be represented by the liturgical calendar were not taken into consideration. Connections that had existed for centuries and had become part of the human relationship with nature and time were changed in a moment, disregarding all other principles but theological ones.³³⁰ Here Ratzinger demonstrates how anthropological and cultural factors can influence the liturgy. Before the conciliar reform, a dynamic had developed in which certain feasts were so strongly connected to the natural cycles of human life that liturgical celebrations became milestones for the Christian person and family. Through these celebrations, people were able to identify key moments in their individual lives as well. Moving the dates of such liturgical moments deprived individual and communitarian life of the connection between everyday life and its religious supernatural character. More concretely, in many countries the harvest traditionally began with the Feast of the Visitation celebrated on July 2nd. When the date of this feast was moved to May 31st, the start of the harvest naturally remained in the first half of July, but had now lost its connection to the liturgical celebration and even to the reference to the transcendental realities that determine the fruitfulness of human work.³³¹

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2012/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20120414_zollitsch_ge.html. [Access: July 23, 2016]; English translation: Pope Benedict XVI, Letter Pro multis to H.E. Msgr. Robert Zollitsch archbishop of Freiburg, president of the Episcopal Conference of Germany, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2012/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20120414_zollitsch_en.html [Access: July 23, 2016]

³³⁰ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 73.

³³¹ The theological background for this: Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 73. I can offer an additional specific example of this. In Hungary, the popular name for the Feast of the Visitation is Our

Another serious issue for Ratzinger concerned the Missal published in 1962. He emphasized that the publication of the new Roman Missal was a joyful event because there was again one obligatory form for the celebration of the Eucharist after a period of experimentation between the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and 1970. He did not agree with its presentation as a new form of the Roman Rite, rather than as a renewed form of the Roman Rite, however. He was shocked that the old missal was prohibited, stating this was a unique step in Church history.³³² This opinion was going to be important when, as pope, he referred in *Summorum Pontificum* to the old missal as never having been abrogated.³³³ What was considered holy in the Church's history, could not suddenly be deemed prohibited or harmful. The Church cannot reject its history, especially in such a short period of time. The way that the post-conciliar Missal was presented was not only an historical or liturgical problem, but also had serious spiritual and ecclesiological consequences. Ratzinger points out: "The two forms of celebration are seen as indicating two different spiritual attitudes, two different ways of perceiving the Church and the Christian life."³³⁴

Lady of the Sickle, where the connection between the feast that is celebrated and the work to be done is very clear.

³³² Ratzinger, *Aus meinem Leben*, 159-73.

³³³ Benedetto XVI, "Con grande fiducia: Lettera di accompagnamento alla lettera apostolica *Summorum pontificum* sull'uso della liturgia romana anteriore della riforma effettuata nel 1970," *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*, Vol. 3/2, 2007, (Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2008), 25-9. For canonical observations on this, see for example, Chad Glendinning, "Was the 1962 Missale Romanum Abrogated? A Canonical Analysis in Light of *Summorum Pontificum*," *Worship* 85 (2011): 15-37.

³³⁴ Joseph Ratzinger, *Unterschiedliche Liturgien - Ein Reichtum für die eine Kirche. Einführungsvortrag am 24. Oktober 1998 vor etwa 2500 Gläubigen im Hotel Ergife in Rom anläßl. der Wallfahrt von Priestern des „Instituts Christus König und Hoherpriester“ und der Priesterbrüderschaft Sankt Petrus und des internationalen Verbandes Una Voce anläßl. derer Jubiläumswallfahrt nach Rom zum zehnjährigen Bestehen des Motu Proprio „Ecclesia Dei“*, at FSSP, <http://www.fssp.org/de/annivratz.htm> [Access: July 23, 2016]

Ratzinger's criticism of what happened after Vatican II is serious. "The old building was demolished, and another was built, to be sure largely using materials from the previous one and even using the old building plans."³³⁵ We have seen some practical problems expounded upon by Ratzinger concerning the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform. He argued that these problems were able to appear because *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was not implemented correctly. The implementation was almost independent of the will of the Council fathers and sometimes even of the conciliar document itself. The main problem however, lay not in practical issues, but in theological ones. I will now explore Ratzinger's idea on the mistaken hermeneutical principles applied in the implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

One of the weaknesses of the post-conciliar liturgy is that years of organic growth were replaced by the "armchair strategy of academics"³³⁶ who felt themselves capable of and authorized in implementing changes that were radical and that did not correspond to the nature of the liturgy. Explaining pre-Vatican II liturgical reforms, Ratzinger notes that until the Council of Trent, the Roman Rite was reformed by tiny changes to the previous editions. Pius V did not create a new rite or a new liturgy. He merely simplified some parts and prescribed the Roman Missal as normative for the whole Church. It was not a new creation.³³⁷ The post-Vatican II Missal was published, according to Ratzinger, as if it were a break with previous liturgical traditions and not the result of a long period of natural growth. Already the understanding and the presentation of the new Missal was problematic, because it embodied a deliberate intention to create something completely

³³⁵ Ratzinger, *Aus meinem Leben*, 173. English translation: Ratzinger, *Milestones*, 148.

³³⁶ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 73. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 81.

³³⁷ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 76-7.

new. It is not entirely clear whether Ratzinger's main problem is the process of the development of the Vatican II Missal, or, as has been said previously, its content and form, even though the two cannot be separated from each other.³³⁸ Two problems are connected here: those charged with the task of implementing the conciliar reform thought they had the authority to change anything. The reason for such a misconception of authority lay in a misconception about the nature of liturgy. According to Ratzinger, the main characteristic of liturgy is that it develops organically. Liturgy does not support radical and sudden change; rather one liturgical form has to grow out of another. He compares this to the growth of a plant that must sometimes be trimmed, but cannot be radically restructured. The maintenance of the principle of organic growth can serve very important issues, according to Tracey Rowland, namely it can guarantee "the true freedom of the faithful. It makes sure that the members of the laity are not victims of something fabricated by an individual or group. [...] The freedom of liturgical innovators can become dominion for the rest."³³⁹

The misinterpretation of some concepts of the conciliar document is symptomatic of deeper problems. In Ratzinger's view, the interpretation of the concept of active participation misled the entire liturgical-theological discussion on modes of participation in the liturgical act. This concept is tightly connected to the conciliar reform, even

³³⁸ In *Unterschiedliche Liturgien*, Ratzinger writes: "An average Christian without specialist liturgical formation would find it difficult to distinguish between a Mass sung in Latin according to the old Missal and a sung Latin Mass according to the new Missal. However, the difference between a liturgy celebrated faithfully according to the Missal of Paul VI and the reality of a vernacular liturgy celebrated with all the freedom and creativity that are possible—that difference can be enormous!" This text suggests that the main problem is with the presentation of the post-conciliar Missal as a new liturgical book and not with its content. The criticism he offers in other places, however, concerns the lack of organic development of the texts and rites as the main problem of the reformed liturgy. Even though the two positions can be reconciled, a certain tension still remains.

³³⁹ Rowland, Ratzinger's Faith, 134.

though it had already been used much earlier with regard to liturgy.³⁴⁰ According to Ratzinger, this expression does not refer in the first place or exclusively to external actions as is commonly understood nowadays, but to the act of praying. There is, and always has been, interplay between words and actions in the liturgy, which derives from the nature of the liturgy. When the Council speaks about participation, it refers to this interplay in such a way that means both words and acts. The Council intended to facilitate the involvement of everyone in the liturgy, not merely the redistribution of roles in the celebration. This is because not everyone can always do everything in the liturgy. There are celebrations in which most of the people cannot perform external actions other than their gestures. Ratzinger interprets the concept of active participation as an inner process. “The real action takes place in the deep places of men’s hearts.”³⁴¹ “The liturgy’s effect cannot be achieved in a purely external manner.”³⁴² From the misunderstanding about active participation follows the opinion that everything in the liturgy is subordinated to usefulness and everything has to serve a purpose in the liturgical celebration. Yet applying such a principle means that both mystery and beauty disappear from the liturgy.³⁴³

³⁴⁰ The concept of active participation was mentioned as early as November 22, 1903 by Pope Pius X in his *motu proprio Tra le sollecitudini* on sacred music. The concept, however, was used with a different accent from the way it is generally used today. Joseph Fessio points out that the concept refers primarily to the restoration of the Gregorian chant and not, as it is understood today, to the physical involvement of the congregation in the liturgical act. This idea is confirmed by Carol Byrne. Joseph Fessio, “Active Participation in the Church’s Liturgy,” *Adoremus Bulletin* 1 (1995). Carol Byrne, “Pius X Did Not Call for Active Participation in Liturgy,” *Tradition in Action*, http://www.traditioninaction.org/HotTopics/f074_Dialogue_2.htm [Access: July 23, 2016] This is quite different from the interpretation of active participation advanced by Lambert Beauduin, who in 1909 referred to it as opposition to a priestly dominion in liturgical celebration. Beauduin, *Liturgy the Life of the Church*, 52-3.

³⁴¹ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 80. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 89.

³⁴² Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 80-1. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 90.

³⁴³ Ratzinger, *Rapporto sulla fede*, 132-3. Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 79-81. Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 147-52.

Such a list of problems can be deemed shocking. No wonder many critics expressed their serious concerns about Ratzinger's ideas. In order to offer a balanced view of Ratzinger's verdict on the implementation of the liturgical reform of Vatican II, we need to acknowledge that he also finds and appreciates many positive elements in the post-Vatican II Missal.³⁴⁴ These positives include the richness of prayers and prefaces that appear in larger variety than in the previous Missal. He praises the new Eucharistic prayers, even though later he clearly prefers those of the Roman Canon, and reconsidering, says that new Eucharistic prayers can cause a never-ending demand for new prayers.³⁴⁵ Further positive elements he identifies include the large variety of prayers for weekdays and even the introduction of the vernacular for some parts of the liturgy, primarily for biblical readings.³⁴⁶ In his apostolic exhortation *Sacramentum Caritatis*, Pope Benedict emphasizes together with the Synod of Bishops the "beneficial influence on the Church's life of the liturgical renewal,"³⁴⁷ even though he does not give concrete examples of such influence in this document.

Ratzinger's liturgical thought has been received in different ways: in the eyes of many he is seen to be dissatisfied with the conciliar liturgical reform as a whole, while others appreciate his ideas.³⁴⁸ It is especially interesting that both progressive and traditionalist thinkers brand him a conservative and sometimes even restorative

³⁴⁴ Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 79-80.

³⁴⁵ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 184-5.

³⁴⁶ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 78.

³⁴⁷ Pope Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis post Synodal Exhortation on the Eucharist* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 2007), § 3.

³⁴⁸ For example, Alcuin Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy: The Principles of Liturgical Reform and Their Relation to the Twentieth-Century Liturgical Movement Prior to the Second Vatican Council* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005); László Dobszay, *The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite* (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2010); Nicola Bux, *La Riforma di Benedetto XVI: La liturgia tra innovazione e tradizione* (Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 2008), 75-9.

theologian. Representatives of the progressive group often criticize his pre-conciliar liturgical spirituality, his false concept of liturgy,³⁴⁹ the lack of importance he attaches to the liturgical community,³⁵⁰ and even his unfaithfulness to the conciliar liturgical reform.³⁵¹ They strongly disagree with Ratzinger's view about the rupture in liturgical tradition after Vatican II.³⁵² Angelus A. Häußling simply states that those who were seeking in Ratzinger's book *Der Geist der Liturgie* a "critical stance toward the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council [...] sees it soon confirmed,"³⁵³ and observes the question "of how the book of the Cardinal and theologian fits into the context of the reception of the Council"³⁵⁴ is a legitimate one. The opinion of this group of critics is summarized by Häußling: "Ratzinger's book must shock us: has the message of the Council not yet arrived?"³⁵⁵

³⁴⁹ Klemens Richter, review of Joseph Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie: Eine Einführung*, *ThR* 96 (2000): 324-5. "Der Leser wird hier aber weithin ... mit einem Zerrbild von Liturgie ... konfrontiert, gegen das sich der Kardinal wendet." "Er favorisiert eine universalistische Sicht der Liturgie, die kaum der in *Lumen Gentium* (LG 26) vertretenen eucharistischen Ekklesiologie entspricht."

Rinaldo Falsini, "Lo spirito della liturgia: da R. Guardini a J. Ratzinger," *RPL* 39 (2001): 3-7, especially 4: "Ratzinger ... ha una concezione di stampo tridentino."

³⁵⁰ Richter, review of Ratzinger, 325. "R[atztinger] ... gibt aber den Erfahrungen der konkret versammelten Gemeinde, ihrer Subjektivität keinen erkennbaren Platz. Darum aber ging es gerade bei der Liturgiereform..."

Angelus A. Häußling, "Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation," *ALW* 43/44 (2001): 362-95, especially 369-70.

³⁵¹ Richter, review of Ratzinger, 325. "Abgelehnt werden ... alle Begriffe, die ... ökumenisch konsensfähig sind. Damit steht R. im Gegensatz zu allen nachkonziliaren liturgischen Dokumenten."

Pierre-Marie Gy, "L'Esprit de la liturgie du Cardinal Ratzinger est-il fidèle au Concile ou en reaction contre?" *LMD* 229 (2002): 171-8.

³⁵² Häußling, "Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation," 375.

³⁵³ Häußling, "Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation," 362, my translation. "...kritisches Verhalten zur Liturgiereform des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils ... sieht sich bald bestätigt."

³⁵⁴ Häußling, "Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation," 363, my translation. "...Frage, wie sich das Buch des Kardinals und Theologen in den Kontext der Konzilrezeption einfügt."

³⁵⁵ Häußling, "Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation," 383, my translation. "Das Buch Ratzingers muss erschrecken: Ist die Botschaft des Konzils noch nicht angekommen?"

3.1.2 Reasons for the Unsuccessful Implementation

Exploring Ratzinger's criticism of the implementation of the Vatican II liturgical reform leads us to the question of why, in his view, the liturgical reform could not be implemented correctly. Ratzinger discusses two sets of reasons for this. I divide these reasons into two groups: those raised from inside the Church and those from outside. My main focus is on the reasons that rose inside the Church, because they can offer theological points concerning liturgical reform. Since these reasons reflect liturgical positions that Ratzinger considers to be wrong, they offer clues to the limits within which he thinks a liturgical reform is possible.

I explained in the previous section that very early on Ratzinger found some points that he considered represented a divergence from the conciliar liturgical reform. One had to wait until 2005, however, for him to reach the depth of the question and explain that some hermeneutical principles had generally been applied and absolutized in reading, interpreting and implementing the Council's teaching. Benedict XVI explained³⁵⁶ in carefully chosen terms the two different hermeneutics applied after Vatican II: the hermeneutic of discontinuity and the hermeneutic of continuity or renovation (*rinnovamento*) in the continuity.³⁵⁷ Such an explanation is not new, because already in

³⁵⁶ Benedetto XVI, "Una giusta ermeneutica per leggere e recepire il Concilio come grande forza di rinnovamento della Chiesa," in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*, Vol. 1, 2005 (Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006), 1018-32. English translation: Benedict XVI, "A Proper Hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council," in *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, ed. Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), ix-xiv.

³⁵⁷ I cannot offer here a thorough study on the papal speech from a systematic point of view. I will concentrate on liturgical implications. Many great analyses of this kind were born from Pope Benedict's proposed hermeneutics. I want to offer here: Joseph A. Komonchak, "Benedict XVI and the Interpretation

1996 he had spoken about something similar. At that time he pointed out that reform can be of two kinds: the one sort gives external factors up in order to live according to the faith. The other is directed to a comfortable life: “Reform consisted in simply jettisoning ballast, in making it easier for ourselves. Reform thus seemed really to consist, not in a radicalization of the faith, but in any kind of dilution of the faith.”³⁵⁸ He even named two ways of interpreting the Council: for one the texts of the council represent the continuity of faith, while the other wants to go beyond the texts.³⁵⁹ Returning to his papal speech, we read that the interpretation of the conciliar documents according to the hermeneutic of discontinuity, means seeing them as non-authentic expressions of the spirit of the Council.³⁶⁰ Therefore it is necessary to go beyond the written text and follow the spirit of the Council and not its texts. The problem with this hermeneutic, according to Pope Benedict, is that it misunderstands the role of the universal council in the life of the Church and cannot define the spirit of the Council, which is not a parliament that can do anything, but instead exists to guard ecclesial integrity and tradition.³⁶¹ One cannot say that discontinuity is entirely unacceptable, however. Reform necessarily implies

of Vatican II,” *Cristianesimo nella storia* 28 (2007): 323-37. Gilles Routhier, “The Hermeneutic of Reform as a Task for Theology,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 77 (2012): 219-243.

³⁵⁸ Ratzinger, *Salz der Erde: Christentum und katholische Kirche an der Jahrtausendwende: Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1997), 79-80. English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, *Salt of the Earth* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1997), 75.

³⁵⁹ Ratzinger, *Salz der Erde*, 80-1. “There are basically two concepts of reform. The first concept has more to do with renouncing external power and external factors, in order to live all the more by the faith. The other consists in making history more comfortable. [...] The texts of the Council are wholly in continuity with the faith... The true inheritance of the Council lives in its texts.” English translation: Ratzinger, *Salt of the Earth*, 76.

³⁶⁰ Ralph Weimann, “Hermeneutik der Reform als Erneuerung in Kontinuität,” in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI*, vol. 4, ed. Franz-Xaver Heibl, Christian Schaller and Rudolf Voderholzer (Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2011), 59-82, especially 68-70.

³⁶¹ Benedetto XVI, “Una giusta ermeneutica,” 1024-5. Ratzinger, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 146-7.

discontinuity also, otherwise how can one say that a reform has occurred? We will soon see the role of discontinuity in the process of a reform.

It is a fair question—that of why and how this kind of reading of Vatican II evolved. Of course, the limits of this work impede an overall response to such a question. We need to see however, that the way of viewing Vatican II as a break with previous councils and the tradition of the Church itself is not new. At the time of the Council there had already appeared the vocabulary of rupture expressing that what happened at Vatican II was a new doctrine and was in contradiction or discontinuity with Church tradition.³⁶² One of the leading figures of this idea was the archbishop of Dakar, Marcel Lefebvre, who himself founded and led a society to a schism. The problem that led him to such a radical decision is not merely rhetorical, however. Catherine Clifford points out that “Lefebvre’s position was founded on a false understanding of tradition as a static, unchanging reality.”³⁶³ As we will soon see, this is not Ratzinger’s position on Church tradition. Vatican II needs to be read in continuity with the tradition. This principle of reading Vatican II was offered already by the Extraordinary Synod of bishops in 1985.³⁶⁴ Thus seeing Vatican II as a completely new teaching, independent from historical and theological developments is completely inaccurate.

We can find some examples of the employment of inappropriate hermeneutics in Ratzinger’s earlier explanation also. He insists that in following Odo Casel’s patristic theology and liturgical Platonism, some reformers latched on to a one-sided idea that

³⁶² Gilles Routhier, “The Hermeneutic of Reform as a Task for Theology,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 77 (2012): 219-243. Here especially 221.

³⁶³ Catherine E. Clifford, *Decoding Vatican II. Interpretation and Ongoing Reception* (New York / Mahwah, NY: Paulist Press 2014)

³⁶⁴ *The Extraordinary Synod – 1985* (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1985) Routhier, “The Hermeneutic of Reform as a Task for Theology,” 221. Clifford, *Decoding Vatican II.*, 19.

rejected the development of the Middle Ages as mere scholastic theology.³⁶⁵ The result was a tendency towards an archaeological liturgy.³⁶⁶ Within this view, the history of the liturgy was not considered a continual progression, but one historical period was considered ideal and subsequent historical developments were ignored. This happened not only at an historical level, but at a theological level as well, with a theological idea of the past imposed on a later development. This was the case when the understanding of the Eucharist as meal was imposed on the later developed theology that spoke about Eucharist as a sacrifice.³⁶⁷

The hermeneutic of reform, according to Pope Benedict XVI, is what Pope John XXIII had in mind when he opened the Council on October 11, 1962, and expressed in his discourse that the task of the Council is to respect doctrine and express it in a way that corresponds to our time. This refers to the new forms, but not to the new content.³⁶⁸ It is a hermeneutic accepts the authority of Church tradition and adheres to the texts of the conciliar documents as real expressions of what Vatican II wanted to achieve.

Pope Benedict proposed a hermeneutic of reform as the correct hermeneutic. The concept of continuity is not new in this discourse, because as early as 1966 Ratzinger spoke about the law of continuity,³⁶⁹ and the idea developed continuously even in the

³⁶⁵ Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Perspektiven," 662. English translation: Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," 146. David G. Bonagura, "The Future of the Roman Rite: Reading Benedict in the Light of Ratzinger," *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 228-46, especially 245.

³⁶⁶ Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Perspektiven," 662; English translation: Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," 147.

³⁶⁷ When Ratzinger speaks about the essence of the liturgy and wants to find its theological foundations, the concept of sacrifice is at the core of the whole discussion. Ratzinger, "Theologie der Liturgie," 639-56. English translation: Ratzinger, "The Theology of the Liturgy," 18-31.

³⁶⁸ Benedetto XVI, "Una giusta ermeneutica," 1025-6.

³⁶⁹ Joseph Ratzinger, "Die Kirche nach dem Konzil," *The Furrow* 18 (1967): 3-23, especially 11-13. "We can no longer deny that exaggerations and aberrations have crept in which are both annoying and unbecoming. Must every Mass, for instance, be celebrated facing the people? [...] The tabernacle has

following decades.³⁷⁰ In the discussion following the papal speech, critics generally used the concept of continuity exclusively as an historical and chronological term, and responded to Ratzinger's theological approach with an historical critique. John F. Baldovin is correct when he lists Ratzinger's observations on liturgy and especially liturgical reform among his theological criticisms.³⁷¹ It is interesting that Gilles Routhier offers a deep theological analysis of the papal speech.³⁷² Routhier points out that in contrast to common opinion, especially in the field of liturgy, representatives of the hermeneutic of discontinuity, such as the schismatic group led by Marcel Lefebvre, are the extreme traditionalists. In liturgical theological discussion one is used to the criticism that the reformists or progressives represent a break with the interpretation of the Council.

Even though Routhier's intention is not to focus on liturgical questions, he reverses the common understanding of Pope Benedict's speech and through this clarifies that in Pope Benedict's understanding continuity means at the same time reform.³⁷³ Continuity in tradition necessarily implies novelty as well, otherwise how can we affirm that reform has occurred? This is expressed in Pope Benedict XVI's address when he brings together under reform, continuity and discontinuity, tradition and development.

removed from our high altars [...] it was replaced by the priest's chair [...] While the translation of the liturgy into the vernacular is dictated by the circumstances of the time, it should not be made a pretext for the destruction of everything which comes to her from the past. There is a law of continuity which we transgress at our peril." English translation: Ratzinger, "Catholicism after the Council," 11-13.

³⁷⁰ Ratzinger, *Rapporto sulla fede*, 33-5.

³⁷¹ Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 65.

³⁷² Gilles Routhier, "The Hermeneutic of Reform as a Task for Theology," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 77 (2012): 219-243.

³⁷³ Routhier, "The Hermeneutic of Reform as a Task for Theology," 241-43. An interesting opinion on Pope Benedict XVI and the Society of Pius X in the light of the liturgy in Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MI: The Liturgical Press, 2012), 146-9.

With regard to liturgy, it is important to emphasize that for Benedict XVI, continuity does not mean only historic continuity, as if in the development of rites every detail would have to be evolved maintaining direct references to the origin. This is not possible in liturgical development. Continuity means theological continuity which will be concrete in the faithful preservation of the tradition, allowing at the same time that this tradition develops and unfolds. Reform does not, however, mean a strict continuity either and Benedict XVI expresses this by saying that “It is precisely in [...] combination of continuity and discontinuity at different levels that the very nature of true reform consists.”³⁷⁴ We now see that reform necessarily implies discontinuity³⁷⁵ and that the “different levels” concern not only the historical. This combination of continuity and discontinuity or “innovation in continuity”³⁷⁶ means that in maintaining the principles, the practical forms are not permanent, because they “depend on the historical situation and are therefore subject to change.”³⁷⁷ This is of course true not only with regard to the liturgy, but it certainly is true with regard to it. The hermeneutic of the

³⁷⁴ Benedetto XVI, “Una giusta ermeneutica,” 1028. English translation: Benedict XVI, “A Proper Hermeneutic,” xiii.

³⁷⁵ It is consequently not true that reform exclusively entails a clear line of sequence in Pope Benedict’s vision. There are some scholars, such as Ralph Weimann, affirming this: “Hermeneutik der Reform als Erneuerung in Kontinuität,” in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI*, vol. 4, 59-82, especially 76. Reform can involve some discontinuity, even though he does not explain the conditions or to what extent it can do so.

³⁷⁶ Benedetto XVI, “Una giusta ermeneutica,” 1028. English translation: Benedict XVI, “A Proper Hermeneutic,” xiii. It seems important to me that in the original Italian text we do not find the word “innovazione” for “innovation” but “novità,” that is, “novelty.” This is important because the word “innovation” emphasizes human activity which is not the case with the word “novelty.”

³⁷⁷ Benedetto XVI, “Una giusta ermeneutica,” 1028. English translation: Benedict XVI, “A Proper Hermeneutic,” xiii.

reform acknowledges the role of the liturgy in the life of the Church and the proper nature of the liturgy. It allows liturgy to evolve organically.³⁷⁸

If there are changeable and unchangeable elements in the liturgy, then we need to see which, in Ratzinger's understanding, are the unchangeable theological principles and which the changeable practical forms. In the introduction to Alcuin Reid's book *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*,³⁷⁹ Ratzinger objects to the Neo-Scholastic approach according to which *materia* and *forma* are the only necessary elements for the celebration of the sacraments and especially the Eucharist. If this were the case then anything else would be freely disposable and the constant updating of the liturgy according to contemporary cultural and sociological trends would not cause any problems. As a consequence, the rite itself would be freed from any restrictions and rubrics which might be considered as a limitation. He refers to the Liturgical Movement

³⁷⁸ I refer here to the way Ratzinger designates the role of liturgy in the life of the Church as I have explained in the first chapter, and the meaning of organic growth as expounded in the previous section. At the same time I want to mention an event in Pope Benedict's pontificate that seems perhaps insignificant, but liturgically has importance, even though it has not been interpreted in the context of this area of questions. After the publication of *Summorum Pontificum* in which Pope Benedict made the pre-conciliar liturgical forms easily accessible, the text of the prayer for the Jews from the Good Friday liturgy was criticised by many and was accused of expressing anti-Semitic ideas. On February 6, 2008 a note was published by the Secretariat of State announcing the obligatory change to the prayer in the 1962 Missal. The new prayer was composed by Pope Benedict himself. We observe here that the criterion of organic growth was overstepped and a direct intervention was made by the Roman Pontiff, whom Ratzinger affirms does not have authority to arbitrarily change anything in the liturgy. On the other hand we see here how social and cultural trends influenced or perhaps even demanded immediate change in the celebration of the liturgy.

A similar example might be the sign of peace, about which Pope Benedict initiated discussion in *Sacramentum caritatis* 49, namely, whether or not it should be situated before the offertory. It was moved to its current position in the fourth century. It would therefore be easy to argue that this is the restoration of an ancient tradition. However, in this case the subsequent ritual development would be skipped over and one would fall into the archeologism rejected by Ratzinger. It was he who criticized the rejection of the liturgical development of the Middle Ages. We can see here that the theology of the liturgy must not be interpreted only through historical lenses, but through theological and biblical ones as well. For some aspects of this issue: Bonagura, "The Future of the Roman Rite," 241-3.

³⁷⁹ Alcuin Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy: The Principles of Liturgical Reform and Their Relation to the Twentieth-Century Liturgical Movement Prior to the Second Vatican Council* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005).

wanting to “overcome this reductionism, [...] and to teach us to understand the Liturgy as a living network of tradition which had taken concrete form, which cannot be torn apart into little pieces, but has to be seen and experienced as a living whole.”³⁸⁰

Another problem that appeared inside the Church in the process of the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform stemmed from matters of competence and authority³⁸¹ in liturgical questions. Following Gamber’s theory,³⁸² Ratzinger explains that after the Council, liturgical scholars ascribed to themselves an authority that was not theirs. Ratzinger is strict in relation to authority over the liturgy and explains that even the pope is limited in this matter because he is not an absolute monarch who can make arbitrary changes.³⁸³ This would again be against the nature of the liturgy itself. Scholars felt authorized to implement any changes they wanted, and so evaded a long period of organic growth.³⁸⁴ They were mostly influenced by theological ideas considered modern and progressive at the time they were introduced into liturgical practice, such as archaeological enthusiasm and pastoral pragmatism.³⁸⁵ They did not acknowledge the nature of the liturgy to which, according to Ratzinger, organic development belongs.

Liturgy must not be a terrain for experimenting with theological hypotheses. Too rapidly, in these last decades the ideas of experts have entered into liturgical practice, often also by-passing ecclesiastical authority, through the channel of commissions which have been able to diffuse at an international level their

³⁸⁰ Joseph Ratzinger, preface to Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*, 9-13, especially 11.

³⁸¹ Weimann, “Hermeneutik der Reform als Erneuerung in Kontinuität,” in *Mitteilungen*, 70-2.

³⁸² Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background* (San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press; Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993), 27-39.

³⁸³ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 142-3; English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 165-6; Ratzinger, Preface to *The Organic Development*, 10.

³⁸⁴ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 73; English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 81.

³⁸⁵ Ratzinger, Preface to *The Organic Development*, 11-2.

“consensus of the moment,” and practically turn it into laws for liturgical activity. The Liturgy derives its greatness from what it is, not from what we make of it.³⁸⁶

At the time of the Council, the general feeling was that nothing was secure in the Church, and everything must be reformed. Ratzinger criticizes the conciliar fathers to a certain degree, saying that they understood their own role as being that of the parliament of the Church that could change everything. Many understood the Council as a struggle against Rome’s centralism. This idea brought with it another one: if the bishops can change everything, why can only bishops do so? In this way theologians gained a certain self-confidence, as the sole “experts,” and the idea of *Volkskirche* became very popular and a basis for liberation theology.³⁸⁷

The question of the role of the theologian in the life of the Church is a long-standing issue for Ratzinger. As I pointed out in the first chapter, in 1990, and as prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, he signed a widely-discussed document on the ecclesial vocation of the theologian. That document reflects Ratzinger’s understanding of authority as it appears here in liturgical context.

Finally, I want to add two more reasons for the unsuccessful implementation of the conciliar documents that have developed inside the Church. These are personal impressions of Ratzinger, not systematic explanations, and therefore I will not develop them at length. Ratzinger mentions two reasons why Vatican II could not be a breakthrough. The first is that “we...doubtless expected too much.”³⁸⁸ Pope Benedict speaks about such enthusiasm and expresses its positive consequences, but notes that

³⁸⁶ Ratzinger, “Theologie der Liturgie,” 656; English translation: Ratzinger, “The Theology of the Liturgy,” 30.

³⁸⁷ Ratzinger, *Aus meinem Leben*, 134-6.

³⁸⁸ Ratzinger, *Salz der Erde*, 79. English translation: Ratzinger, *Salt of the Earth*, 74.

because of what was disseminated through the media, people often misunderstood the role of the Council.³⁸⁹ And this is the second reason: the difference between what the Council fathers wanted to achieve and what actually reached the public. In the intentions of the fathers, the Council worked within the faith, whereas the media applied a political hermeneutic in which they separated the work of the Council from the context of the faith, promoting false expectations among the people. The goal of the fathers was not understood any more as *aggiornamento*, but as reform, consisting in changes to and cancellations of that which was too difficult. Pope Benedict thinks that something similar happened to the liturgy, when for many, the most important goal of the liturgical reform was the adaptation of the liturgy to contemporary cultural and sociological realities. But these people forgot to apply the hermeneutic of faith and view liturgy in the context of the Church's faith.³⁹⁰

There are of course certain reasons for the unsuccessful implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform that came from outside the Church. These are sociological and cultural factors that emerged from or characterized the period of the implementation. I mention them only briefly because the theological character of the present work prevents deep exploration of this area. The first factor to influence the reception of the conciliar

³⁸⁹ Benedetto XVI, "Al concilio pieno di entusiasmo e speranza," *L'Osservatore Romano* (16 febbraio 2013): 4-5, especially 4.

³⁹⁰ Benedetto XVI, "Al concilio pieno di entusiasmo e speranza," 5. English translation: Vatican Radio, http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2013/02/14/pope_to_rome%27s_priests_the_second_vatican_council,_as_i_saw_it/en1-664858 [Access: July 23, 2016] "This was the case for the liturgy: there was no interest in the liturgy as an act of faith, but as a something to be made understandable, similar to a community activity, something profane. And we know that there was a trend, which was also historically based, that said: 'Sacredness is a pagan thing, possibly even from the Old Testament. In the New Testament the only important thing is that Christ died outside: that is, outside the gates, that is, in the secular world.' Sacredness ended up as profanity even in worship: worship is not worship but an act that brings people together, communal participation and thus participation as activity. And these translations, trivializing the idea of the Council, were virulent in the practice of implementing the liturgical reform, born in a vision of the Council outside of its own key vision of faith."

teaching was sociological, namely that in the opinion of contemporary society, the main characteristic of an institution is that it oppresses. When the Church is seen as an institution, it is considered an entity that is against freedom. The only way to maintain personal freedom is thus to reject any prescribed forms emanating from the oppressing institution. In this vision, liturgy is seen to be used by the Church to preserve itself and give its oppression a religious veneer.³⁹¹ This vision is of course not very theological, because in it the Church is seen merely as a mundane institution separate from the Christian faith. There is, however, another reason that is anthropological in nature, and which is characterized by a developed individualism with tendencies to deism.³⁹² During the period after the Council, a certain transition could be observed from the universal Church to the local Church and from the local Church to the local congregation. The liturgical celebration was also evaluated according to its usefulness to the individual, and the primary subject of the liturgy became the celebrating community instead of God. This tendency was complemented by an almost deistic interpretation of the relationship between God and humans: one could no longer imagine that human actions could offend God, and as a consequence, there was no need for expiation. Liturgy and sacrifice lost their meaning and importance.³⁹³ All these factors led to the fragmentation and destruction of the liturgy, because it did not reflect the presence of the mystery anymore, but rather, the religious experiences of the congregation. In contrast, Ratzinger emphasizes that “the Liturgy is not an expression of the consciousness of the

³⁹¹ Ratzinger, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 150; English translation: Ratzinger, *A New Song for the Lord*, 146.

³⁹² Rowland, *Ratzinger's Faith*, 140.

³⁹³ Ratzinger, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 50-1. Blázquez Pérez, “Liturgia y Teología en Joseph Ratzinger,” 305-7.

community...It is revelation received in faith and prayer, and its measure is consequently the faith of the Church, in which revelation is received.”³⁹⁴ He acknowledges that it is difficult to understand this today because of what he calls the “breakdown of liturgical consciousness”³⁹⁵ that can be caused by conceptual problems in relation to liturgy. In all these arguments we see that Ratzinger criticizes the way that, in his view, contemporary thought was imposed on the liturgy, on its traditional understanding and therefore on an organic liturgical development, which until then had not been radically disturbed by contemporary thought.

3.2 Ratzinger’s Proposals for a Liturgical Renewal

The previous section has helped us understand the categories Ratzinger uses when speaking about liturgical renewal or reform. I turn now to some of the writings in which he discusses principles of reform. These publications do not speak about liturgical reform generally, however, but the liturgical reform of Vatican II in particular, and also non-liturgical reform in general. They are nevertheless useful in this research, because, by integrating them into Pope Benedict’s hermeneutical principles, we can in the end identify some general criteria governing any liturgical reform.

³⁹⁴ Ratzinger, “Theologie der Liturgie,” 656; English translation: Ratzinger, “The Theology of the Liturgy,” 30.

³⁹⁵ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 75-76; English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 84.

3.2.1 Principles of Liturgical Renewal

What the essence of any reform consists in is a very complex question. A reform involves more than old and new elements and their relationship. It is, rather, a change in one's mind or way of thinking that has concrete, sometimes even empirically measurable results. Reform does not occur primarily at the empirical level, however, but at the spiritual and rational. Therefore one cannot simply state that reform means a break with the old and the introduction of something completely new. It is a new approach to realities; it is the reconsideration and eventual correction of how one looks at things and understands them.

Already in 1971 Ratzinger explained the deep meaning of reform in a short article dedicated to the Church and to the question of why the Church is determinant in the life of the Christian. He writes here on reform in general:

Reform originally meant a spiritual process, very much akin to repentance [...] When reform is dissociated from the hard work of repentance, and seeks salvation merely by changing others, by creating ever fresh forms, and by accommodation to the times, then despite the many useful innovations it will be a caricature of itself. Such reform can touch only things of secondary importance in the Church. No wonder, then, that in the end it sees the Church itself as of secondary importance.³⁹⁶

Ratzinger speaks here about a reform that is akin to repentance. Unfortunately, he does not explain his reasons for this alignment. Nevertheless, we can see that repentance is an inner shift when an individual suddenly realizes that the direction of his or her life needs a serious and radical change. They start to see their own life and the whole of creation as they are destined for a purpose by God. The person realizes that sin destroys

³⁹⁶ Hans Urs von Balthasar, Joseph Ratzinger, *Two Say Why. Why I Am Still a Christian. Why I Am Still in the Church*, 70.

the goodness of God's plan and the purpose of creation and recognizes that sin changes their relationship to the whole of creation and to God himself. The individual sees the change in his or her life as necessary because life is seen in a new light that is God's love. The radical nature of this recognition is not realized primarily in external actions, but within the person. For this reason Ratzinger says that reform cannot be realized merely by changing external forms. This internal shift of repentance finds its application in the words, deeds or general behaviour of the person. These are, however, only external forms of the inner change. Such forms are important to make repentance concrete, but they do not have a primary role in the process, otherwise, as Ratzinger explains, repentance or reform touches upon things of secondary importance and not upon what is essential. In such a case repentance would not be repentance and reform would not be reform.

Applying Ratzinger's idea on reform in general, we can see now that it must also be an inner process that is realized within the Church and its members. It does not relate primarily to changes in external forms, even though these can be very useful at times, but to the way liturgy is received, interpreted, celebrated, loved and lived. Liturgical reform means a new way of looking at the liturgy, the recognition of its place in the life of the Church, its role in the relationship with God, and its importance in the life of the Christian community and individual. Therefore liturgical reform cannot be carried out primarily in the area of rubrics, but in the Church, in the members of the Church and so also in the community that celebrates liturgy. In order for people to attain this inner shift, they must be helped. This is the point where Ratzinger begins to speak about the primary meaning of liturgical reform as formation. We have seen in the previous chapter that

Romano Guardini considered formation the main challenge of the period after Vatican II and that he urged his colleagues to think about liturgical reform primarily in terms of formation. Even though we cannot find any direct connection with regard to this interpretation of liturgical reform, seeing the general influence of Guardini on Ratzinger's thought, it is possible to assume here too some intellectual dependence by the future pope on Guardini.

In the next section I will return to the question of liturgical reform understood as liturgical formation, but before developing it, I want to discuss another publication from Ratzinger, one that in my view complements the idea of reform expounded thus far. Forty years after the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, Ratzinger writes about the basic categories of the conciliar liturgical reform. He explains that the liturgical reform of Vatican II has three main characteristics that are adequate to any liturgical reform. These are *Verständlichkeit, Teilhabe, Einfachheit*³⁹⁷ (comprehensibility, participation, simplicity.) These three characteristics fit perfectly into Ratzinger's vision of the reform of the liturgy.

Comprehensibility is not meant primarily as a semantic concept. Liturgical language cannot be understood through verbal explanation. Liturgical language is based not only on oral components, but on symbolic ones as well. Therefore to make liturgy comprehensible does not in the first place mean translation. The understanding that Ratzinger speaks about can be achieved by adequate formation of the faithful and the clergy and through the formation of the liturgy. It thus has a didactic character such that

³⁹⁷ Joseph Ratzinger, "40 Jahre Konstitution über die heilige Liturgie. Rückblick und Vorblick," *LJ* 53 (2003): 209-21.

through the participation in the liturgical act the participants explore ever better the world of the liturgy, are transformed by its transcendental realities, and grow in the knowledge of divine truths. Formation of the liturgy necessarily requires formation for the liturgy, however. Translations or explanatory translations are not sufficient, because the celebrating community has to be aware of the theological significance of the liturgical act as well.³⁹⁸ Even though the comprehensibility of the liturgy is one of the important points of the Vatican II reform, the Council was also aware that the liturgical act at the same time exceeds the limits of understanding because it is mystery. The mystery of God present in the liturgical action cannot be explained or understood rationally. It exceeds human understanding. Therefore liturgy can either be oversimplified or without limits, but both will mean the destruction of liturgy itself.

The accessibility of the liturgy should not be taken to mean the immediate intelligibility of the banal. It cannot be created simply by either better translations or more comprehensible gestures. It requires an inward journey if it is to disclose itself—it demands “*eruditio*,” an opening up of the soul in which the higher dimensions of reason break open, and one is taken up into a process of seeing and hearing.³⁹⁹

The importance of understanding the meaning of the celebration is central to conciliar reform and it is even expressed in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 34, 48, 50, 59, 62, often connected to the theme of the participation of the faithful.

³⁹⁸ Regarding Guardini’s main concern as explained in Chapter 2, the most important issue of the post-conciliar liturgical reform is to enable people to perform this act. Later on I will discuss liturgical translation in more depth.

³⁹⁹ Ratzinger, “40 Jahre Konstitution,” 218. My translation: “Die Zugänglichkeit der Liturgie ist nicht mit der unmittelbaren Begreiflichkeit des Banalen zu verwechseln. Sie ist auch nicht einfach durch bessere Übersetzungen und verständlichere Gebärden herzustellen. Sie erschließt sich nur auf einem inneren Weg – sie verlangt »eruditio«, Öffnungen der Seele, in denen die höheren Dimensionen der Vernunft aufbrechen und ein Prozess des Sehend- und Hörend-Werdens geschieht.”

The second aspect—participation—brings us to that widely discussed expression of Vatican II: *participatio actuosa*. As I pointed it out in the first section of this chapter, for Ratzinger, active participation does not primarily indicate an exterior activity, because liturgy is not composed merely by doing, but by words as well as acts. Since not everyone can take part in every external act, the *actio* in which everyone must participate is the *oratio*. But even here, active participation does not primarily mean that the individual must join the spoken prayers, but instead that the act of prayer can be realized as an internal action. Here Ratzinger refers to Joseph Pasher: it is not sufficient to keep the rubrics, but to fulfill the inner demand of the rubrics: what the liturgical texts themselves demand.⁴⁰⁰ Active participation means cooperation with the divine action. Human action gives precedence to the *actio divina* in order to be submerged into the mystery through which every individual will be transformed into the Logos.⁴⁰¹ Active participation means that the individual allows God to transform his or her existence and elevate it to a higher level, a level at which the unity with the heavenly liturgy and with Christ himself can be realized to the full.⁴⁰² Participation is also an important concept expressed, for example, in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 19, where, similar to Ratzinger, the Council emphasizes both inner and outer participation. Pope Benedict brings this idea up again in *Sacramentum Caritatis* 52, asking that the term “be understood in more

⁴⁰⁰ Ratzinger, “40 Jahre Konstitution,” 219.

⁴⁰¹ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 147-52; English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 171-7. Ratzinger, “‘Der Geist der Liturgie’ oder: die Treue zum Konzil. Antwort an Pater Gy,” *LJ* 52 (2002): 111-5, especially 111. Thomas P. Rausch, *Pope Benedict XVI: An Introduction to his Theological Vision* (New York: Paulist Press, 2009), 128-9.

⁴⁰² Ratzinger, “40 Jahre Konstitution,” 220. Guido Marini, *La liturgie: Mystère du salut* (Perpignan: Éditions Artège, 2010), 47-55.

substantial terms, on the basis of a greater awareness of the mystery being celebrated and its relationship to daily life.”⁴⁰³

The third criterion is simplicity. Ratzinger points out that in the second half of the twentieth century, simplicity of the rites was explained as if they should have only pragmatic rather than sacral significance. This idea is not acceptable at all because at the heart of the liturgical act is Jesus’ act of giving bread and wine, which is truly and fully a sacral act. “It is correct that the liturgical structure, the individual signs, actions and word become transparent for this centre and so contain a noble simplicity in themselves.”⁴⁰⁴ The term simplicity as used by *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and by Ratzinger is not to be understood as a merely aesthetic concept. Simplicity means that everything in the liturgy must serve its main purpose: the adoration of God.⁴⁰⁵ Simplicity must be explained in order to open up and internalise what the eyes see and the heart experiences.⁴⁰⁶ According to the conciliar liturgical document, the purpose of the criterion of simplicity of the rites is to help with understanding and participation. This is expressed, for example, in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 34. The Council seems to confirm the idea here that too many explanations can ruin the dynamics of the entire liturgical act.

⁴⁰³ Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, § 52.

⁴⁰⁴ Ratzinger, “40 Jahre Konstitution,” 220.

⁴⁰⁵ The concept of adoration is very important in Ratzinger’s entire theology of the liturgy because he believes this concept can express the most appropriately what liturgy is about. It is the adoration of God. More on this: Blázquez Pérez, “Liturgia y Teología en Joseph Ratzinger,” 307-13.

⁴⁰⁶ Ratzinger, “40 Jahre Konstitution,” 221.

3.2.2 Renewal of the Liturgical Awareness: Liturgical Formation

Thus far our research indicates that in Ratzinger's thinking, reform of the liturgy is not reducible to change in ritual and rubric. We have discovered instead that he thinks on a theological level and all his recommendations imply that in the reform of the liturgy it is important to safeguard the nature of the liturgy and the tradition of the Church. A reform of the liturgy is possible and even desirable. As we have seen, the first step in a reform can never be a change in the rites or rubrics, and neither can it mean the invention of new rites. When in a certain historical situation the main goal of liturgy is obscured and reaches the congregation only with difficulty, the first step must always be the formation of the faithful. Here Ratzinger seems to suggest that when liturgy is not received appropriately, it is probable that the problem is not with the rites, but with human incapability in perceiving it. Therefore the task is to find new ways in which the faithful can again see what the liturgy is about, what its main elements, goals and tools are, and how these serve the one purpose: the adoration of God. The direction of liturgical reform is the opposite of what one might expect: liturgy is not to be formed according to the individual, but the individual must be formed to understand liturgy and through this understanding participate therein. That is why the most important aspect of liturgical reform is formation.⁴⁰⁷ We can make two observations here. The first is that Ratzinger refers to the role of the individual in the liturgical community rather than to

⁴⁰⁷ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 448; English translation: Ratzinger, *God and the World*, 416. "In the first place to be above all it is an educative process, which would put a stop to this trampling all over the liturgy with one's own inventions [...] It is a matter of an impulse emanating from people who celebrate a living faith." Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 80; English translation: *The Feast of Faith*, 90.

that of the congregation. The second observation is that in Ratzinger's idea we can trace that of Guardini, who similarly laid strong emphasis on the ability of humans to perform the liturgical act. In his letter *Der Kultakt*, analysed in the previous chapter, Guardini calls for the restoration of the *symbolfähigkeit* of human beings in order to make them capable of performing the liturgical act. Ratzinger's reasoning is similar: because of the human incapability of celebrating liturgy appropriately, people must be taught how to do so. I will return to these remarks more thoroughly in Chapter 4. That the idea of liturgical formation is not unfamiliar in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* is confirmed, especially numbers 17-19, which concern the formation both of the clergy and the faithful.

According to this idea, liturgical reform cannot mean, for Ratzinger, a simple return to the pre-conciliar liturgy as is sometimes suggested by his critics. Ratzinger was clear about this as early as 1984: "If by restoration is meant turning back, no restoration of such kind is possible [...] There is no going back, nor is it possible to go back."⁴⁰⁸ It is more correct to say that Ratzinger offers the history and the development of the pre-conciliar Liturgical Movement as a model. It was not an officially initiated movement, but came from the faithful who wanted liturgy to be a significant part of their prayer life. It was centered on formation and not primarily on rubrics. Any liturgical reform must somehow have this character: it must come from the celebrating communities as a first step and not merely be imposed by the Magisterium.⁴⁰⁹ The first step to liturgical reform is a renewed liturgical awareness in both the clergy and the faithful, or as Bonagura calls

⁴⁰⁸ Ratzinger, *Rapporto sulla fede*, 36. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Ratzinger Report*, 37. Further on this: Ratzinger, *Salz der Erde*, 186-8.

⁴⁰⁹ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 449.

this, “reforming the spirit.”⁴¹⁰ This entails the acknowledgement of what liturgy is in the life of the Church and of the faithful and why it is important in the prayer life of the community and the individual. It is worth quoting at length what Ratzinger writes about this liturgical awareness:

A renewal of liturgical awareness, a liturgical reconciliation that again recognizes the unity of the history of the liturgy and that understands Vatican II, not as a breach, but as a stage of development: these things are urgently needed for the life of the Church. I am convinced that the crisis in the Church that we are experiencing today is to a large extent due to the disintegration of the liturgy, which at times has even come to be conceived of *etsi Deus non daretur*: in that it is a matter of indifference whether or not God exists and whether or not he speaks to us and hears us. But when the community of faith, the worldwide unity of the Church and her history, and the mystery of the living Christ are no longer visible in the liturgy, where else, then, is the Church to become visible in her spiritual essence? Then the community is celebrating only itself, an activity that is utterly fruitless. And, because the ecclesial community cannot have its origin from itself but emerges as a unity only from the Lord, through faith, such circumstances will inexorably result in a disintegration into sectarian parties of all kinds—partisan opposition within a Church tearing herself apart. This is why we need a new Liturgical Movement, which will call to life the real heritage of the Second Vatican Council.⁴¹¹

Ratzinger writes here about the reintegration of the liturgy in the life of the Church. His criticism of contemporary society urges him to ensure liturgy’s real place in the life of the Church, where it is not the celebration of the community, but is centred strictly and primarily on God. Again liturgy must be the adoration of God, and it must be received and celebrated according to this most important principle. There is a call in this text for a new liturgical movement which is needed because of the disintegration of the liturgy due to several factors. It seems that for Ratzinger a general irreligiosity can be derived from the misinterpretation of the role of liturgy in the life of the Church. Liturgy has serious impact on society and culture also, for it completely transforms the

⁴¹⁰ Bonagura, “The Future of the Roman Rite,” 237.

⁴¹¹ Ratzinger, *Aus meinem Leben*, 174. English translation: Ratzinger, *Milestones*, 148-9.

individual, who is a member not only of the Church, but of society as well. The integrity of the liturgy is needed not only because of society: liturgy is a major tool on the way to the unity within the Church and the mediator of the mysteries of Christ. It is at the same time a goal too, inasmuch liturgical unity derives from the unity of the Church. Liturgy's ecclesiological impact is extremely important. The place *par excellence*, where the Church becomes visible, is the liturgy. But if the Church cannot be expressed in the liturgy, if it cannot be visible as the communion of the faithful with God, where else can this be done? Therefore the ecclesiological applications of the liturgy also have a significant part to play in liturgical reform and formation so that the real essence of the Church can be understood and lived out.

Ratzinger claims that Western culture has forgotten that liturgy is not something made by the Church, but is given. Recognizing this given nature of the liturgy must be seen as an important step in the awakening of liturgical awareness. The fact that Ratzinger represents the idea of a given liturgy does not exclude historical development, however. Yet historical development can entail only small changes or reforms in matters of detail,⁴¹² similar to those applied when one cares for a plant: it must be trimmed and formed, but cannot be transformed. Its essence and nature must be taken seriously. Ratzinger offers as examples of such liturgical reforms those of Pius X, who cut back the number of saints celebrated in the liturgical year, or those of Pius V who removed superfluous sequences.⁴¹³

⁴¹² Benedikt XVI, *Licht der Welt: Der Papst, die Kirche und die Zeichen der Zeit. Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Verlag Herder, 2010), 184.

⁴¹³ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 446-7.

A second point concerning liturgical awareness results from liturgy's given nature: it is necessary to respect liturgy and acknowledge that it cannot be manipulated.⁴¹⁴ We have spoken about the authority of the Pope, the Magisterium and the theologians in liturgical matters. We must, however, take a step further and learn to look at the liturgy as a gift, with participation in the heavenly liturgy as the model for and the fulfillment of any liturgical celebration. Doing so will help avoid the profanation of the liturgy.

Gerard Mannion observes that for Ratzinger catechesis and liturgical formation cannot be a profession. According to Mannion, Ratzinger laments the professionalization of catechesis, because, as he observes, it has been overcome by practical theology and anthropology, rather than remaining focused on theology.⁴¹⁵ This has caused the social sciences to enter the field of theology, resulting in the primacy of experience in the understanding and interpretation of faith.⁴¹⁶ Liturgical formation must preferably be charismatic, perhaps even mystagogical, based on the theology of liturgy, in order to provide the necessary foundation on which liturgical praxis can be built, acknowledging the didactic character of the liturgy itself.

3.2.3 Renewal in Praxis

Following Ratzinger's argument on the nature of liturgical reform and the problems in the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform, it becomes inevitable that some

⁴¹⁴ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 448. Benedikt XVI, *Licht der Welt*, 184.

⁴¹⁵ Mannion, "Liturgy, Catechesis and Evangelization," in *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey*, ed. Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 225-56, especially 231.

⁴¹⁶ Mannion, "Liturgy, Catechesis and Evangelization," 241. Joseph Ratzinger, *Vom Wiederauffinden der Mitte: Grundorientierungen, Texte aus vier Jahrzehnten* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1997), 88-9.

rubrical changes are made. These are proposed by Ratzinger in order to correct that which was not authorized by the conciliar liturgical document, but was nevertheless realized in liturgical praxis, whether these be erroneous principles or practical changes.⁴¹⁷ It is important to understand that Ratzinger does not refer here to uniformity, but to the opposition of fragmentation. At the Fontgombault Liturgical Conference in 2001, Ratzinger expressed the view that there are three issues that are especially important and that changes should be implemented immediately. These changes are: the rejection of a false creativity, the correction of wrong translations, and the celebration *ad Orientem*.⁴¹⁸ In the case of the last, he proposes a new idea with regard to the meaning of the expression *ad Orientem*.

False creativity primarily means the arbitrary changes made by the presider and/or the celebrating community. Ratzinger does not merely call this creativity, but false creativity, because in his view this kind of creativity is not an authentic category for liturgy; therefore it is always false and negative in liturgical context.⁴¹⁹ It refers to arbitrary changes in texts, gestures, symbols or rubrics. Such changes obscure the fundamental nature of the liturgy—that it is given to and not made by the Church.⁴²⁰

Sacrosanctum Concilium is very severe on this question as well.⁴²¹ It is characteristic of

⁴¹⁷ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 8; English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 8-9; Ratzinger, “Bilanz und Perspektiven,” 674-7. English translation: Ratzinger, “Assessment and Future Prospects,” 150-2.

⁴¹⁸ Ratzinger, “Bilanz und Perspektiven,” 673-7; English translation: Ratzinger, “Assessment and Future Prospects,” 150-1.

⁴¹⁹ Blázquez Pérez, “Liturgia y Teología en Joseph Ratzinger,” 303.

⁴²⁰ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 444-6. English translation: Ratzinger, *God and the World*, 412-4; Benedikt XVI, *Licht der Welt*, 184.

⁴²¹ *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 22: § 1: “The regulation of the liturgy depends solely on the authority of the church, which resides with the apostolic see and, within the normal functioning of the law, with the bishop.” § 2: “As a result of the power that the law has devolved on them, the regulation of the sphere of liturgy within fixed boundaries belongs also to the competent local episcopal groupings of various kinds

the Missal, Ratzinger affirms, that it gives many *ad libitum* provisions that were and can be understood as a certain release from the boundary of rubrics and as an invitation to creativity.⁴²² Through this liturgy can easily be manipulated according to the subjective ideas of the community or the presiding minister. Following the application of false creativity, however, liturgy is transformed into the celebration of one concrete community and its ecclesial nature is destroyed. The repression of false creativity could be aided by less *ad libitum* indications in the Missal.⁴²³ At the same time we must not forget that creativity has at least some part in the liturgy, because it possesses the capacity for the realisation of the new creation, and foremost the change of people's hearts, enabling them to overcome their personal horizons and look beyond. Ricardo Reyes confirms that such creativity must be directed to and guided by the Church because the Church can guarantee its continuity with tradition and its unity with the creation and the Church.⁴²⁴

Regarding translations,⁴²⁵ Ratzinger affirms that in the English-speaking world especially, politically correct and inclusive language sometimes does not allow the application of translations that are required by the nature of the liturgy, and by

that have been legally set up." § 3: "Thus, absolutely no one other than these, even a priest, should disruptively add, remove or change anything in the liturgy on his or her own."

⁴²² Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 72. Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Perspektiven," 674-5. Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," 150-1. Benedetto XVI, "Con grande fiducia," 28.

⁴²³ Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Persepektiven," 674-5; English translation: Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," 150-1.

⁴²⁴ Ricardo Reyes, *L'unità nel pensiero liturgico di Joseph Ratzinger* (Roma: Centro Liturgico Vincenziano, 2011), 240.

⁴²⁵ An exciting discussion took place between German theologian Reiner Kaczynski and Joseph Ratzinger after the publication of the instruction *Liturgiam Authenticam* on liturgical translations. Even though the discussion was primarily focused on areas other than those in my research, such as competence in the process of approval of liturgical translations, it was a significant discussion on the issue. The segments of the discussion are: Reiner Kaczynski, "Angriff auf die Liturgiekonstitution? Anmerkungen zu einer neuen Übersetzer-Instruktion," *Stimmen der Zeit* 219 (2001): 651-68. Joseph Ratzinger, "Um die Erneuerung der Liturgie. Antwort auf Reiner Kaczynski," *Stimmen der Zeit* 219 (2001): 837-43.

Magisterial teachings. Instead, certain sociological and cultural trends have become visible in the translations which hide or sometimes even deny liturgical, theological, and dogmatic truths. He offers the example of the names Father or Son being branded as chauvinistic expressions and substituted with gender neutral forms; or when, because of inclusive language, the Christological dimension of the psalms disappears.⁴²⁶ Speaking about translations, Ratzinger adds that Latin is neither desirable nor possible as a liturgical language nowadays, but it is important to maintain at least some Latin in the liturgy,⁴²⁷ as a useful tool against personal creativity in liturgical celebrations and to recuperate space for the holy.⁴²⁸ Further, the use of Latin would indicate the “bond of ecclesial fellowship and communion.”⁴²⁹ In an organically developed liturgy there are ancient usages that must not be destroyed, such as the expressions *amen*, *alleluia*, *hosanna*, and *marana-tha*.⁴³⁰ Their translation does not necessarily make them comprehensible. The idea of the preservation of the Latin appears in *Sacramentum Caritatis* as well.⁴³¹ It is, however, not entirely clear whether in Ratzinger’s view every liturgy should preserve some Latin, or only the celebration of the Eucharist.⁴³²

⁴²⁶ Ratzinger, “Bilanz und Perspektiven,” 675-6; English translation: Ratzinger, “Assessment and Future Prospects,” 151.

⁴²⁷ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 447-50.

⁴²⁸ Ratzinger, *Rapporto sulla fede*, 129-31.

⁴²⁹ Ratzinger, “Bilanz und Perspektiven,” 676; English translation: Ratzinger, “Assessment and Future Prospects,” 151. Ratzinger is probably influenced in this matter by Pope John XIII, who promoted the use and the study of Latin in his Apostolic Constitution *Veterum saepeintia*. Rowland, *Ratzinger’s Faith*, 126.

⁴³⁰ Rowland, *Ratzinger’s Faith*, 130. Ratzinger, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 179.

⁴³¹ Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, § 62. “The better-known prayers of the Church’s tradition should be recited in Latin and, if possible, selections of Gregorian chant should be sung.”

⁴³² More on translations: Jorge Maria Mejía, “The Problem of Translation: Some Linguistic and Other Considerations,” in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*, ed. Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford (Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010), 17-23. Dennis McManus, “Translation Theory in Liturgiam Authenticam,” in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy*, 116-31.

On the question of the celebration *versus Orientem*, a long historical debate has developed. Ratzinger focuses not on historical but on theological research.⁴³³ This direction of celebration is the natural expression of the inner direction of the liturgical prayer: the whole congregation, including the presider, turns toward God. Through this means, the community can avoid putting itself into the centre of the celebration. Ratzinger sees a strong connection between the celebration *versus populum* and the understanding of the Mass primarily as a meal, however. We can assume rightly that the promotion of an eastward celebration is based on his constant emphasis on the understanding of the Mass as a sacrifice, setting it in its true cosmic context as the anticipation of the coming of Christ.⁴³⁴ Avoiding further radical liturgical and architectural changes, Ratzinger would carry out this third directive, not by turning the altars again, but rather by putting a crucifix at the center of the celebration and of the altar. This will help to maintain the cosmic character of the liturgy because it expresses more significantly the openness to and the unity with the whole of creation and the transcendental, heavenly liturgy.⁴³⁵ Therefore the name *versus Orientem* is of course not

⁴³³ He refers to the question briefly in Ratzinger, “‘Der Geist der Liturgie’ oder: die Treue zum Konzil. Antwort an Pater Gy,” 113. Two significant directions seem to have developed with regard to the question. Each is represented by a significant book. The first one is Otto Nußbaum, *Der Standort des Liturgen am christlichen Altar vor dem Jahre 1000: eine archäologische und liturgiegeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1965) that considers the celebration *versus populum* the more authentic and historically original. The other is Uwe Michael Lang, *Conversi ad Dominum: Zur Geschichte und Theologie der christlichen Gebetsrichtung* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 2010). Lang’s research indicates that the more ancient form is the celebration *versus Orientem*. The introduction to the book was written by Ratzinger.

⁴³⁴ Rowland, Ratzinger’s Faith, 136. Rausch, Pope Benedict XVI, 129-30.

⁴³⁵ Reyes, *L’unità nel pensiero liturgico di Joseph Ratzinger*, 232-4. Reyes summarises perfectly Ratzinger’s main thought on the cosmic dimension of the liturgy on p. 233-4: In the liturgy “the human person is immersed in a movement which involves the praise of the whole creation. His act of worship becomes therefore a point of connection between his universe and the universe that surrounds him, to whose praise the human being gives voice. It is fundamental therefore to be aware that the cosmic dimension of the liturgy indicates that its range includes not only the human being, body and soul, but that

adequate, but perhaps another expression can be used, such as *versus Deum*, which is sometimes used by those who are attached to the extraordinary form, because in their view it expresses the inner rather than the external direction of the prayer.⁴³⁶

There is another area with regard to practical liturgical reform that has been the object of long discussions, and this is the extraordinary form of the Roman Rite. Pope Benedict made access to the pre-conciliar form of the Roman Rite easy for everyone. The reception to his decision was very varied.⁴³⁷ Having seen his theology of the liturgy, one cannot wonder about this decision, because it follows naturally on from what has been said so far. Of course, this does not mean that the decision was received with general enthusiasm. Yet I am convinced that Pope Benedict's decision regarding this issue was not made with the intention of going back to a previous stage of liturgical history. What he wanted to achieve was the liturgical peace and the mutual influence or enrichment of the two forms.⁴³⁸ Bonagura explains that the reconciliation does not refer only to people of the old and the new tradition, but to the reconciliation of the Church with its own liturgical tradition.⁴³⁹ Pope Benedict wanted to restore the unity of the

it extends to the whole creation, in an event that upsets the normal order of things. The prayer of the human being brings the whole creation back to what it was created for: the praise of God the most High" (my translation). "l'uomo è immerso in un movimento che coinvolge la lode di tutta la creazione. Il suo culto diviene dunque un punto di congiunzione tra il suo universo e l'universo che lo circonda, alla cui lode l'uomo stesso dà voce. Fondamentale, pertanto, è essere consapevoli, che, dimensione cosmica della liturgia indica che la sua ampiezza, non solo coinvolge l'uomo, corpo e spirito, ma si allarga a tutta la creazione, in un evento che stravolge l'ordinario. La preghiera dell'uomo riporta così la creazione tutta a ciò per cui è stata creata: la lode del Dio Altissimo."

⁴³⁶ Ratzinger, "Bilanz und Perspektiven," 676-7; English translation: Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," 151-2.

⁴³⁷ More on the reception of *Summorum Pontificum*: Steven A. Kiczek, "Pope Benedict XVI's *Summorum Pontificum*: Reconciling Conflicting Values," *Journal of Religious & Theological Information* 8 (2009): 37-64.

⁴³⁸ Benedetto XVI, "Con grande fiducia," 25-9. Dobszay, "Perspectives on an Organic Development of the Liturgy," *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 18-27, especially 19-20.

⁴³⁹ Benedetto XVI, "Con grande fiducia," 28. Bonagura, "The Future of the Roman Rite," 236.

Church for those who, while canonically inside the Catholic Church, feel themselves at the edge because of their liturgical preferences.⁴⁴⁰ We can understand Pope Benedict's decision only in light of this understanding. The influence of the extraordinary form can help in the celebration of the *Novus Ordo* to concentrate more intensively on the given nature of the liturgy, and the new form can help to reform the Missal of 1962 according to the will of Vatican II. Because of the short time period, the effectiveness of this intention cannot yet be seen. I will return to this question in Chapter 5.

3.3 Pope Benedict XVI's Liturgical Praxis

Observing Pope Benedict's liturgical praxis, one soon discovers the extent to which his papal celebrations reflect his understanding of liturgy, liturgical development, and even liturgical reform. His papal liturgies were always at the centre of interest, and because of his particular interest in liturgical matters and the fact that his ideas were criticized by many, it is worth taking a look at what Pope Benedict proposes for the preservation of continuity; what a new liturgical movement can achieve immediately in liturgical celebrations; and how liturgy can be reformed or re-reformed. The papal liturgies have always been exemplary for the Church,⁴⁴¹ even though it is not possible to imitate all the elements of papal liturgies in an episcopal or parish liturgy. In the

⁴⁴⁰ I do not address here the question in relation to the Society of Pius X, because in their case the problem is not merely liturgical, but dogmatic as well. More on this: Society of Saint Pius X, *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform: A Theological and Liturgical Study* (Kansas City, MO: Angelus Press, 2001). More on Pope Benedict's reasons for issuing *Summorum Pontificum*: Kiczek, "Pope Benedict XVI's *Summorum Pontificum*," 52-5.

⁴⁴¹ Benedetto XVI, "Nel canto noi possiamo sentire la presenza della liturgia celeste, un po' della bellezza nella quale il Signore ci vuole comunicare la sua gioia." In *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 1, 2005 (Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006), 1012-3, especially 1013.

following I will offer some elements of Pope Benedict's liturgical praxis that help us to understand his ideas on liturgical reform.

One of the most significant innovations in papal liturgies was the emphasis on the direction of the whole liturgical act. Ratzinger earlier explained that the direction of the liturgical act is not circular, as this would make it a private act of the liturgical congregation, but rather goes from the community to God. This was expressed by the ancient practice of celebrating liturgy *versus Orientem*. When the liturgy is celebrated in a circle, when priest and community look at each other, the cosmic character of the liturgy almost completely disappears. Pope Benedict wanted to restore the presence of the cosmos and direct the participants' attention beyond the community. For this reason he put the crucifix at the centre of the altar and the celebration. This placement expresses the idea that the congregation gathers around Christ and looks up at him while celebrating his sacrifice.⁴⁴²

Even before and after this change it was explained that the crucifix cannot be something accidental to the liturgy. It cannot be considered an object that blocks the view, because it is much more important than the presiding priest. It is the restoration of an ancient tradition, since in the first centuries of basilical liturgies the cross was on the eastern wall of the church such that everyone looked at it while celebrating the liturgy.⁴⁴³ Even though Benedict's praxis refers to this period, he did not think it possible to turn back the direction of the celebration to the East. He thought his suggestion could give back the inner direction of the liturgical act, however. He expressed this vision in a

⁴⁴² Marini, *La liturgie: Mystère du salut*, 29-36.

⁴⁴³ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 122-3.

different way from 2008, when in masses in the Sistine Chapel he used the altar attached to the wall, and another altar, *versus populum*, was not installed.

Other significant elements came from Corpus Christi in 2008, when those who received communion from Pope Benedict, received it kneeling. A renewed reverence toward the sacramental presence of the Lord is emphasized through this posture which indicates that something extraordinary happens in the moment of the communion that the person can approach only with reverence and adoration.⁴⁴⁴

The use of liturgical vestments was also often remarked upon. Pope Benedict used both traditional and modern chasubles. At the end of his pontificate he had even recovered the use of the fanon put aside by Pope Paul VI. Generally speaking, during this time observers saw a large variety of liturgical vestments and styles of vestments. We might think of the introduction of previous liturgical furnishings, such as the *faldistorium*, or steps leading to the chair of the pope. As it was expressed, the intention behind these changes was to maintain the unity between older and newer liturgical elements. Behind this thinking was the conviction that there is no opposition at all between periods of liturgical history and the styles of different periods. In using both, Pope Benedict wanted to express his appreciation for both old and new styles.⁴⁴⁵

Pope Benedict XVI's liturgical praxis, much like his theology of the liturgy, was often branded traditionalist and even restorative. Many elements of his papal liturgical praxis can probably justify such an idea. With a deep knowledge of his liturgical theology however, one must acknowledge that these practices were a natural

⁴⁴⁴ Marini, *La liturgie: Mystère du salut*, 39-40.

⁴⁴⁵ Anselm J. Gribbin, *Pope Benedict XVI and the Liturgy: Understanding Recent Liturgical Developments* (Leominster, UK: Gracewing, 2011), 133-5.

consequence of all that he represented in theory over the previous years. In this regard, another important fact must be mentioned, namely that Pope Benedict did not celebrate the Eucharist according to the 1962 Missal. While still a cardinal, he accepted the invitation to the pontifical celebration of the Mass in Weimar on April 17, 1999. We know that as a pope he never celebrated the extraordinary form openly, and there is no information at all about such a private celebration. This confirms that his main purpose was not the complete restoration of the extraordinary form in the pre-conciliar form. His decision on the extraordinary form was not only a theological decision, but a pastoral one, and he probably saw a future when the two forms of the Roman Rite would be one again. I will discuss the pastoral consequences and the future of Pope Benedict XVI's theology of the liturgy in Chapter 5.

At the end of this section I would like to offer a short overview of Pope Benedict XVI's decisions in relation to liturgy and his requests expressed to the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments based on Peter J. Elliott's paper:⁴⁴⁶

- In 2006 the Congregation asked US bishops to observe the General Instruction of the Roman Missal 279, according to which only priests and deacons can purify the sacred vessels.
- In 2006 the Congregation decreed that *pro multis* is to be translated literally as *for many*.
- For some celebrations of the Neo-Catechumenal Way variations were permitted, such as the sign of peace before the offertory.

⁴⁴⁶ Peter J. Elliott, "Benedict XVI and the Liturgy: Vision, Teaching, Action" (paper presented at Saint Mary of Victories Church. St Louis, MO, September 29, 2012).

- In 2007 he issued *Summorum Pontificum* and made the pre-conciliar form of the Roman Rite accessible without requiring the permission of the local bishop.
- In 2008 a document stated that the tetragrammaton YHWH was not to be used in hymns, songs and prayers.
- In 2008 the new prayer was issued for the Jews in the Good Friday liturgy of the extraordinary form.
- In 2009 *Anglicanorum Coetibus* authorised the use of liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition, even though such books must have been approved by the Holy See.
- In *Sacramentum Caritatis* Pope Benedict opened a discussion on the place of the sign of peace in the Eucharist.
- Pope Benedict authorized three new Latin forms of dismissal.

3.4 Conclusion of Chapter 3

This present chapter was intended to show that Joseph Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy is a complex system of thought, incorporating theological disciplines from dogmatics to history, and from philosophy to anthropology. The mind of a systematic theologian is recognizable therein, since he approaches liturgy in a systematic way.

At the centre of Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy we can find two major foci. The first is the recognition of the specific nature of the liturgy. When Ratzinger emphasises liturgy's given nature and explains that its subject is Christ himself, giving at the same

time as an example the liturgy of heaven, it becomes clear that he believes liturgy belongs to the supernatural world and humans only participate in this liturgy according to their capabilities. Everything else follows from this: human beings are not authorized to deal with liturgy as their own property; at the centre of every liturgical celebration must be God. Historical development of the liturgy must reflect the idea that liturgy derives from God and therefore is subject to change only in a very limited way, with the role of the celebrating community very modest.

The second main focus in Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy is faithfulness to the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council. The hermeneutic he proposed in 2005 helps to illuminate his theological ideas on the interpretation of Vatican II, even though its reception was varied. This hermeneutic clearly shows, however, that Ratzinger thinks strictly within the traditional categories of faith and Church, while at the same time allowing liturgy to be reformed, even though he has his own interpretation of the concept of reform.

The examination of Guardini and Ratzinger's ideas on the reform of the liturgy has shown that they use similar concepts. The specific nature of the liturgy as the place of the encounter with God is important for both and must therefore be maintained. They both speak about the inability of human beings to worship appropriately and about the task of helping people to understand symbols, the language of the liturgy, and their own roles therein. Both Guardini and Ratzinger refer to formation as the main task in a time of liturgical reform, to the extent that formation seems to be the translation of the concept of liturgical reform.

Despite the many similarities, one can see some differences as well. While Guardini approaches liturgy with an anthropological focus, Ratzinger's focus is theological. While for Guardini the celebrating community is the bearer of the liturgical act, for Ratzinger its task is to fulfill what is required from it by the seemingly authoritative and unimpressionable liturgy. In order to understand the ideas on liturgical reform of the two theologians correctly, in order to be able to set up some criteria for liturgical reform in each of their systems of thought, and in order to analyze them in relation to each other, we need to deepen our knowledge of their basic understanding of liturgy and its concepts and the extent to which their ideas on liturgical reform are compatible.

4. THE CRITERIA FOR LITURGICAL REFORM

Guardini and Ratzinger's views on the reform of the liturgy as presented in the last two chapters reveal the similarity of the concepts they use and their shared interpretation of liturgical reform, not as change in the rite, but as liturgical formation. Through liturgical formation both clergy and faithful acquire a theoretical knowledge and practical ability to celebrate the liturgy and to perform the liturgical act in which the personal encounter with God is realised, and through which homage is expressed. The result is that people are transformed into the likeness of Christ. The main purpose of these last two chapters is to elaborate upon some criteria for liturgical reform taken from a holistic vision of the liturgical thought of Guardini and Ratzinger. In the first chapter we saw how the understanding of liturgy among the theological disciplines has changed, especially over the last few decades, and it is important to take this into consideration when analysing the two theologians. We have seen that in both their understanding, liturgical reform does not mean only (or predominantly) ritual change. Liturgical reform primarily entails a comprehensive awareness of theological, historical, and cultural phenomena that affect the realization of the divine action in the liturgy and the participation of human beings therein. It means the attainment of a symbolic way of thinking that is so necessary for participation in the liturgy. We know from history that liturgical reform generally does not mean sudden change, but is rather the culmination of a long period in which texts, rites, and sometimes even theology, manifest a deeper understanding of the divine mysteries present in liturgical celebrations.

In this present chapter I develop from Guardini and Ratzinger's theologies some concrete and universal criteria that can be applied to the reform of the liturgy in any historical period and then compare these. This involves understanding the concept of liturgy, elaborating briefly but clearly what liturgy is, and identifying the importance in liturgical celebrations of the human being and of the dogmatic content.

One should not forget to take into consideration the theological relation between the two theologians, however. The theological influence of Guardini is evident in and even acknowledged by Ratzinger. I mention a few points briefly in order to highlight their commonalities. Franz-Xaver Heibl summarizes their theological closeness clearly.⁴⁴⁷ Silvano Zucal offers concrete examples as well as explaining how and why such an influence might have developed.⁴⁴⁸

In Heibl's study there is an interesting section entitled "Romano Guardini im Urteil Papst Benedikts," (Romano Guardini in the Judgement of Pope Benedict).⁴⁴⁹ Here Heibl identifies the most important views that Ratzinger himself attributes to Guardini. These

⁴⁴⁷ Franz-Xaver Heibl, "Theologische Denker als Mitarbeiter der Wahrheit. Romano Guardini und Papst Benedikt XVI," in *Symphonie des Glaubens: junge Münchener Theologen im Dialog mit Joseph Ratzinger/Papst Benedikt XVI*, ed. M.C. Hastetter and C. Ohly and G. Vlachnois (St. Ottilien: Eos, 2007), 77-101.

⁴⁴⁸ Silvano Zucal, "The Intellectual Relationship between Joseph Ratzinger and Romano Guardini," in *L'Osservatore Romano Weekly Edition in English* (10 December 2008): 8. "Ratzinger was not only one of Guardini's readers but also on certain occasions a 'listener,' as the great theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar had been in Berlin. In the years between 1946 and 1951, the very same years in which Ratzinger was studying at the School for Advanced Studies in Philosophy and Theology in Freising, on the outskirts of the Bavarian capital, and then at the University of Munich, in the same city, in that University and in that local Church of Munich, Guardini assumed the role of intellectual and spiritual leadership. For Ratzinger, then only 20 years old, a figure like Guardini was indisputably fascinating and was to make a strong impression on his intellectual outlook. When, in 1952, he began his teaching activity at the School in Freising where he had been a student, the echo of Guardini's lectures resounded very clearly in the small town which basked in the atmosphere of all the cultural and intellectual events that took place in the nearby Bavarian capital. Moreover, the intellectual relationship between the future Pope and 'Maestro' Guardini was extraordinarily intense."

⁴⁴⁹ Heibl, "Theologische Denker," 87-91.

are the inner connection between liturgy and Christology,⁴⁵⁰ the unity of soul and body,⁴⁵¹ and the importance of philosophical understanding.⁴⁵²

4.1 On the Essence of Liturgy

As noted previously, there was an enormous difference between the magisterial teaching of Guardini's time and that of Ratzinger. The relationship between theology and liturgy has already been elaborated and from this we know that the historical and theological context is one point of importance with regard to the interpretation of the two theologians' opera. This is not the only point that must be clear before embarking on a comparative analysis; also required is a holistic vision of the way they understand liturgy and the viewpoint from which they interpret liturgical celebrations and the liturgy itself.

Before comparing Guardini and Ratzinger's understanding of liturgical reform, we need to dig more deeply into what lies at the base of their respective theologies of the liturgy, namely how they understand liturgy, its nature, and the extent to which their interpretations of the concept of liturgy are compatible with those of the Second Vatican Council. For this reason we now look briefly at their basic liturgical concepts as well as those of Vatican II, acknowledging that different historical, theological, cultural and sociological (i.e. contextual) issues influenced their thinking.

⁴⁵⁰ Heibl, "Theologische Denker," 87.

⁴⁵¹ Heibl, "Theologische Denker," 88.

⁴⁵² Heibl, "Theologische Denker," 89.

In one of his most important liturgical writings, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, Guardini provides his own definition of liturgy:

The liturgy is the Church's public and lawful act of worship, and it is performed and conducted by the officials whom the Church herself has designated for the post—her priests. In the liturgy God is to be honored by the body of the faithful, and the latter is in its turn to derive sanctification from this act of worship.⁴⁵³

Perhaps this definition might not seem very satisfying. It is a juridical rather than a theological or liturgical approach to liturgy. It concentrates on whom the liturgy belongs to, by whom it is performed, and what its fruits might be. Guardini here speaks primarily about Church, the Church's officials, and the body of the faithful. It is very difficult to discover from this definition anything about the nature of the liturgy and how it relates to individual or communal spiritual life, or what the role of God might be. Before viewing Guardini's concept of the liturgy against a broader horizon, it is necessary to first deal with this definition, because it clarifies some important points in his thinking. The important features are the subject of the liturgy; what he refers to when he speaks about Church; how the community and the individual are connected in the liturgical celebration; and how one might discern the objectivity and subjectivity of a concrete liturgical action.

Ratzinger understands liturgy in a very complex way. In seeking to summarise his liturgical thought, on the one hand I would use the term 'idealist' with its philosophical meaning. On the other, his thought must be considered theological rather than pastoral,

⁴⁵³ "Liturgie ist der öffentliche, gesetzliche Gottesdienst der Kirche und wird durch eigens von ihr dazu gewählte und bestellte Amtsträger, die Priester, geleitet. In ihr soll Gott durch die geistliche Gemeinschaftseinheit als solche verehrt und diese in und durch solche Verehrung »aufgebaut« werden." Romano Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag; Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1997), 17. English translation taken from: Romano Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. A. Lane (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1998), 19.

although these two terms are of course not opposites. Ratzinger can nevertheless be ranged among the idealists as, for example, in the way that he points to the heavenly worship in which the liturgy of the Church on earth participates, saying it is the fullness of worship which the mundane liturgy must resemble.⁴⁵⁴ The mundane liturgy is impermanent;⁴⁵⁵ only the liturgy of heaven is complete and perfect, because—as shall be seen—its subject and object are both perfect. With this, Ratzinger provides an understanding of the liturgy as possessing a transcendental and cosmic character. It is not merely something that belongs to the Church; on the contrary, it belongs in its fullness to the heavenly kingdom, even to Christ, but it involves the whole creation also, both at its natural and transcendental levels. The importance that Ratzinger accords to the heavenly liturgy and its cosmic character leads us to a constantly recurring opinion on his Platonism. Even though it is categorically denied by Ratzinger himself,⁴⁵⁶ we can certainly find in this idea traces of such idealism.

In the following I identify four points that will help explain the main commonalities and differences between the thinking of the two men. These are: the subject of the liturgy, the nature of Church, the relation of individual and community, and how the subjective and objective relate to each other. These topics also shed light on a seeming difference between their understandings of liturgical reform.

⁴⁵⁴ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 53-4. 130-1. In this idea one can easily find the allusion to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 8 in which the Council states that in our liturgy we have a foretaste of the liturgy of heaven.

⁴⁵⁵ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 43. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 50.

⁴⁵⁶ I refer here to Walter Kasper's discussion of Ratzinger's Platonism in another context, dealt with in the previous chapter.

4.1.1 The Subject of the Liturgy

In defining liturgy, one of the most important questions concerns the respective roles of God and the human being therein. More concretely, who is the subject of the liturgy? In other words, whose action is the liturgy? It seems from Guardini's definition that the one who is active in the liturgical action, and whose role is on the one hand determinant, is the Church, the body of the faithful. Liturgy belongs to this body and this body honours God in its liturgical action. In turn, this body's sanctification derives from the liturgy. On the other hand, the individual human person also has a decisive role. Yet the person is reduced to being merely one of the Church's officials. We will explore this question more closely in order to get a clearer picture of what he means when he speaks of the Church as the subject of liturgical actions, and to discover whether or not the congregation itself is included. It is clear that this definition is not the only one in Guardini's thought and it is not even complete. At this stage, however, we need to be satisfied with this definition as a starting point.

We see in Guardini's definition the idea that human beings have the decisive role in liturgical celebration: the initiative is theirs, they perform the liturgical rites, they can define its elements, and in the end, even though liturgy gives glory to God, it remains on a very earthly level, inasmuch it centers on the celebrating person or community: their life, spiritual stance and salvation. In Guardini's definition, God appears primarily as the object and the receiver of the act of worship. We must acknowledge, however, that Guardini does not elucidate the matter clearly. From his definition it seems that the subject of the liturgy is found on the human side. We nevertheless cannot state with

certainty that Guardini denies Christ is active in liturgical celebration. We must not forget that in his historical context, what was most important was the involvement of the human being in the liturgical act. Therefore he emphasizes this element, and the omission of the other does not mean at the same time its rejection.

The question of the role of the celebrating priest follows from what I have said so far. For Guardini the “act of faith in Jesus Christ requires one’s commitment to the church.”⁴⁵⁷ Even though he sometimes criticizes the hierarchy’s stance towards the life of the faithful, he never questions its necessity and usefulness.

Of course the church is not identical with a single unit within its hierarchy or with a theological school or with a conventional way of doing things. It is more than this, and in every single instance the process of renewal is open to the church’s totality and its essence. [...] Nevertheless, there is also the immediate relationship to the church in the fullness of its essence, and because of this relationship it is possible to proceed [in a conflict], as Paul says, ‘in confidence’ when insight and inner authority warrants it.⁴⁵⁸

One of the key points in Ratzinger’s theology is the way he understands the subject of the liturgy. Liturgy therefore gains a different meaning from the one it holds for Guardini, and it becomes clear that Ratzinger comes at the pastoral from a theological perspective – using primarily theological arguments. Ratzinger makes as the cornerstone of his thinking the idea that liturgy is the work of Jesus Christ and refers to “the historical, redemptive actions of Jesus”⁴⁵⁹ in the Paschal Mystery. In the liturgy this

⁴⁵⁷ Krieg, Romano Guardini, 63.

⁴⁵⁸ Guardini, *Berichte über mein Leben*, 117-8. English translation: Krieg, *Romano Guardini*, 65.

⁴⁵⁹ Joseph Ratzinger, “Theologie der Liturgie,” in *Gesammelte Schriften*. Vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie. Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2008), 639-656, 639. English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, “The Theology of the Liturgy,” in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger: Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*, ed. Alcuin Reid (Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael’s Abbey Press, 2003), 18-31, 18.

“work of Jesus is brought into contact with history in order to penetrate it.”⁴⁶⁰ Therefore Christ, the incarnate Word of God, is the true subject of the liturgy. The Church only joins Christ in this work of worship, but the Church itself is not its subject. This is the reason why Ratzinger is so serious when specifying the role of human beings in the liturgy and why he strongly criticizes those who put human beings or the community into the centre of the liturgical celebration. To do so constitutes rejection of what liturgy is in reality and Christ’s role therein. Ratzinger recognises the danger of affirming that the community is the subject of the liturgy. This affirmation, he suggests, would have serious consequences. It derives from the nature of the liturgy that its bearer is Christ, and everything contrary to this affirmation is contrary to the nature of the liturgy as well. He suggests that making the human being the bearer of the liturgical action and the subject of the liturgy reflects an almost-deliberate intention of manipulating the liturgy. He is very determined in his judgement in this matter: “The thesis according to which it is the community itself which is the subject of the liturgy, serves as an authorisation to manipulate the Liturgy according to each individual’s understanding of it.”⁴⁶¹ These words absolutely do not allow the integrity of the liturgy to be disturbed or confused by those who celebrate it.

The role of the human in the liturgy cannot be directed or defined. The human as an individual and as a member of the liturgical congregation and the Church community joins Christ in the action of honouring God, while the bearer of the liturgical action is

⁴⁶⁰ Ratzinger, “Theologie der Liturgie,” 640. English translation: Ratzinger, “The Theology of the Liturgy,” 19.

⁴⁶¹ Ratzinger, “Theologie der Liturgie,” 643. English translation: Ratzinger, “The Theology of the Liturgy,” 21.

Christ himself. He alone can offer the perfect sacrifice of prayer to God in his obedience and divine and human nature. He gave himself as an expiratory offering to God, not for some egoistic reason, but for the salvation of humankind. Humans are not able to offer such perfect homage to God. Acknowledging our inability to do this and discovering in Christ's offering not only its perfection, but its fruitfulness also, can enlighten us to the fact that even our most perfect prayer or ritual action cannot be compared to that of Jesus Christ. Humans therefore need Christ in their liturgical activity.

With regard to the subject of the liturgy, we can see that both Guardini and Ratzinger understand Christ as the central actor in the liturgy. He is the focal point around which the whole liturgical community gathers, and the one who gives reason to the whole cultic action, incorporating it into his redemptive action, the Paschal Mystery. Even though Guardini speaks about the object of the liturgy in relation to Christ, this does not refer to Christ's person, in my opinion, but rather to his life, mission, actions and mundane existence. These do not cover Christ's entire existence, because his divine power and nature are of great importance to the liturgy in making possible the perfect offering and homage to God. The community and the celebrating individual have an important role in the liturgy: they make it possible through their bodily existence and spiritual joining. Their role is necessary also, for only they can define in some way the modality of this role. Guardini does not deny Christ's decisive role in the liturgy; rather he sees it from an anthropological viewpoint, as he seeks to define the role of the human being and community in the liturgical action and identify the fruits of their participation. Ratzinger, however, puts the emphasis completely on Christ as the only bearer of the liturgical action. For him the role of the human being is to fulfill what derives from the

nature of the liturgy, as Saint Paul in another context suggests: “I am filling up what is lacking in the afflictions of Christ on behalf of his body, which is the church” (Col 1:24).⁴⁶² To usurp the liturgy is an abuse— humans cannot take the place of Christ in the liturgy because they are under the power of sin and of the egoism that wants to take possession of them. The only perfect and cosmic sacrifice is that of Christ, and this cannot be substituted for by any other offerings. Christ’s sacrifice is of divine and not human origin. Being the subject of the liturgy means at the same time being in possession of everything that liturgy is and belongs to. Therefore the question of the subject of the liturgy has practical consequences for the reform of the liturgy. It indicates whether or not the human being is capable of instituting a liturgical reform and to what extent he or she can make decisions with regard to concrete liturgical praxis. To this question we will return in the second part of this present chapter.

4.1.2 The Church

When Guardini speaks about Church or the body of the faithful and says that liturgy belongs to them, we need to clarify what Church is. If liturgy belongs to the Church it belongs to Christ also inasmuch as he too belongs to the Church. The question as to whether or not Christ himself is included in the concept of Church is justified here. We must not forget that even though the interpretation of the Church as the mystical body of Christ appears already in St Paul, Guardini’s definition comes before the publication in

⁴⁶² This Biblical verse explains how Ratzinger views liturgy, even though the context is different.

1943 of Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, which deepened the Pauline understanding of the Church.

Guardini explains his thinking in *Vom Sinn der Kirche – Die Kirche des Herrn*, which contains several lectures on the Church. In this work he points out that it is through the faithful that the Church becomes visible and concrete. It is a living being that is divine and human at the same time and the correct relation to Church must be life itself, since it is life and gives life.⁴⁶³ So Church is not seen merely as an institution, but as a living reality. This implies a transcendent dimension that surpasses the limits of a mere institution. In addition to this, Guardini affirms: “The Church is awakening in souls.”⁴⁶⁴ Guardini expresses here the view that the faithful have crossed an important threshold, namely they have moved from the individual and the subjective to the community, and have recognized the objective character of the reality that surpasses them, their personal experiences and their knowledge. Therefore they discover themselves as nation and community, and even Church. This brings within itself the consciousness of life itself, now “not primarily a matter of doing, but a matter of being and sharing in a reality greater than one's self.”⁴⁶⁵ Church is therefore not merely an institution, but belongs to the inner reality of the Christian person, whose Christian identity is defined by the presence of the life-giving communion with the transcendent. This communion is realized in the Church and in human hearts at the same time.

⁴⁶³ Guardini, *Vom Sinn der Kirche – Die Kirche des Herrn*, *Romano Guardini Werke* (Mainz/Paderborn 1990), 133, 194.

⁴⁶⁴ Guardini, Romano, *Vom Sinn der Kirche – Die Kirche des Herrn*, *Romano Guardini Werke*, 19. With this sentence Guardini paraphrases Franz Marc's statement “mystical reality has awakened in human hearts.” Krieg, *Romano Guardini*, 55.

⁴⁶⁵ Krieg, *Romano Guardini*, 55.

Therefore Christ is not someone who externally observes human life. He is bound to it individually and communally, is part of it, and moreover is the determinant part of it.

Robert A. Krieg lists three important aspects of the Church in Guardini's thought that constitute an adequate summary: firstly, the Church has a sociological-juridical dimension which means it is an institution. It has a visible and mundane level through which the transcendental becomes part of earthly life. Secondly, it is the unity of contemplative, reflective and prayerful activity. Liturgy is therefore the Church's constitutive element. In the liturgy the encounter with God becomes concrete and real, the fulfilment of which is one of the goals of the Church's existence. And thirdly, the Church is the guardian of the divine truth that transmits infallibly the truths necessary to the salvation of the person and the world.⁴⁶⁶ According to Krieg's analysis, there is a clear process in the way Guardini speaks about the Church: he starts from a sociological entity and arrives at an immanent institution that is the visible form of a transcendent being.

In another place Guardini affirms that "the content of the Church is Christ."⁴⁶⁷ This means that his life, mission, and person are living and present in the liturgical celebrations; therefore liturgy does not deal with the past, but with the present, with a now. This does not mean that the Church possesses Christ. Guardini is aware that Christ surpasses all the visible realities of the institution. But he tries to safeguard the

⁴⁶⁶ Krieg, Romano Guardini, 51.

⁴⁶⁷ Guardini, *Die Kirche des Herrn*, 91.

Christocentrism of the Church and the liturgy.⁴⁶⁸ Without Christ there is no Church and therefore no liturgy. We must acknowledge that Guardini speaks more about the anthropological character of the Church. In my opinion this is not a rejection of its Christocentric character, rather it is the fruit of Guardini's historic context, in which the attention turned to the human being, and where, in the field of liturgy, the participation of the faithful was needed. Guardini therefore emphasises what is needed most: the conscious and fruitful participation in the liturgical action and the discovery of the way through which the nature of the liturgy, its symbols and words, can be received and interpreted in order to realize human sanctification. For this reason, Guardini can affirm that the Church is "the mysterious reality which is immersed in history and nevertheless is the guarantee of eternity."⁴⁶⁹ It is, namely, transcendent and immanent at the same time, bearing in itself the promise of eternity.

As with the liturgy, Church also is viewed by Ratzinger from its transcendental dimension. It is not merely an institution, but the living body of Jesus Christ of which he is himself the head. Christ is not separated from the Church, but he is within it. Church does not belong merely to the mundane world, but to the kingdom of God. Angels and saints and primarily the Holy Spirit are active members of this Church, just as humans are. Church is not merely a society of believers; by its nature it is a liturgical community. It is truly Church when it celebrates Eucharist and makes present the

⁴⁶⁸ Schilson, Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter, 23. "Für Guardini formt demnach keine andere Gemeinschaft dieser Welt den einzelnen so stark wie die in der Liturgie erfahrbare und vorgegebene Gemeinschaft der Kirche."

⁴⁶⁹ Guardini, Berichte über mein Leben, 88.

Paschal Mystery and the person of Jesus Christ.⁴⁷⁰ Therefore Church and liturgy are strongly connected in such a way that Church makes the Eucharist and the Eucharist makes the Church.

Another important point is the question of the relation between local churches and the universal Church. Even though the limits of this work preclude the presentation of this question in its completeness, we know that Ratzinger definitely gives precedence to the universal Church over local churches.⁴⁷¹ This is what is reflected in his theology of the liturgy when what is general and universal precedes what is local or particular. In Ratzinger's ecclesiology we can trace some common points with Guardini that follow from the priority of the universal Church.

Ratzinger has consistently opposed all projects giving priority to orthopraxy, and in so doing follows the lead of Romano Guardini, who as early as the 1920s spoke of the primacy of *logos* over *ethos*. [...] He also observes that, paradoxically, those who wanted to reduce Christianity to mere orthopraxy also had a tendency to affirm that there is no such thing as specifically Christian morality, and this that Christianity, ought to take its norms of conduct from the anthropological insights of the day.⁴⁷²

Again with regard to the Church we can affirm that Ratzinger's vision contains a strong transcendental and cosmic character.

“Both Guardini and Ratzinger presuppose the reality of the Church as spiritual mediator of God's self-revelation. There is no true faith in God's self-revelation in Jesus

⁴⁷⁰ Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 250. Mannion-Boeve, *The Ratzinger Reader*, 228. Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, 53: “The Church is *communio*; she is God's communing with men in Christ and hence the communing of men with one another—and, in consequence, sacrament, sign, instrument of salvation. The Church is the celebration of the Eucharist; the Eucharist is the Church: they do not simply stand side by side; they are one and the same. The Eucharist is the *sacramentum Christi* and, because the Church is *Eucharistia*, she is therefore also *sacramentum*—the sacrament to which all other sacraments are ordered.”

⁴⁷¹ Mannion-Boeve, *The Ratzinger Reader*, 100-1. Rowland, *Ratzinger's Faith*, 95.

⁴⁷² Rowland, *Ratzinger's Faith*, 102.

Christ unless it is bound up with the community of the Church. The Church is therefore an indispensable condition of faith.”⁴⁷³ For Ratzinger, the most important task of theology is to reflect on the faith of the Church. Even criticism of the Church can be made, and reforms serve the restoration of the form of the Church, and are not the experiments and creation of single individuals. In this regard he refers to the Liturgical Movement as a justified form of critique, because it derived from love toward the Church and the desire to bring people closer to the Church.⁴⁷⁴

In the Liturgical Movement and theological renewal of the first half of this century a real reform grew up that effected positive change. This was possible only because there were people with a gift of critical discernment, who kept their eyes open, and who loved the Church and were ready to suffer for it. If today nothing succeeds any more, it is for the reason that all too often we just want to confirm our own views. To remain in a Church that we first have to render worthy of remaining in, is not worth the effort; it is a self-contradiction. To remain in the Church because the Church deserves to remain; because it is worthy of being loved and ever transformed through love beyond itself into what it really is—this is the path that the responsibility of faith points out even today.⁴⁷⁵

⁴⁷³ Heibl, “Theologische Denker,” 91-92, my translation. “Sowohl Guardini als auch Ratzinger setzen die Kirche in ihrer Wirklichkeit als geschichtliche Vermittlerin der Selbstoffenbarung Gottes voraus. Es gibt keinen wahren Glauben an Gottes Selbstoffenbarung in Jesus Christus, wenn er nicht mit der Gemeinschaft der Kirche verbunden ist. Kirche ist deshalb unabdingbare Voraussetzung des Glaubens.”

⁴⁷⁴ Heibl, “Theologische Denker,” 93.

⁴⁷⁵ Joseph Ratzinger, “Warum noch ich in der Kirche bin,” in *Grundsatz-Reden aus fünf Jahrzehnten* (ed. Florian Schuller. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 2005), 118-119, my translation. “In der liturgischen Bewegung und theologischen Erneuerung der ersten Hälfte dieses Jahrhunderts ist wirkliche Reform gewachsen, die positive Veränderung bewirkte; das war nur möglich, weil es Menschen gab, die die Kirche wach, mit der Gabe der Unterscheidung, ‚kritisch‘ liebten und um sie zu leiden bereit waren. Wenn heute nichts mehr gelingen will, so dich wohl deshalb, weil wir alle allzu sehr nur uns selbst bestätigen möchten. In einer Kirche zu bleiben, die wir eigentlich erst machen müssen, damit sie bleibenswert werde, lohnt sich nicht; es ist ein Widerspruch in sich selbst. In der Kirche bleiben, weil sie es wert ist, daß sie bleibt; weil sie es wert ist, daß sie geliebt und durch Liebe allzeit neu über sich hinaus zu sich selbst verwandelt wird—das ist der Weg, auf den die Verantwortung des Glaubens auch heute weist.”

4.1.3 The Individual-Community Relation

Having identified what Church is, a further set of questions arise, namely, the need to ask about the connection between individuals and community in liturgical celebrations; the role of the Church's members and officials; and whether they function as individuals or as members of the body of the faithful. The answers to these questions probably seem evident, but as noted in Chapter 2, the spiritual effects of the liturgy are explained by Guardini mostly in relation to the individual. Therefore the observation is justified that the role of the celebrating community and the fruits of the liturgy for the congregation are not at first sight present.

Krieg's study helps us to understand that in *Vom Sinn der Kirche*, Church consists of two interdependent elements: the community and the individual believers. The community's main goal is some kind of solidarity that becomes alive in faith; therefore it is solidarity in Christ. This is not exclusively a sociological principle of community, but a spiritual one as well, because solidarity must be lived out in the Church community in connection also to sanctification and salvation. Church is *communio*, in which the faithful in Christ grow in the knowledge of God and sanctity of life. In the liturgy they appear as the children of God and members of the same family, and liturgy becomes the foretaste of the perfect glorification of God in heaven, when the sole existence of the human being, that is, when he or she is the image and likeness of God, becomes the perfect glorification of God. This existence is perfect because it is redeemed by Christ and because it exists in Christ. It is the perfect form of the individual who lives out to the full the plan of God with regard to his or her person. Through this personal maturation

into a full person, he or she reaches the main goal: personal union with Christ. This union is a goal and a means at the same time. It is a goal because salvation means the perfect and never ending life with the triune God. It is a means because in the liturgy we anticipate this union already in material form; even though this union is imperfect, because by committing sin we can again be separated from the Creator. We can see that community and individual cannot be without each other. They are interconnected both in Christian life and in the liturgy.

“The faithful are actively united by a vital and fundamental principle common to them all. That principle is Christ Himself; His life is ours; we are incorporated in him; we are His Body, *Corpus Christi mysticum*.”⁴⁷⁶ Here the common responsibility of the faithful is expressed, not only for the liturgy, but for the common faith as well. “Real community is service done to others,” Guardini says in another place.⁴⁷⁷

“The union of the members is not directly accomplished from man to man. It is accomplished by and in their joint aim, goal, and spiritual resting place—God—by their incidental creed, sacrifice and sacraments.”⁴⁷⁸

We can see that in his ecclesiology Guardini emphasizes both the individual person and the community. It can easily be affirmed that in his thought the Church gives room for personal development and salvation. Even the role of the community, to live a life of solidarity among the Church’s members and the sacramental communion, serves the individual in the end, it seems. Naturally, we must acknowledge that Guardini does not

⁴⁷⁶ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 33. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 37. Schilson, *Vom Geist der Liturgie. Versuch einer Relecture*, 83-4.

⁴⁷⁷ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 95.

⁴⁷⁸ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 37. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 41.

simplify the question of the Church. With regard to our theme, however, we can see that the historical context in which he elaborates his ecclesiology, namely the search of the individual for community after World War I, could have resulted in a certain move to emphasize the individual who needs the community's help to grow into a full person according to the plan of God. We can say that Guardini sees the Church from the point of view of its human component and tries to define it in its connectedness to human beings.⁴⁷⁹ We can affirm this even when Guardini naturally makes clear, as we have seen, that “the church is not an institution devised and built by men, but a living reality.”⁴⁸⁰ Community and individual are both present in his theology and both of them form a constitutive part of the whole.⁴⁸¹ Nevertheless, his viewpoint can be variable according to the theme he wants to expose.

Guardini's ecclesiology naturally influences his liturgical thought. The fact that in the Church individuals have a decisive role in relation to the Church's purpose and role means that liturgy, as the Church's public action, accords priority to the individual. We can understand this, seeing how important it is to him that the human being is enabled to perform the liturgical act, and that liturgical celebration in a certain sense can serve the human transformation that seems to be as important for Guardini as the main purpose of the liturgical action, i.e. the glorification of God. Human transformation consists in becoming more the person one was intended to be by the Creator. Because of the

⁴⁷⁹ “Es wäre viel darüber zu sagen, daß die Kirche ein Ganzes ist, groß, umfassend, aller Spannungen voll und wunderbar einungskräftig zugleich. Sie verwirklicht sich in der kleinsten Gemeinde, und strebt doch wieder über die ganze Welt. So wird man immer wieder von ihr sprechen müssen, denn im Nachdenken jeder Zeit kommt sie sich zu Bewußtsein, empfängt Bejahung und Widerspruch und daraus immer neue Kraft der Entfaltung ihrer selbst.” Guardini, *Die Kirche des Herrn. Meditationen über Wesen und Auftrag der Kirche* in: Guardini, *Vom Sinn der Kirche – Die Kirche des Herrn*, 194.

⁴⁸⁰ Guardini, *Die Kirche des Herrn*, 194. English translation: Guardini, *The Church of the Lord*, 102.

⁴⁸¹ Schilson, *Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter*, 18-9.

importance given to the human being, we can call Guardini's liturgical thought an anthropological theology of the liturgy.

The Church is built up by the community and the individual believers. It realizes human solidarity on a natural and supernatural level and at the same time it effects the salvation of the individual who wants to reach their personal union with Jesus Christ.⁴⁸² This means that speaking of Church one speaks about the tension that exists between such realities that are inseparable from each other, although one or the other can be emphasised or focused on. The Church offers the way to human individuation. In the Church one can grow into a whole self, or into the person that has been created. This human development, offered by the Church, leads to conformation to Jesus Christ and unity with him. "As we participate in the church, we receive the guidance and strength to become fully individuated in relation to God."⁴⁸³

Liturgy is a communal activity and, as expressed in *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, gives form to the worship of the entire Church. Everyone who participates in the liturgy is united with the others present and with Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁸⁴ This union manifests in the common purpose, means and physical presence.

The primary and exclusive aim of the liturgy is not the expression of the individual's reverence and worship for God. It is not even concerned with the awakening, formation, and sanctification of the individual soul as such. Nor does

⁴⁸² In his *Vom Geist der Liturgie* Guardini speaks about the social fruits of the Eucharist. The idea is explained in a footnote, but it is worth citing here: "The full active and moral power of the Blessed Sacrament is only free to operate unchecked when its connection with the problems and tasks of public and family life, and with those of Christian charity and of vocational occupations, is fully comprehended." Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 16, fn 1. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 19. Footnote 1.

⁴⁸³ Krieg, Romano Guardini, 56.

⁴⁸⁴ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 32-3. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 36-7. Schilson, *Vom Geist der Liturgie. Eine Relecture*, 83-4. Schilson, Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter, 22.

the onus of liturgical action and prayer rest with the individual. It does not even rest with the collective groups, composed of numerous individuals, who periodically achieve a limited and intermittent unity in their capacity as the congregation of the church. The liturgical entity consists rather of the united body of the faithful as such—the Church—a body which infinitely outnumbers the mere congregation.⁴⁸⁵

Liturgical action is not accomplished by the individual, but rather by the community, the *We*. Therefore it is a precondition of every liturgy that the individual extends his or her consciousness into a community-*I*.⁴⁸⁶

The question of the relationship between community and individual in Ratzinger's thinking is as justifiable as it is in Guardini's. In a similar way we discover the importance of the community in liturgical action, even though the fruits of liturgy apply rather to the individual. It goes without question that liturgy refers to and influences personal and individual existence. One can recognise easily that speaking about the nature of the liturgy, Ratzinger refers mostly to the individual Christian and explains the role of the individual in and for the liturgy. It seems that the role of the celebrating community or the consequences of liturgy for the community are elaborated less.

It is difficult to differentiate between Guardini and Ratzinger's ideas in relation to the respective roles of individual and community in their theologies of the liturgy. It is

⁴⁸⁵ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 17. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 19.

⁴⁸⁶ "Daß das Ichbewußtsein sich ausweitet in das Gemeinschafts-Ich, bis das große Wir als Subjekt des Betens und Opfern im Sinne steht." Schilson, Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter, 22. Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 76.

"Die Kirche: unendliche Lebensgemeinschaft des *Corpus mysticum* und das allumspannende Ordnungsgefüge der Hierarchie, freilich gefestigt durch das Formgerüst des kanonischen Rechts; das Ganze aber nicht als starres, unbewegliches System, sondern lebendig hingestellt in die geschichtliche Stunde, sie formend und von ihr empfangend—das ist das Ich der Liturgie. Und der Einzelne betet liturgisch, wenn er es aus einem wachen und inhaltserfüllten Bewußtsein von diesem kirchlichen Gesamt-Ich tut.

Aber: diese Kirche ist lebendig gegeben in Bistum und Gemeinde. Sie ist keine unverbindliche Weltkonstruktion, sondern lebendiger Leib, der für uns gegeben ist dort, wo wir stehen, in der Gemeinde mit ihren besonderen Verhältnissen, Aufgaben, Nöten, ihrem Schönen und Armseligen." Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 75-6.

clear that for both of them liturgy is a communal activity. However, when they speak about the fruits of the liturgy, they move to the level of the individual. It is difficult to find the communal consequences of the liturgy; one sees more the individual results, of which the most important is the sanctification of the human person, the union with Christ that can be reached through the Christian life that in its fullness becomes liturgy, and the transformation of the human person inasmuch as in the single Christian the image of Christ develops and his life becomes theirs.

This is perhaps the most surprising area in both Guardini and Ratzinger's theologies. Both emphasize the importance of the celebrating community in the liturgical action, and they even describe liturgy as a communal activity, notwithstanding they remain mostly on an individual level. When they speak about community, they see in it individuals connected through the common Father of whom they are all children. They see the common faith that connects the individuals not only as an outer connection, but as an internal link. The individual, however, does not dissolve in the community. He or she maintains his or her characteristics and authority, thus remaining a free person intended to take part in the common responsibility of the human family, and sacrificing to a certain degree what otherwise could belong to it: limitless freedom and absolutized self-authority. This ability to think and act as a community is basic for a proper celebration of the liturgy. On this point the two theologians agree completely.

Both Guardini and Ratzinger express the view that liturgy does not say *I*, but *We*, because it surpasses the limits of local church. The individual encounters God not merely as an independent existence, but as a member of a unity.⁴⁸⁷

4.1.4 Objectivity and Subjectivity in the Liturgy

Guardini defines the objective nature of the liturgy as being assured by five laws: 1) while prayer must be sustained by thought, 2) the heart and emotions also have an important role in the prayer; 3) it springs from the fullness of truth, 4) requires active participation, and 5) and is rooted in the natural world and culture.⁴⁸⁸ It is interesting that with regard to objectivity, Guardini speaks about the heart and emotions. Usually, one would categorize these under subjective components of the liturgy. They belong, however, to the liturgy itself, because liturgy is never abstract. It needs the human person who deciphers it and through whom liturgy can be as objective as it is required to be.

Jesus Christ's person, life, word and work comprise the content of the liturgy.⁴⁸⁹ Heart and emotion and even active participation are rooted primarily in an individual understanding of the liturgical celebration, since subjective experiences cannot be applied communally. In order to give liturgy its proper meaning and to give the human being what the liturgy can offer him or her, liturgy must be also a personal, individual

⁴⁸⁷ Duffy, "Benedict XVI and the Spirit of the Liturgy," 37.

⁴⁸⁸ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 18-31. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 21-35.

⁴⁸⁹ Romano Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald Verlag, Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1993), 114.

and subjective experience.⁴⁹⁰ Even though not all five laws refer to this, we can trace the great importance of subjectivism in Guardini's thought.

An element that sheds light on the subjective nature of the liturgy is the importance that Guardini accords to the popular devotions that are strongly marked by their personal and subjective character.⁴⁹¹ Their role is twofold: on the one hand they prepare the person for the participation in liturgical action, and on the other they help liturgy be fruitful in the life of the individual. They give warmth and colour to liturgical life. Popular devotions are helpful because they impact heart and emotions rather than mind and thoughts, and therefore they introduce the person to the nature of liturgical actions inasmuch as liturgical elements (symbols, gestures, words, liturgical laws) appear in them. Catching the human heart they gradually encourage it to open itself up to both the vertical and horizontal dimension of worship. They also help liturgy to become fruitful, because what the individual experienced in the liturgical actions, popular devotions help to personalize, internalize and deepen, making of it a personal religious-liturgical experience with consequences and fruits for the individual's life. And finally, they lead to the ultimate goal of any liturgical action: the glorification of God and union with him. For this reason, subjective experiences are not unnecessary for the Christian; rather they complete the personal involvement in liturgical actions.

⁴⁹⁰ Schilson, Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter, 20-1. "Nur jener Mensch, der nicht nur im Selbstausdruck lebt, sich selbst darstellt, sein Subjektiv-Sein lebt, sondern der sich bilden läßt, sich ein Objekt gegenüberstellen läßt, das er sich als seine Form einbilden läßt, nur dieser Mensch gelangt in seine Wahrheit—genauer gesagt: er gibt der vorgegebenen, objektiven Wahrheit die Ehre und wird so »er selbst«. Genau dies aber ist die Absicht der Liturgie: In ihr kommt der Mensch zu sich selbst, wenn er sich in ihre objektive Vorgabe einläßt."

⁴⁹¹ Schilson, Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter, 9.

“There could be no greater mistake than that of discarding the valuable elements in the spiritual life of the people for the sake of the liturgy, or than the desire of assimilating them to it.”⁴⁹²

Guardini points out: “Liturgy is not about external accomplishments, but about internal forms of life in the most powerful sense of the word; about preconditions and modes of religious experience.”⁴⁹³

Guardini identifies *das Objektive* as *das Soziale* and *das Subjektive* as *das Individuelle*. Reflecting on Festugière’s book, Guardini points out that one cannot deal with the question of the effects of the liturgy with regard to the subjective and the objective as either-or questions, because both must have a general importance.⁴⁹⁴ “The individual must become independent of whether he has a feeling of community or not. It is not about felt-experience, but discipline, a conscious attitude that must be learnt.”⁴⁹⁵

With regard to what is objective or subjective in the liturgy, Ratzinger takes a different stance from that of Guardini. Everything that belongs to the nature of the liturgy must be objective and therefore independent from individual taste and thinking. Why liturgy is so autonomous in front of human influence and what belongs to its nature, Ratzinger explains as follows in *Der Geist der Liturgie*. The most appropriate expression for liturgy is *logiké latreia*, which is translated by Ratzinger as *logosgemäßer*

⁴⁹² Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 76. English translation: Krieg, *Romano Guardini*, 81.

⁴⁹³ Guardini, “Das Objektive im Gebetsleben,” 118, my translation. “In der Liturgie handle es sich nicht um äußerlich zu erledigende Verrichtungen, sondern um innere Lebensformen im stärksten Sinne des Wortes; um Voraussetzungen und Weisen religiöser Erfahrung.”

⁴⁹⁴ Guardini, *Das Objektive im Gebetsleben*, 123. Schilson, *Romano Guardini – Wegbereiter*, 18.

⁴⁹⁵ My translation: “Die Einzelne muß sich ganz davon unabhängig machen, ob er »Gemeinschaft fühlt« oder nicht. Hier handelt es sich nicht um Erlebnis, sondern um Zucht, um bewußte Haltung, die gelernt werden muß.” Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 76.

Gottesdienst.⁴⁹⁶ In this term, not only the reference to Christ, the Logos, is expressed, but personal human transformation as well. Ratzinger explains the original meaning of the term *logiké latreia* as: “The sacrifice is the ‘word,’ the word of prayer, which goes up from man to God, embodying the whole of man’s existence and enabling him to become ‘word’ (*logos*) in himself. It is man, conforming himself to *logos* and becoming *logos* through faith, who is the true sacrifice, the true glory of God in the world.”⁴⁹⁷ Liturgy is *logiké latreia* because it gives reason and purpose to human existence; it makes logical human existence.⁴⁹⁸ This making logical means the total transformation of the human person in complete conformity to Christ. Ratzinger adds another important factor. He explains that in contrast to a Hellenistic interpretation of the term *logiké latreia*, Christian use expresses the spiritual union with the divine, not only spiritually, but also in bodily form. The basis for this union is the incarnation of the Logos that makes possible the participation of soul and body in Christ’s sacrifice. Even though the exemplary form of the liturgy is the liturgy of heaven, it is fully human also because it embraces both spiritual and material existence. This process of conformation to and union with Christ must be objective and directed by Christ himself, because this process is of divine origin and is realized through divine power and action. This is a completely objective force based on the objectivity of God.

Liturgy is connected in a very special way to the sacrifice of Christ as the perfect form of adoration and therefore of liturgy. This means that maintaining the sacrificial

⁴⁹⁶ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 43. Sometimes it is translated in German also with *vernünftiger Gottesdienst*.

⁴⁹⁷ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 39. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 46.

⁴⁹⁸ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 51. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 58.

character of the liturgy and especially of the Eucharist is crucial for Ratzinger's theology. In the liturgy the celebrating subjects allow themselves to be taken up into the sacrifice of Christ, which in this way becomes their sacrifice as well. Ratzinger states: "We ask that the Logos, Christ, who *is* the true sacrifice, may himself draw us into his act of sacrifice, may 'logify' us, make us 'more consistent with the word,' 'more truly rational,' so that his sacrifice may become ours and may be accepted by God as ours, may be able to be accounted as ours."⁴⁹⁹ The same idea appears here as the transformation of human existence and the participation in the sacrifice of Christ. Liturgy is the way through which participation in the sacrifice offered by Christ becomes possible. Ratzinger offers his own interpretation of sacrifice:

Of what then does sacrifice consist? Not in destruction, not in this or that thing, but in the transformation of man; in the fact that he becomes himself conformed to God. He becomes conformed to God when he becomes love. "That is why true sacrifice is every work which allows us to unite ourselves to God in a holy fellowship" as Augustine puts it.⁵⁰⁰

Sacrifice therefore becomes self-denial and renunciation of everything that hinders community from becoming conformed to Christ, and that hinders God acting in people's favour. The concept of sacrifice is also very important, because reducing its importance, first of all in connection to the Eucharist, can lead to the separation of the dogmatic content from the liturgical form.⁵⁰¹ This is the area that Ratzinger considers an inappropriate development of modern liturgical theology, namely that these two have become separated. As noted in the first chapter, Ratzinger gives a very special role to

⁴⁹⁹ Joseph Ratzinger, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens: Kirche als Communio* (Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich Verlag, 2002), 101. English translation: Joseph Ratzinger, *Pilgrim Fellowship of Faith* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005), 116.

⁵⁰⁰ Ratzinger, "Theologie der Liturgie," 649. English translation: "The Theology of the Liturgy," 25.

⁵⁰¹ Joseph Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1981), 31-54; *The Feast of Faith*, trans. G. Harrison (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 1986), 33-60.

theology and with it to the dogmatic content of liturgical celebrations, when he tends to affirm that liturgy is the external form or expression of dogmatic content, even though he sometimes refers to this idea as the theology of the past.⁵⁰² Speaking about a liturgical reform that does not imply the dogmatic content, and only the structure or form, would be a mistake, however; a mistake that seemed to be possible for some scholars before and after the Council.⁵⁰³ The separation does not make sense, however, when one considers the structure not only as an external form, but as a manifestation of its content, Ratzinger affirms.⁵⁰⁴ Liturgy needs dogma because dogma gives objective form to liturgy and, as Guardini put it, keeps liturgy under strict control. This is necessary so that liturgy does not become overly emotional and subjective.

In the liturgy the whole creation gives homage to God, not only with its voice, but through its very existence. Being part of God's creation and acknowledging this dignity is already liturgy, because it is the acknowledgement of what God has done: creation, redemption and salvation. Liturgy even impacts upon the essence of human existence in which it is directed to an ontological change: the transformation of the creation and especially of humans, making them conform to the divine Logos, Jesus Christ. This explanation of the cosmic character of the liturgy constitutes the basis for further consequences in Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy, such as the spiritual and bodily direction of the prayer that must be always centred in Christ and therefore must be expressed externally when the whole congregation turns toward the same focal point, namely to Christ.

⁵⁰² Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 31-2. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 34.

⁵⁰³ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 33. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 36.

⁵⁰⁴ Ratzinger, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 33. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 35-6.

4.1.5 A Concluding Word on the Liturgy

Guardini's understanding of the liturgy was new in his time. He interpreted liturgy as an activity that is not functional, because it does not seek to accomplish something, but rather seeks to express significance and meaning. It is an end in itself. That is why liturgy is like art and play, since both are undertaken for their own sake. A playing child does not want to achieve anything. All the child wants is to "pour forth its life in an aimless series of movements, words and actions, and by this to develop and realize itself more fully."⁵⁰⁵ This is the stance of the participants at the liturgical celebration.

It is not surprising that Joseph Ratzinger also turns to this image, even though he corrects it slightly. The intellectual influence is not only unquestionable, however, but is also acknowledged.⁵⁰⁶

In the second chapter we saw that for Guardini it was a serious matter whether or not humans of contemporary culture and society are capable of performing the liturgical act. That he raised the question suggests that Guardini did not think they were capable. However he responded with a yes to his own question in a private meeting, as quoted by auxiliary bishop Tewes.⁵⁰⁷ This indicates that Guardini's question is not necessarily an expression of his dissatisfaction with anthropological developments, but is a pedagogical position that indicates the importance of the human ability necessary for the liturgy.

⁵⁰⁵ "Seine jungen Kräfte auswirken, sein Leben in der zweckfreien Form der Bewegungen, Worte, Handlungen ausströmen und dadurch wachsen, immer voller er selbst werden." Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 63. English translation: Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 68.

⁵⁰⁶ Ratzinger, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 11-3. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 13-5.

⁵⁰⁷ Theodor Maas-Ewerd, "Anwalt des liturgischen Anliegens: Guardini und die Liturgische Bewegung." in *Christliche Weltanschauung: Wiederbegegnung mit Romano Guardini*, ed. Walter Seidel (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985), 163-83, especially 179.

Ratzinger does not deal with the human component as much; instead he turns to more theoretical questions, such as the connection between liturgy and faith, and the concretization of the faith through the liturgical act.

In the second part of this chapter I identify and analyze concrete criteria for the reform of the liturgy. I base this identification on the research presented thus far, from the historical and theological context of the theology of the liturgy explained in previous chapters, to the understanding of the concept of the liturgy as elaborated in the first part of this present chapter.

4.2 Criteria for the Reform of the Liturgy

We have seen that both Guardini and Ratzinger consider formation as the key to liturgy and liturgical reform, and we have explored the notion that in times of liturgical crisis formation is needed in order to encourage the faithful to grow in liturgical awareness and to change their false preconceptions concerning liturgy. The term *formation* is ambiguous because one might easily think that growing in theoretical knowledge will lead to the understanding of the liturgy and therefore to a deep and conscious participation. That is to say, the person must primarily be conformed to the liturgy and not the liturgy to the person. It is only as a second step that the liturgical celebration is changed when the person proves incapable of perceiving it anymore. In my opinion this is a basic point in the understanding of both liturgical formation and liturgical reform. Therefore we need to understand correctly the importance and the meaning of formation. It is not accidental that the expression *teaching* is not used by

either theologian. Formation is much more than teaching. Formation involves the whole person: the intelligence, emotions, heart, personality and faith. It is not merely learning new things and discovering new ways of thinking. It is, rather, a new way of seeing and perceiving things. This new way of seeing affects everything that belongs to the human being. It contains the development of a new human being, because a new vision leads to new reactions to realities and new reactions are followed by a development or even change in human qualities, which is again followed by seeing other things differently. In such a way, formation is a continuous action that affects all elements of human life.

With regard to formation, one of Guardini's main concerns is how people can be enabled again to perceive symbols.⁵⁰⁸ Reality appears at a symbolical level in the liturgy. To perceive symbols is not merely an intellectual effort however; it is a complex process that involves reality on both natural and transcendental levels. As seen in Chapter 2, Guardini's philosophical and anthropological approach considers liturgy from the viewpoint of the liturgical congregation, and even from the viewpoint of a single member of the same congregation. By now we understand that even for Guardini, who is sometimes interpreted as a theological thinker who gives free reign to liturgical subjectivism, liturgy is absolutely objective to the extent that the human being needs to be conformed to it. People must change their vision of natural and transcendental things lest they not find the answers to questions about their own existence. This type of vision or way of seeing things is worded by Guardini with the verb *schaufen*, which means to

⁵⁰⁸ Krieg, Romano Guardini, 88.

decode what is beyond the visible.⁵⁰⁹ Liturgy is therefore not a constantly changing religious act, but the framework that helps human development and maturation and makes possible both the expression of cultic behaviour and salvation/eternal life. In this way liturgy becomes a necessary tool for becoming human and for finding salvation and eternal life.

Ratzinger's viewpoint is different, however. In his opinion liturgy is given by God and therefore there is no real option for the Church to look at the liturgy in a different way from how it needs to be accepted: namely, as it is. Naturally, this does not exclude the fact that liturgy changes, but this is almost the last option once humans are no longer capable of being conformed to the given liturgy. It is a further question what the given liturgy is like and how the human person can discover what belongs exactly to this given nature. To these questions Ratzinger does not offer thorough answer. I think that this given nature of the liturgy in Ratzinger's thinking is strictly connected to his idea of the liturgy as the expression of the dogmatic content of Christian faith. Dogmas cannot change; they are given in divine revelation. The Church in its historical development grows in the understanding of revelation until it arrives at the point where it can define concrete dogma. After this definition, the dogma remains stable and further development is not possible. From Ratzinger's idea however, follows this: if dogmatic content is unchangeable, because of their interconnectedness, its liturgical expression needs to be unchangeable also. Liturgy is not merely some outer decoration, but is so strictly connected to the dogma's inner truth and therefore to the divine existence, that dogma's

⁵⁰⁹ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 12. Stosur, "Liturgy and (Post) Modernity," 25. I explained *schauen* in section 2.2.1.

main attributes become liturgy's most important qualities as well. This is the reason why liturgy changes only with difficulty and why liturgical reform must be held in the strictest control by dogma and its guardian, the Magisterium.

After seeing these important preconditions for the identification of the criteria for the reform of the liturgy and the basic concepts with regard to liturgy in the thought of both Guardini and Ratzinger, we come now to the point where we are able to identify some general criteria for the reform of the liturgy. I define such criteria with the help of the two theologians' general understanding of liturgy, their stance towards the liturgy of their time, and the analysis of contemporary liturgy in the context of contemporary society as it is focused on the human person. It is important to emphasise in advance that the definition of such criteria must necessarily be a subjective process, because the data can be interpreted only through the interpretative lenses of the person who analyses it. Therefore it must be acknowledged that other criteria might be found as well. I thus tried to identify those criteria that Guardini and Ratzinger's writings offer me personally.

4.2.1 Guardini's Criteria

In section 2.1 I identified those tendencies that Guardini says can easily mislead any attempt to make liturgy easily accessible to the human being. Such tendencies are paths to be avoided. With the help of that analysis I can define six criteria for the reform of the liturgy that I believe correspond to Guardini's liturgical thought.

4.2.1.1 Liturgical Reform Is Formation

Liturgical reform primarily means formation. However, as we have seen, this does not mean first of all teaching the liturgy and explaining its meaningfulness, but rather enabling the faithful to perceive what liturgy has to offer. The capability of perceiving symbols and thinking and acting on a symbolic level is one of the main criteria that needs to be met in liturgical reform.⁵¹⁰

4.2.1.2 Liturgical Reform Acknowledges the Human

Liturgical reform needs to acknowledge human beings: their needs, their society and their culture. Liturgy must be able to speak to today's people and at the same time liturgical reform needs to learn from liturgical praxis. A well-perceived liturgy can reach to the depths of the human being and therefore lead to Christ and personal union with him. For this reason it is very important that liturgy operates with such tools as are suitable for the human being of a certain historical and cultural age. Spontaneously developing liturgical praxis, first of all popular devotions,⁵¹¹ reveal the human stance of the faithful of a particular historical era and offer an important means of seeing what is concretely suitable and acceptable and even of changing that which no longer touches and speaks to human hearts. It must not be forgotten that the objective character of liturgy impedes too hasty or arbitrary change in the liturgy, or the generalization and realization of subjective ideas.

⁵¹⁰ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 175-6.

⁵¹¹ Engelmann and Ferrier, *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*, 163-4.

4.2.1.3 Liturgical Reform Operates on Communitarian Level

It is necessary to think on a communitarian level. Liturgy is not the action of single persons and not even of a local community. It belongs to the whole Church as it points beyond time and space and connects the celebrating community with all Christians and all Christian communities of all ages and spaces, including that of heaven. Liturgical reform therefore cannot satisfy the needs of single persons; it needs to satisfy general human spiritual desires for the encounter with God. It cannot become the idealization of a certain historical period either,⁵¹² because that would impede liturgy from speaking to today's faithful and would be a denial of the fact that liturgy can change, even today. For Guardini, Church, hierarchy and the Church's history are not of secondary importance, but are seen in a wider picture in which the Church is indeed understood as the community of all the baptized, who are responsible for what the Church does and what is it like.

4.2.1.4 The Objective Character of Liturgy to be Maintained

In the reform of the liturgy, the objective character of liturgy needs to be maintained. One must not look merely at human expectations, because seeking to satisfy these will dissolve liturgy in subjectivity. Guardini calls the tendency that concentrates on individual needs and opinions dilettantism, because it completely forgets that liturgy belongs to the Church and that from its nature operates on a communitarian level.⁵¹³ Guardini appreciates liturgical tradition, but in contrast to Ratzinger, the objectivity of

⁵¹² Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 175-84. Krieg, Romano Guardini, 83.

⁵¹³ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 176-8.

liturgy does not derive from its connection with dogmas, but from the need to acknowledge the primacy of the Logos and the presence of objective religious truths therein. It is a question of disposition.⁵¹⁴

4.2.1.5 Liturgical Reform Must Concentrate on the Liturgical Act

Liturgical reform needs to concentrate on the liturgical act. This criterion seems to be the opposite of the one about the importance of the human person and the community. It is not its opposite at all, in fact. In his time Guardini did not want his colleagues to deal primarily with textual or ritual questions and changes.⁵¹⁵ In his view these are of secondary importance. One needs to be sure that contemporary people are capable of performing the liturgical act, of thinking symbolically, of offering, denying, and thinking on a communitarian and transcendental level, and of accepting humbly that liturgy deals with realities that overcome their individual existence. To concentrate on the liturgical act means therefore to give precedence to the deep comprehension of the liturgy before making any practical change.

4.2.1.6 Appreciation of Interconnected Elements

In the reform of the liturgy it is necessary to discover and appreciate the interconnectedness of humans and things; the spiritual and material, the individual and communal. Even though I mentioned this partially in the previous criteria, I want to emphasize such a dichotomy. These terms seem to be opposites, but in reality they are

⁵¹⁴ Guardini, *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, 79-88, especially 85-6. English translation: *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 85-95, especially 91-2.

⁵¹⁵ Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie*, 92. Gerl-Falkovitz, *Romano Guardini*, 257-8.

not; they complement each other. Human beings and material things are both important in liturgical action as the spiritual becomes concrete in the material and gains an outer form.⁵¹⁶ The individual is a member of a larger community that is the bearer of the liturgical act. As a communitarian action, liturgy needs to involve the whole Church, which in a certain sense becomes the guarantee for the objective performance of the liturgical action. One needs to learn to say *We* instead of *I*. This is not merely a grammatical issue, however, but an existential question about whether or not the single individual becomes able to think liturgically and therefore to perform the liturgical act.⁵¹⁷

These six criteria provide me with an overview of Guardini's thought with regard to the reform of the liturgy. They contain all the important elements of his thinking. Observing these criteria, according to Romano Guardini, one is able to embark on a liturgical reform that produces a result corresponding to the nature of the liturgy and its interpretation.

4.2.2 Ratzinger's Criteria

Now we turn again to Joseph Ratzinger and with the same intellectual effort try to elaborate his criteria. I define here five criteria that in my opinion cover his thought in the area of the reform of the liturgy. Such criteria are not clearly defined in his written opus. I therefore construct here a list of possible criteria that could be modified with ease

⁵¹⁶ Guardini, *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*, 62. Marshall, In Wahrheit beten, 58.

⁵¹⁷ All these questions are explained thoroughly in the section 2.3.

in light of other interpretations. For me, the most important criteria for the reform of the liturgy that Ratzinger would endorse include the following.

4.2.2.1 Having a Clear Understanding of the Church's Faith

In any theological or liturgical discussion it is extremely important to have a clear understanding of the Church's faith as it is. The explanations and different understandings of theologians are not satisfying, because they fall easily into subjectivism. The true bearer of the Church's faith is the Magisterium. It is the guarantee of the pureness of the faith and its connection with the divine truth, and in the end, of human existence itself. As liturgy is the outer expression of the Church's faith, it is authentic insofar as it expresses the true faith and insofar as it expresses the whole of the Church's faith. Conversely, it must be true also, even though Ratzinger does not mention this, that liturgy is the source of theology and dogma, as we could see in Chapter 1. Dogma can be supported directly by liturgical praxis. Because of the interconnectedness of liturgy and dogma and the necessity of true dogma for true liturgy, it would be interesting to ask whether there is true dogma without true liturgy. The answer is of course that there is, because dogma is based primarily on divine revelation. One nevertheless needs to face questions such as these that derive necessarily from the affirmation of such a strong connection between dogma and liturgy.⁵¹⁸

⁵¹⁸ We understand here also the liturgical consequences of Ratzinger's discussion with Walter Kasper on the primacy of the universal Church over the local churches. Liturgy can belong to the whole Church; it can maintain its objectivity when it depends primarily on the universal and not on the local Church. The need for universality is the natural consequence of the transcendental dimension of the Church as the mystical body of Christ, to which belong the members of heaven as well. At the same time this does not negate the possibility of the inculturation of the liturgy, but that is, however, a secondary step in the development of the liturgy. More on this: Adam Koester, "The Local Churches and the Universal Church:

4.2.2.2 *Finding the Real Subject of the Liturgy: Christ*

To define correctly the subject of the liturgy means to make sure that liturgy is a common treasure that belongs to the whole Church and first of all to Christ. This criterion relates to the first one. Ratzinger has several times expressed the view that the true subject of the liturgy is Christ.⁵¹⁹ In affirming this one avoids missing several points in the interpretation of the liturgy. Human beings, according to Ratzinger, are not bearers of the liturgical act; they merely join to Christ as the only one who is capable of making the perfect offering to God. Liturgy becomes comprehensible when the members of the liturgical community are aware of what is happening in their celebration.⁵²⁰ Comprehensibility is therefore not merely a semantic concept, but an important criterion that refers to the whole of the liturgical act. Acknowledging that Christ is the true and only subject of the liturgy means that the person will find his or her proper place in the liturgical action and will accept that he or she cannot do anything to the liturgy. Therefore, for Ratzinger, participation means either what is commonly understood, namely doing something, or an inner stance, something that happens internally. He emphasizes that even without doing or saying something one can fully participate in the liturgy, because the inner direction of the soul is decisive. If it is directed to God, the participation is full.⁵²¹

Reflections on the Kasper/Ratzinger Debate,” *Obsculta* 3 (2010): 12-21. Kilian McDonnell, “The Ratzinger/Kasper Debate: The Universal Church and the Local Churches,” *Theological Studies* 63 (2002): 227-50.

⁵¹⁹ Ratzinger, “The Theology of the Liturgy,” 19.

⁵²⁰ Ratzinger, “40 Jahre Konstitution,” 218.

⁵²¹ Ratzinger, “40 Jahre Konstitution,” 220. Marini, *La liturgia*, 47-55.

4.2.2.3 Faithfulness to History, Tradition, and Organic Development

Faithfulness to theological and liturgical history and tradition, and to the principles of organic development⁵²² is the third important criterion for the reform of the liturgy. It is interesting to see how important this is for Ratzinger, for Guardini, while acknowledging the importance of history, warns of the danger of an exaggerated historicism. I assume that the importance of liturgical history and tradition derives from the place Ratzinger gives to the Church in his thought.⁵²³ The guarantee that the Church will maintain its identity and the divine truth is that its development is traceable, which fact prevents deviation in teaching. On the other hand, continuity is a theological concept also, because in God there is no change and no development. The Church is the people of God, the mystical body of Jesus Christ who is head of the Church and therefore inside it. When the divine becomes part of human life it not only assumes the human condition, as happened in the incarnation, but influences the world and human life by pouring forth its own divine attributes. Liturgy cannot change radically; it must be faithful to the tradition of the Church, because this relative constancy will be a tool in maintaining Christ as the only subject of the liturgy, and in guaranteeing that liturgy does not become primarily a human act, but remains always of a divine nature.

⁵²² Benedetto XVI, “Una giusta ermeneutica,” 1028. English translation: Benedict XVI, “A Proper Hermeneutic,” xiii.

⁵²³ Ratzinger’s position has been explained thoroughly in section 3.1.2, as well as the influence of Klaus Gamber on Ratzinger in section 3.1.1.

4.2.2.4 Understanding of the Nature of the Liturgy

In the reform of the liturgy it is necessary to be faithful to the nature of the liturgy explained through theology. Ratzinger calls this the criterion of simplicity.⁵²⁴ The concept of simplicity in this context means that everything in the liturgy must serve the main purpose of liturgy, namely the adoration of God. Liturgy is nothing other than the human action of which the centre is the homage given to God. This criterion implies all other criteria mentioned before. Liturgy necessarily needs to be faithful to the content of the faith so that the only living God is adored. Liturgy's subject must be Christ because he is the only one able to make the perfect offering to God and who knows the divine nature, being himself God. Liturgy is connected to history as God has connected himself to time and history in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. The importance of the concept of adoration is very important to Ratzinger, who through almost an entire chapter in his liturgical book follows the biblical liturgical forms as the adoration of God.⁵²⁵

4.2.2.5 Liturgical Reform Means Formation

As I have explained this concept in section 3.2.2, I refer here simply to the main goal of the formation, namely to teach the faithful to understand liturgy as it is explained by theology. This means that the human being needs to be formed by the liturgy, which therefore has a didactic character.⁵²⁶ Liturgy forms those who participate in it through the divine power that is present therein, through the self-dedication of the person and

⁵²⁴ Ratzinger, "40 Jahre Konstitution," 221.

⁵²⁵ Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 30-43. English translation: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 35-50.

⁵²⁶ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 448; English translation: Ratzinger, *God and the World*, 416.

through his or her commitment to accept the rules of the liturgy that derive from its nature. Liturgical formation means the further renewal of liturgical awareness so that members of the Church recognize their common responsibility for the pureness of Christ's liturgy and the fruits that can be gained if it is Christ who primarily acts in the liturgy and if the human being accepts that liturgy is given and not made.⁵²⁷

4.3 Conclusion of Chapter 4

We have discovered that for both Guardini and Ratzinger liturgical reform means primarily formation, a concept that naturally refers to the human being understood both as an individual and as a member of a community. It is perhaps surprising that it is not the liturgy that must primarily be reformed, but the human person. This shows that for both our theologians, liturgy is much more than the fruit of human intellectual effort. Liturgy is a gift and an opportunity for the Church and its members, making it possible to taste in advance the main goal of all human beings: personal union with Jesus Christ.

Even though Guardini and Ratzinger view in a similar way the importance of liturgical formation, they differ slightly in their understanding. For Guardini, the main purpose of liturgical formation is to render the human person capable of performing the liturgical act. Ratzinger wants human beings to be capable of perceiving what liturgy has to offer. It seems that for Guardini, formation is directed to helping human beings to act, while for Ratzinger it is seen as an aid in making human beings capable of receiving. In both one can discover a certain bipolarity that is based on the duality of the nature of the

⁵²⁷ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 448. Benedikt XVI, *Licht der Welt*, 184.

liturgy and the meaning of the human person. Both the nature of the liturgy and the human being or community are decisive in the performance of the liturgical act. What is objectivity for Guardini, is faithfulness to the nature of the liturgy and to the faith of the Church for Ratzinger. What is the importance of the human person for Guardini, is the common responsibility of human beings for the liturgy for Ratzinger. What is the concentration on the liturgical action for Guardini, is the discussion on the subject of the liturgy and therefore on what happens in the liturgy for Ratzinger.

In their depths, Guardini and Ratzinger nevertheless speak about similar realities when they explain the essence of liturgical reform. I assume that the slight differences we perhaps sense derive primarily from the different viewpoints they apply. Guardini looks at the liturgy from an anthropological viewpoint, while Ratzinger does so from a dogmatic one. This idea is sustained by the historical-theological contexts explained in Chapter 1.⁵²⁸ Pius XII's change in the vision of the liturgy corresponds to the understanding of the liturgy of Joseph Ratzinger. Romano Guardini's thinking is closer to the theology of the liturgy before *Mediator Dei*. Despite such a significant change effected by magisterial teaching, Guardini and Ratzinger have both found the real essence of the liturgy, even though they explain it with different concepts and viewpoints. What is important for us is that liturgical reform is not merely planned and made, but is a process that needs to meet theological, liturgical, historical and anthropological criteria. Even though it is realized by human beings and the Church, it is

⁵²⁸ Silvano Zucal, "The Intellectual Relationship between Joseph Ratzinger and Romano Guardini," *L'Osservatore Romano Weekly Edition in English* (10 December 2008): 8.

essential to look at the origin of every liturgical act, God himself, and to adjust our liturgy and ourselves to what he is and has to offer.

5. FROM LITURGICAL REFORM TO LITURGICAL PRACTICE

In the previous four chapters we have seen why the question of liturgical reform is so important in the thought of Romano Guardini and Joseph Ratzinger. Despite their differing viewpoints on the liturgy and their different methods, they are in agreement on most points about the nature of liturgical reform. Ratzinger's dogmatic and systematic view leads him to an understanding of the liturgy in terms of which it seems to be an external form of the Church's faith. The philosophical foundation of his theology of the liturgy has him considering the liturgy of heaven as the fullness of worship, to which the mundane liturgy must necessarily and increasingly conform. In order to offer the most perfect possible liturgy and in order to join perfectly in the liturgy of Christ who is its true subject, human beings need a constant formation, a continuous progress in how they worship. Guardini, however, places the emphasis on anthropology, recognising that liturgy is important to human beings as well. Through the liturgical act human lives are transformed and conformed to Christ. This is one of the main goals of liturgy. Liturgical formation thus offers fruitful aid to human beings in this process of transformation.

In liturgical studies theoretical ideas always have their practical consequences. It is thus also necessary to speak about liturgical practice in this last chapter, because neither Guardini nor Ratzinger's thought on the reform of the liturgy is meant to remain at the merely theoretical level, but according to the intentions of the two thinkers, needs to be applied to the Church's liturgical practice as well. In Chapters 2 and 3 I pointed out how our theologians apply their ideas to liturgical practice. Now we need to see the

consequences of their thought for the future, the direction which liturgy must and will take, and the methods to be applied in such a development. Naturally I cannot deal here with a complex vision of liturgical development, and will thus limit myself to those liturgical-practical developments that follow directly from Guardini and Ratzinger's theologies.

First of all, we need to be aware of an important distinction that contains at the same time a parallel. The two theologians worked in radically different periods. Guardini's liturgical ideas refer not only to the pre-Vatican II form of the Roman Rite, but to the spirituality, ecclesiology and psychology of that time, while Ratzinger speaks about the post-Vatican II form of the liturgy, especially the Eucharist, and applies a liturgical theology and ecclesiology widely criticised by his contemporaries. At the same time, we see that Guardini's scholarship contributed significantly to the liturgical reform of Vatican II and to the formation of the modern liturgical forms as we understand them today. Pope Benedict XVI, however, took a significant step away from the post-Vatican II forms to the pre-Vatican II forms in *Summorum Pontificum*. This latter move does not mean a radical or obligatory return, of course, especially when we take into consideration his intentions for the publication of this document, as explained in Chapter 3. The document does indicate, however, that the way of development for Pope Benedict is not necessarily further progress in the future, but rather a new start that is based in the liturgical forms of a previous period of history and also in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. It is thus true that for Pope Benedict the post-conciliar form of the liturgy is not a hermeneutical principle for future developments, but simply a constant point of reference or the basic material for future changes. The hermeneutical principles of

Vatican II are not negotiable, however, and represent the objective framework for the liturgy and its reform.

The acknowledgement of this distinction is important in order that we not draw false conclusions from their theologies, which might easily be done since both are considered to be in a certain sense reformers of liturgical theology and praxis.

In this current period of liturgical history, I want to turn first of all to the future of the two forms of the Roman Rite, not because this is the primary question concerning liturgical development, but because the analysis of this question necessarily follows from the discussion of the previous chapters. There are other questions that could be dealt with, such as how and to what extent liturgy should be inculturated in this globalized and culturally diverse world. We might deal also with other elements, such as the role and development of liturgical music. I think, however, that the question of the future of the Roman Rite not only derives from what we have said so far, but is the question that corresponds most closely to the theological-theoretical nature of this present work. I will make some observations on the question of whether or not a reform of the reform is necessary and if so, how it might be carried out. These two questions will, I think, connect this present work to the liturgical praxis of the twenty-first century.

5.1 The Future of the Roman Rite and its Extraordinary Form

I want to start with the extraordinary form of the Roman Rite, not only because of its historical precedence, but because of its recent accentuation. In order to understand the reason behind the decision of Pope Benedict XVI to make the pre-conciliar liturgical

forms easily accessible for both priests and laypeople, we can refer to Ratzinger's criticism of the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform and his interpretation of the concept of liturgical development.⁵²⁹ We cannot stop at a merely theological argument, however, because in the *motu proprio* Pope Benedict offers other reasons for his decision. In *Summorum Pontificum* and in the letter accompanying the document, he explains that on the one hand those who are attracted to the previous liturgical forms must not feel themselves inferior in relation to other liturgical forms.⁵³⁰ On the other hand, following from his argument on the unfaithful implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform,⁵³¹ he hopes that the now called extraordinary form of the Roman Rite will help effect the return to the Council's liturgical theology and liturgical hermeneutics as well as prompting a recognition of what the Council really wanted to achieve and how it sought to do so. Beside this, the extraordinary form will help the further development of the ordinary form, since the extraordinary form, which for Pope Benedict represents an unbroken development of liturgical history, can provide those theological and

⁵²⁹ This question was explained in section 3.1.2.

⁵³⁰ I cannot deal here with why some faithful are so attached to the pre-Vatican II form of the liturgy. The answers to this question vary considerably. One can probably discover both external and internal reasons. Surely there are many who can discover in this form a sense of the sacred, as is sometimes expressed by Ratzinger himself, which they cannot find in the ordinary form, either because they grew up with the extraordinary form, or because of some bad experience with the ordinary form in which the sacredness was partially or completely ruined. Such people look for the sense of mystery that best mediates for them the presence of the transcendent God.

There are probably people for whom the extraordinary form of the liturgy is a kind of route to nostalgic feelings or to an antiquarianism. In such cases, liturgy is mostly of secondary importance. What is important is the age, in terms of which everything that is old and of old times is considered worthier and more adequate.

In *Summorum Pontificum*, Pope Benedict XVI concentrates only on those who give grounds for the use of the extraordinary form either as an inner desire or from a theological critique of the implementation of the Vatican II liturgical reform, because, as he explains many times, subjective desires cannot influence the objective nature of the liturgy. This affirmation seems to be in opposition to the acceptance of the request from those who are attached to the pre-Vatican II form of the liturgy. Pope Benedict's decision reveals to me that in a certain sense he agrees with their liturgical and theological criticisms, as has been explained in Chapter 3.

⁵³¹ I explained this thoroughly in section 3.1.

liturgical principles to the ordinary form of which, in his opinion, are lacking. I understand his explanation of the need for the *motu proprio*, not primarily as a theological reason, but as a pastoral concern. We will see that even the influence of the extraordinary form on the ordinary form is significant, because it ensures that the faithful can participate in the official liturgy of the Church and not in a personal invention of individuals and small groups. Through this, the nature of both liturgy and liturgical reform is secured and maintained.

With regard to the future of the extraordinary form, I want to deal with two major questions. The first is the coexistence of two forms of the Roman Rite, an unprecedented reality in liturgical history and theology. The second involves problems that derive from the simultaneous coexistence of a pre-conciliar liturgical form and a post-conciliar theology in liturgical law. In this section I will refer also to the wide criticism of the papal decision and the *motu proprio*. In the end I draw some liturgical-theological conclusions, especially in relation to the extraordinary form.

5.1.1 The Coexistence of the Two Forms of the Roman Rite

Pope Benedict XVI's ideas on the two forms of the same rite are new and without precedent in liturgical history. It is a new reality that a rite, more concretely, the largest rite of the Church, has two equal legal forms from which the clergy and the faithful can

choose.⁵³² The lack of precedent for this is especially interesting when we consider that Pope Benedict XVI is so sensible of historical tradition.⁵³³

On the other hand, we must acknowledge that the most difficult point is not the historically unprecedented use of a double form of the Roman Rite. The present use of the extraordinary form still ignores the whole teaching of the Second Vatican Council, including its liturgical document, because it has been completely restored as it was before the Council.⁵³⁴ Therefore the liturgical renewal sought and founded by the Council is not present at all in the extraordinary form. Since for Pope Benedict XVI the teaching of Vatican II is not negotiable, it needs to be applied also to the extraordinary form. We can refer here to several points of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, such as SC 53,⁵³⁵ on the reintroduction of the prayers of the faithful, or SC 54,⁵³⁶ on the use of vernacular language in the liturgical celebration. Beyond its practical instructions, the conciliar

⁵³² Dobszay, László, *The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite* (London, New York: T&T Clark: 2010), 47-50. It is interesting that Dobszay justifies the two contemporary forms of the Roman Rite with the affirmation that Roman Rite is “the rite living in the Roman Church.” Therefore both forms have an equal right to exist. See p. 50 of the above work.

⁵³³ Something similar happened in 2009, even though the situation was rather different. It was Pope Benedict XVI who made it possible for the faithful and the communities of the Church of England to enter into full communion with the Catholic Church. Liturgically, this means that such communities can maintain their own traditions with only slight modifications. Even though it was not expressed in such terms, the Anglican Catholic rite was established with this decision. The situation is meaningful because a new rite has appeared in the Catholic Church, even though it has an antecedent in a non-Catholic tradition.

⁵³⁴ This is with the exception of the one prayer for the Jews on Good Friday, as it was explained in chapter 3.1.2, fn. 369.

⁵³⁵ “Especially on Sundays and feasts of obligation there is to be restored, after the Gospel and the homily, ‘the common prayer’ or ‘the prayer of the faithful.’ By this prayer, in which the people are to take part, intercession will be made for holy Church, for the civil authorities, for those oppressed by various needs, for all mankind, and for the salvation of the entire world.”

⁵³⁶ “In Masses which are celebrated with the people, a suitable place may be allotted to their mother tongue. This is to apply in the first place to the readings and ‘the common prayer,’ but also, as local conditions may warrant, to those parts which pertain to the people, according to the norm laid down in Art. 36 of this Constitution.

Nevertheless steps should be taken so that the faithful may also be able to say or to sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them. And wherever a more extended use of the mother tongue within the Mass appears desirable, the regulation laid down in Art. 40 of this Constitution is to be observed.”

teaching represents a renewed liturgical theology, especially when we think of the centrality of the paschal mystery in the liturgy, the particular role of all the gifts in the celebration, or the renewed emphasis on the integrity of the liturgy. Considering a longer period of time, it is not possible that that which the Council decreed would not be implemented in the extraordinary form. Therefore the present situation can only be temporary, even when we think of historical periods using the measure of the Church's time and not merely those of individual human lives.

When reading about Pope Benedict's hope for a mutual influence of the two forms, we need to ask ourselves how the ordinary form can fruitfully influence the extraordinary form. For many this would perhaps mean a loosening of the latter, making its celebration less formal and ceremonial, applying more freedom. Being aware of Ratzinger's theology of the liturgy, we know that this is not what he proposes. It means rather the acknowledgement of the integrity of the celebration as a single liturgical act; the recognition of proper liturgical roles for both clergy and faithful; active participation, even in terms of praying, singing together or common postures or gestures; and theologically, the acceptance of the real nature of liturgy.⁵³⁷

Naturally, the conciliar document *Sacrosanctum Concilium* needs to be applied to the extraordinary form as well. A rereading of the document clearly shows what is to be reformed, both in the theology of the liturgy and in liturgical praxis.

⁵³⁷ See Chapter 3.1.1.

5.1.2 Pre-Conciliar Liturgy in the Context of a Post-Conciliar Theology

In the period after Vatican II, significant progress was made in both theology and canon law. One must not overlook such a development. Not only have liturgical forms and liturgical theology changed, but the relationships between Church and the world, and between the Christian faith and other monotheistic religions have also been re-evaluated. The proper tasks and the responsibilities of all the Church's members have been acknowledged, and in its self-understanding, the Church has taken a rather spiritual stance. These ideas are, however, sometimes underrepresented in the pre-conciliar theology and therefore there is no reference to them either in pre-Vatican II liturgical texts or in the Code of Canon Law of that time.⁵³⁸

Significant changes were made in the post-conciliar liturgical books and the Code of Canon Law, in order to respect the renewed liturgical forms. It is not necessarily clear how such norms or canons should be applied to the extraordinary form. Some examples can be listed here, although we cannot offer a complete list. It is not necessarily clear for example, which liturgical calendar must be followed in the extraordinary form. Further, it allows the use the pre-conciliar *Pontificale Romanum* for ordinations. The *motu proprio* does not mention, however, whether the pre-conciliar stages of the *ordo* must be applied, or the post-conciliar ones. All these and other questions cause not only canonical and theological problems, but confusion as well, even though Pope Benedict XVI notes that this was not his intention with *Summorum Pontificum*. The solution,

⁵³⁸ Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform. Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium*, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 2-3.

however, did not arrive until 2011. In this year the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* published the instruction *Universae Ecclesiae*⁵³⁹ that resolves some of the above mentioned doubts and helps to insert the extraordinary form in the liturgical life of the Church, even though some questions still remain unresolved, for example on the use of the liturgical calendar.

Taking these issues into consideration, we need to affirm with certainty that the present situation of the two forms of the same Roman Rite cannot be a long-term solution.⁵⁴⁰ Analysing Pope Benedict XVI's theological writings, we recognise how carefully he elaborates his theological thought. I identified his pastoral concern as the major reason for the publication of the *motu proprio*. He did this even though many unclear points and difficulties arose afterwards that could easily have been foreseen. He published it, however, and as we can find within it comments on his decision, I agree also that this is not only a pastoral decision, but a temporary solution as well. The temporary nature of Pope Benedict XVI's decision is completely adequate to the whole of his theology of the liturgy.

There is a significant question in relation to the existence of a pre-conciliar liturgy in a post-conciliar theological context, namely the situation of the Society of Saint Pius X, or using their common name, the Lefebvreists. We need to touch upon this question, because the Society of Saint Pius X is usually connected in public opinion with the

⁵³⁹ Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, "*Universae Ecclesiae. Instruction on the Application of the Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum* of His Holiness Benedict XVI given *Motu Proprio*."*

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_commissions/ecclsdei/documents/rc_com_ecclsdei_doc_20110430_istr-universae-ecclesiae_en.html [Access: July 16, 2016]

⁵⁴⁰ Cassian Folsom, "The Roman Missal in *Summorum Pontificum*," in *Benedict XVI and the Roman Missal: Proceedings of the Fourth Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2011*, ed. Janet Elaine Rutherford and James O'Brien (Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2013), 133-6.

traditional liturgy. It is clear, however, that the main problem with the society is not primarily liturgical, but theological and juridical. The fact that after *Summorum Pontificum* the situation of the society is still not resolved shows that their desire for specific liturgical forms derives not from a liturgical-theological reasoning, but from a purely dogmatic one, influenced by a significantly subjective and biased theological position. I will refer here only to the theology of the society that is connected to the liturgy. In 2001, the society published a booklet with the title “The Problem of the Liturgical Reform: A Theological and Liturgical Study.”⁵⁴¹ One notes at first glance that the booklet has no individual authors: the society holds the collective responsibility for its contents. But one observes also that in the title the word “problem” is in the singular form, suggesting that there is only one major problem with the liturgical reform rather than a significant number of questions still unresolved. This opinion of the society derives from its subjective evaluation of its own existence and theology.

At the centre of the thinking of the society, with regard to liturgy, we can find a point that seems to be the major one, namely the understanding of the Mass as sacrifice. The society’s booklet supports the idea of a rupture in liturgical development with the publication of the *novus ordo* and the inadequacy of the theology of the paschal mystery, which, according to them, is the main supporter of a theology of the rupture.⁵⁴² The main thesis of the Society is summarised in the following sentences:

The analysis of the *Novus Ordo Missae* and the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* compels us to recognize that the structure of the rite is no longer based on sacrifice but on a memorial meal [...]. We will also see that this rite has emphasized

⁵⁴¹ Society of Saint Pius X, *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform: A Theological and Liturgical Study* (Kansas City, MO: Angelus Press, 2001).

⁵⁴² Society of Saint Pius X, Foreword to *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform*, iv.

the presence of Christ in His Word and in his people, and has diminished the importance of the presence of Christ as Priest and Victim [...]. Consequently, the Eucharistic dimension has become more significant than the propitiatory aim [...]. The inevitable conclusion of these observations is that the expression “liturgical rupture” defines the differences between the traditional missal and the new missal more accurately than the expression “liturgical reform.”⁵⁴³

Here we can see that the problem for the society is twofold: the *novus ordo* is not an expression of the theology of the Mass as sacrifice, but that of a meal; the sacrificial presence of Christ is diminished in relation to other forms of his presence. As a consequence, the centre of the Eucharist has—in their view—disappeared. They explain that the disappearance of the sacrificial character is expressed primarily in the textual changes made in the *novus ordo*. New modifications in the prayers for the offertory (of which the name has been changed to preparation of the gifts) and in the Canon, mean that “while the words of consecration in the traditional missal emphasize firstly transubstantiation and sacrifice, the words of the new missal exclusively emphasize the memorial and the dimension of friendship.”⁵⁴⁴

Another significant difference is found in the mode of Christ’s presence in the liturgical celebration. The authors explain that in the post-conciliar rite, Christ’s spiritual presence is over emphasised as being realised through his word and his body, that is, in the ecclesial assembly, while his presence as Priest and Victim is devalued. Consequently, the common priesthood of the faithful has become more important than the ministerial priesthood, since the former is now capable of making Christ spiritually

⁵⁴³ Society of Saint Pius X, *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform*, 3-4.

⁵⁴⁴ Society of Saint Pius X, *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform*, 9. They support this idea with the following: (1) the inclusion of the words *Take and eat this all of you* and *Take and drink this all of you* in the words of consecration emphasizes the aspect of friendship in the action of the transubstantiation; (2) the words *delivered for you* take away the sacrificial dimension in the words of consecration; (3) with the introduction of the words *do this in memory of me* in the act of consecration, the memorial becomes the focal point in the act of consecration.

present.⁵⁴⁵ The new rules for church buildings seem to confirm this idea when the tabernacle is no longer the focal point of the whole building, reinforcing the idea that it is primarily for the liturgical assembly.

The booklet further affirms that changes in the liturgy are consequences of theological changes. The publication explains, for example, that a shift in the understanding of the concepts of sin and redemption contributed significantly to the fact that the sacrificial and the sacerdotal terminology of the Mass disappeared and it became a communitarian event.⁵⁴⁶ This means that, according to the society, the mistaken liturgy derives from a mistaken theology and until theology is once again Catholic, liturgy will not have the chance to become Catholic either.

The publication touches upon significant questions, such as that of liturgical development and of the interconnectedness of dogma and liturgy. It seems that the society allows liturgy to develop only until the first decades of the twentieth century. After that they do not accept any further changes or developments either to theology or to liturgy. It is therefore not clear if they believe liturgy can change, develop or be reformed. It seems that their answer is no. However, this is what happened for nineteen centuries of liturgical and theological history. At certain points the society is close to the vision of Ratzinger, inasmuch as dogma finds its expression in the liturgy. Their conclusion is mistaken, however, and not even Catholic, because they are rather more attached to their personal opinion than open to Magisterial teaching, even sacrificing ecclesial communion. It seems that the society is so attached to the pre-conciliar

⁵⁴⁵ Society of Saint Pius X, *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform*, 13.

⁵⁴⁶ Society of Saint Pius X, *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform*, 28-32.

theology and liturgical forms that they cannot even consider its development. Therefore they reject anything that does not meet their subjective understanding. It is not surprising that Ratzinger is counted among the traditionalists, because he deals with similar questions in his theology of the liturgy. However, while the society gives up the communion with the Church, Ratzinger elaborates his theological and liturgical ideas inside and in accordance with the Church. The Society of Saint Pius X clearly shows the way in which the Church and its liturgy will not proceed in the future.

5.2 The Future of the Ordinary Form

It is a much more difficult task to speak about the future of the ordinary form. Following the reasoning of Pope Benedict XVI, it would be easy to predict that the post-conciliar form of the liturgy needs to undergo certain changes, primarily those that were explained by Ratzinger in his conference on the theology of the liturgy in 2001.⁵⁴⁷ At the same time, one must not forget that this is not merely or primarily to do with ceremonial changes, but is instead a new liturgical awareness or thinking for getting close to the liturgy and allowing that it form and transform human existence as is required by the nature of the liturgy.

Pope Benedict's intentions with regard to the ordinary form of the Roman Rite lead us to a rethinking of the meaning of the liturgy in the life of the Church and the

⁵⁴⁷ We recall here the three points that he believes need to be implemented immediately: elimination of a false creativity; correction of new translations and the preservation of a minimal amount of Latin in every celebration; and the external expression of the inner content of prayer by putting the crucifix in the centre of all the celebration. Ratzinger, "Assessment and Future Prospects," in A. Reid, ed., *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference* (Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael's Abbey Press: 2003), 150-2.

individual Christian and to a more significant emphasis on the way we celebrate liturgy. The reform of the reform, which is spoken of so often, would not, in my opinion, mean a radical change in the structure of the Eucharist in the ordinary form. If we can use such a concept at all, it would mean rather that the liturgical principles of Vatican II were applied to the ordinary form, leading gradually to the elimination of the possibility of abuses and a clearer expression of the sacrificial theology and cosmic dimension of the liturgy. In order to do this, and following Ratzinger's theory, certain changes in the rite itself are unavoidable.

Several authors explain that Pope Benedict's intention with the publication of *Summorum Pontificum* was not to guarantee the parallel existence of the two forms for a long period of time. They note—based on the *motu proprio* itself—that the pope wanted to take the first step, starting the process of reconciliation between the two forms, allowing at the same time their mutual influence.⁵⁴⁸ Thinking in terms of the future, he therefore holds that the unification of the ordinary and the extraordinary form will happen when the faithful, after a thorough preparation, are ready to feel the meaning and the importance of such a step. It will probably not be sudden or radical, but rather step by step without causing further tensions, ruptures or schisms. Such a proposal is justified because of the problems and uncertainties that having two parallel forms of the Roman Rite can cause, as has been explained in Chapter 5.1.2.⁵⁴⁹

⁵⁴⁸ Benedetto XVI, "Con grande fiducia: Lettera di accompagnamento alla lettera apostolica *Summorum pontificum* sull'uso della liturgia romana anteriore della riforma effettuata nel 1970," in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 3/2, 2007 (Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2008), 25-9.

⁵⁴⁹ Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 130-3.

The concept of the reform of the reform is often used, primarily by those who promote the extraordinary form, in order to express the need for a reform of the post-conciliar liturgical reform. This understanding often refers exclusively to the ordinary form, based on the pure implementation of the conciliar decisions. One must not forget that Ratzinger uses the concept in a different way, and that he avoided its use in his more recent publications or writings. He probably discovered that this term is easily misunderstood and can be interpreted as a radical change in the rite or a simple return to the pre-conciliar form. I assume that what he wants to avoid is the sense of uncertainty in the liturgy and skipping from one period of liturgical history to the other.⁵⁵⁰ Further, as he explained earlier, idealizing a concrete period of liturgical history is neither desirable nor appropriate to liturgical development. In *Gott und die Welt*, Ratzinger explains his use of the term and says that reform of the reform means (1) stopping arbitrary creativity; (2) developing the inner sense of the sacred; and (3) recovering the inner dynamism and coherence of the liturgy through the examination of what was changed, overly simplified or cancelled unnecessarily during the process of implementation of the conciliar reform. He draws the conclusion that similar to liturgical reform in general, reform of the reform must primarily be a process of formation.⁵⁵¹ In this interview published in 2000, Ratzinger still speaks about a condition for such a reform: namely that the initiative must come from the faithful and not be imposed from above. Here he refers to the pre-conciliar Liturgical Movement. This is why later in

⁵⁵⁰ Ratzinger, Preface to *The Organic Development of the Liturgy: The Principles of Liturgical Reform and Their Relation to the Twentieth-Century Liturgical Movement Prior to the Second Vatican Council* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005), 9-13.

⁵⁵¹ Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 382.

2007, in *Summorum Pontificum* he refers to those who are attached to the pre-conciliar form of the Eucharist and names this the main reason for the publication of the *motu proprio*. Here we face again the pastoral concern which acknowledges that such a desire of the faithful can be justified because of the hermeneutical and methodical problems of the implementation of the conciliar document. This does not mean, however, that liturgy should or can be a matter of personal taste. It seems that the theology that is marked by Ratzinger as incorrect allowed for some kind of subjectivism in liturgical matters during this historical period.

What will the liturgy be like after the awakening of liturgical awareness? Here again Ratzinger does not speak about ceremonial elements, even though his papal liturgical praxis speaks volumes. He speaks only about the recognition and acknowledgement of the given nature of the liturgy and points out that we are not creators of the liturgy, but its recipients. It is further necessary that there be an inner participation, a point to which the faithful move gradually, growing not only in their faith, but in liturgical awareness as well.⁵⁵² Here we can recall Guardini, who also emphasizes the capability of the human being to perform liturgy, and the necessary formation of the faithful to achieve this. This is the guarantee of a liturgy that is celebrated fruitfully by all the participants. The faithful are capable of celebrating in such a way, but they need help. This is the responsibility of liturgical scholars.⁵⁵³

Even though the future of the ordinary form is rather uncertain, and as we have seen, implies a somewhat new approach to the liturgy, we must ask about ceremonial

⁵⁵² Ratzinger, *Gott und die Welt*, 383.

⁵⁵³ David A. Stosur, "Liturgy and (post) modernity: A Narrative Response to Guardini's Challenge," *Worship* 77 (2003): 22-41, especially 31-5.

changes as well. There are not many references in Pope Benedict XVI, but in order to offer a holistic view of his vision, we need to deal briefly with this area. In an interview in *L'Osservatore Romano* (November 22, 2008), Francis Cardinal Arinze, then prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, said that Pope Benedict was to ask the opinion of the bishops on the transfer of the sign of the peace to before the presentation of the offerings. The reason for such a move would not only be the biblical reference (Mt 5:23-24), but also to avoid unnecessary confusion among the faithful before communion.⁵⁵⁴ This is the only reference where the structure of the mass is mentioned as part of the intention of Pope Benedict XVI.⁵⁵⁵

There are, however, other parts of the Eucharist where textual and not ceremonial variations are already made or allowed. On 15 October 2008, three new forms were allowed for the dismissal at the end of the mass. Beginning at Pentecost 2009, in the words of consecration, the term “for all” was substituted for “for many” in legislation binding on the Church worldwide. There is no information on further textual changes in the ordinary form, however.

With regard to the future of the ordinary form, there are more ideas, suggestions and theories as to how, what and when to reform. I would like to refer only to an Italian author, Claudio Crescimanno, who in his work entitled *La Riforma della Riforma liturgica*⁵⁵⁶ proposes two interesting points. First, he lists four areas in which certain problematic consequences appear in the ordinary form in connection with the conciliar

⁵⁵⁴ Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, §49.

⁵⁵⁵ In *Sacramentum Caritatis* §49 Benedict XVI indeed asks the opinion of bishops throughout the world whether it would not be better to have the sign of peace before the preparation of the gifts. In the end this rite remained as it was.

⁵⁵⁶ Crescimanno, Claudio, *La Riforma della Riforma Liturgica. Ipotesi per un “nuovo” rito della messa sulle tracce del pensiero di Joseph Ratzinger* (Verona: Fede & Cultura, 2009).

reform: (1) In the area of the liturgical architecture the major problem is the restructuring of the presbytery, which puts the focus on the celebrating priest. (2) The change in the understanding of priestly ministry brings with it the view that priesthood is a task of organization, teaching and social occupation, rather than that of mediator of the divine cult, or a bridge between divine and human worlds. (3) The negative consequences for the faithful appear as uncertainty in liturgical matters when liturgies change from one place to the other and a sense of feeling at home cannot develop easily. (4) The major problem for Crescimanno is in the liturgical-theological area and is a fivefold problem. First there is fragmentation, or the institutionalization of creativity which results in a style of thinking in terms of which the official liturgy is only the framework within which one moves freely. Second is experimentation: “the radicalization of the principle of creativity.”⁵⁵⁷ This principle often mistakenly appears under the name of inculturation. Thirdly, there is spectacularization, which is to behave as protagonists of the liturgical action and to think that human comportment is decisive therein. The fourth problem is didacticism, which is concretized in the overestimation of the liturgy of the word, especially that of the homily, and the multiplication of free speeches, such as introductions and comments. All of these can obscure liturgy’s cultic and laiturgical aspect. Fifthly, and this is Crescimanno’s most serious point, there is

⁵⁵⁷ Crescimanno, *La Riforma della Riforma Liturgica*, 194. Quoting the interview with A.M. Ranjith Patabendige, Secretary of the Congregation for Divine Cult in La Croix, June 25, 2006. My translation: “...è la radicalizzazione del principio della creatività.”

desacralization, which means taking out of liturgy what is sacred. This, furthermore, is “the premise to the secularization of the faith itself.”⁵⁵⁸

In this area Crescimanno follows Ratzinger, whose thinking on such matters has already been explained. Crescimanno can show us in praxis what Ratzinger pointed out in theory. Analyzing such matters makes clear that one need not expect radical changes in liturgical action and especially not very soon. We must remember again, following Guardini, that liturgical work needs time: sufficient time for formation and sufficient time for development. It is interesting however, that Crescimanno works out in a hundred pages a reformed form of the liturgy of the Mass that he believes meets the criteria of the liturgical reform of Vatican II.⁵⁵⁹

5.3 Need for a Reform of the Reform?

Having seen the establishment of a new liturgical-theological reality, namely, the two forms of the only Roman Rite, and Pope Benedict’s intentions behind the decision for this, i.e. the mutual influence of the two forms, one might take a look also into the future. What is going to happen next? What is the future of the liturgy? Can we expect any changes in liturgical praxis, or will everything remain the same as it is now? Do we need to modify something in our Roman Rite? We have seen the ideas of both Guardini and Ratzinger and finish our journey by turning to the conciliar document itself, which is the fundament for any further development in the field of liturgy, both in its theology

⁵⁵⁸ Crescimanno, *La Riforma della Riforma liturgica*, 199. my translation. “...la premessa per la secolarizzazione della fede stessa.”

⁵⁵⁹ Crescimanno, *La Riforma della Riforma liturgica*, 221-320.

and in its praxis. Studying the teaching of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* we need to ask whether there is a need to rethink our liturgical-theological ideas and to remove those which—according to some—were implemented wrongly from the conciliar document. Understanding the hermeneutics of reform, and Guardini and Pope Benedict’s liturgical thought, do we need to do anything? For example, do we need to reform the liturgical reform? Or do we have to leave everything as it is now?

These questions are not only interesting, but are justified as well. Guardini and Pope Benedict’s understandings of liturgical reform, even though their differing points are more than their personal opinions, are those of many other theologians and faithful also. One cannot deny that one need hear and understand their requests, because this helps us deepen our sense of the liturgy and the union with Jesus Christ. Even though we cannot see into the future and are not able to prophesy anything with regard to the liturgy, I can only mention some points that in my opinion need to be discussed thoroughly in the future in order to be faithful to the Second Vatican Council and to revitalize the celebration of our Church’s liturgy.

We have already seen in Chapter 3 the crucial points of Ratzinger’s critique with regard to the implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. We now will take a brief look at the document itself and draw parallels with the liturgical praxis of today, to see whether that which was requested by the Council has been realized. I will deal here with mostly practical and not theoretical points, emphasizing only some of the most important. These are the matters to which the critics of the implementation of the conciliar document often refer.

Concerning liturgical language, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* affirms that the language of the Roman Rite is Latin.⁵⁶⁰ It prescribes that the clergy pray the liturgy of the hours in Latin.⁵⁶¹ The document also asks that the faithful be able to pray at least the most important prayers in Latin.⁵⁶² The reality, however, is that Latin has almost completely disappeared from our liturgical praxis. It has been preserved mostly in the case of international Eucharistic celebrations and in the extraordinary form. One can affirm a certain tension here, because people nowadays do not know or study Latin and how can they actively and fruitfully participate at a liturgical celebration if they do not understand what is said? The tension is not primarily in practical reasoning, since people of earlier periods did not in general know more Latin than today either, and participation is not realized exclusively through words. The real question here is whether laws made at the highest level of the Church on earth can be revised at a lower level. The question is thus juridical rather than liturgical, although with serious liturgical consequences.

⁵⁶⁰ SC 36 says: “1. Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.

2. But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. This will apply in the first place to the readings and directives, and to some of the prayers and chants, according to the regulations on this matter to be laid down separately in subsequent chapters.”

⁵⁶¹ In SC 101 we read: “1. In accordance with the centuries-old tradition of the Latin rite, the Latin language is to be retained by clerics in the divine office. But in individual cases the ordinary has the power of granting the use of a vernacular translation to those clerics for whom the use of Latin constitutes a grave obstacle to their praying the office properly. The vernacular version, however, must be one that is drawn up according to the provision of Art. 36.

2. The competent superior has the power to grant the use of the vernacular in the celebration of the divine office, even in choir, to nuns and to members of institutes dedicated to acquiring perfection, both men who are not clerics and women. The version, however, must be one that is approved.

3. Any cleric bound to the divine office fulfills his obligation if he prays the office in the vernacular together with a group of the faithful or with those mentioned in 52 above provided that the text of the translation is approved.”

⁵⁶² SC 54: “Steps should be taken so that the faithful may also be able to say or to sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them.”

It is no longer possible to go back to a completely Latin celebration and to change again the language of the liturgy. Notwithstanding, the request of the Council is still valid. The knowledge of the basic prayers, chants and responses of the Mass in Latin could sufficiently fulfill the Council's will and not skip over the developments of the decades since the publication of the liturgical document.

A second intensively discussed question is that of the direction of liturgical prayer. While we do not find any suggestion of change in this regard in the conciliar document, the praxis shows that there are hardly any churches to be found where the liturgy is not celebrated *versus populum*. Critics of this praxis generally come from the supporters of the extraordinary form and their reason for such a criticism is deeply theological in that it touches both upon the stance of the liturgical community in the liturgical action and the role of the presiding priest.⁵⁶³ Liturgical prayer must be directed to God and the view that the whole congregation should turn in the same direction expresses not only this, but the community's openness to what God is to give along with the liturgy's cosmic and eschatological dimension. One could argue, however, that the *versus populum* celebration reinforces community-consciousness and recalls the liturgical form of the first celebrated Eucharist, the Last Supper. Responding to such remarks one could say that over centuries of official teachings, the celebration of the Mass was understood as a

⁵⁶³ A thorough study of this question is that of Uwe Michael Lang, *Conversi ad Dominum: Zur Geschichte und Theologie der christlichen Gebetsrichtung* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 2010). Ratzinger also dedicates a whole chapter to this area: Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 74-84. Joseph Ratzinger, Foreword to *Turning towards the Lord. Orientation in Liturgical Prayer*, by Uwe Michael Lang (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2004), 9-12. All of the above represent a historical and theological deepening. Guardini too mentions the question as a personal impression that reflects an anthropological and pastoral point: Heinz R. Kuehn, "Fires in the Night: Germany 1920-1950." in *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the Sacred in a Modern World*, ed. Robert A. Krieg (Chicago, IL: Liturgy Training Publications, 1995), 1-14, especially 6-8. R. Kuehn, "Romano Guardini in Berlin," 88-9.

sacrifice rather than a community meal. Again we can see here how biased is the discussion surrounding this question. While theologically such arguments might be correct, one needs to face again the matter of authority in questions of liturgical law. In addition, the instruction in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 22,⁵⁶⁴ according to which no-one is allowed to arbitrarily change anything in the liturgy, questions about why and how that could then happen are as justified as certain observations concerning the nature of the liturgy and its anthropological character.

As we can see, there are some contradictions between the conciliar document and our liturgical praxis.⁵⁶⁵ The question necessarily follows: is it then necessary to reform the liturgical reform? Do we need to re-establish a liturgy that meets the requirements ordered in the conciliar documents? Or has the developed liturgical praxis a right to survive?

It is not easy to give a proper answer to these questions. There are many pros and cons that can support or disaffirm either direction. Briefly reviewing the two choices and their consequences, it seems support for reform of the conciliar liturgical reform is a possible choice. What went wrong can be, and even has to be, corrected. The question is who decides what is wrong in our liturgy: the theologians, liturgical experts or presiding bishops and priests? The answer one might suggest is the Magisterium. But even the post-Vatican II-liturgy was promulgated under papal authority after a certain period of study and experiment. When one of the most important problems for the critics is the

⁵⁶⁴ SC 23. 3. "No other person, even if he be a priest, may add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority."

⁵⁶⁵ This is not unique in liturgical history, however. Baldovin offers few examples such as shifts in theological accent in liturgical prayers. John F. Baldovin, "Sacrosanctum Concilium and the Reform of the Liturgy: Forty-Five Years Later," *Studia Liturgica* 39 (2009): 145-57.

application of a mistaken hermeneutics, namely that of discontinuity, would not a new reform be precisely the realization of such a discontinuity after more than fifty years of development? In the case of a reform of the reform, what might be the grounds: the liturgy of today or that of the time of the Council? Is it not now necessary to introduce such changes in the liturgical praxis that were considered too radical after the Council? We can think of the language of the liturgy. Is it not incomprehensible for many that a language that is not generally understood should be used? Or, with regard to liturgical direction, the most common criticism against the one common direction might be that the priest then turns his back on the liturgical community. Even though such reforms can be interpreted as a return to the liturgical tradition and history, people worshipping today belong more and more (through their experience and history) to the liturgy generally celebrated that is now called the ordinary form. Here we can refer to the liturgical thought of Guardini, for whom celebrating the liturgy with one's understanding, capabilities and whole being is one of the central means of helping the individual to union with Jesus Christ. In this sense, liturgy serves the person inasmuch it realizes and even activates the divine grace which is given to everyone in order to be saved.

The proposed need for a reform of the reform is not to be rejected either. As has been pointed out, conciliar decisions and liturgical praxis sometimes diverge. In order to follow faithfully what the Second Vatican Council proposed concerning liturgy, we need to critically re-evaluate and rethink the implementation of the post-conciliar liturgical reform and the position of the human being in contemporary liturgy, Church and society. Therefore a reform of the reform cannot be understood merely as a historical turn whose point of reference is the pre-conciliar liturgy. A reform of the reform needs to turn

toward the future also, so that it becomes a development in its proper meaning.

Liturgical tradition and history are constantly points of reference, as in the case of the development of dogmas. Tradition cannot freeze liturgy and exclude further developments, however. Tradition can offer the hermeneutical framework within which a natural development of the liturgy unfolds.

What will the future bring? Ratzinger points out that liturgy develops slowly and organically.⁵⁶⁶ This means that a concrete liturgical praxis that is acknowledged by the competent authority was itself once not officially acknowledged, but was practiced *par experiment*. Logically, certain practices today might be officially acknowledged in the future and become part of the Church's liturgy. Ratzinger's criteria for liturgical reform, discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, serve as a tool for the Magisterium to define what is acceptable and what unacceptable as part of the liturgy of the Church.

We must not forget that liturgy speaks to and involves the human person. In order to be able to decide on liturgical reform, one needs to know the situation of humans in their concrete historical, theological and sociological reality. People need to find their thoughts, emotions, faith and even themselves in the liturgy, in order to accept what the gift of liturgy has to offer them. The human being can find him or herself in the liturgy, primarily through the formation that renders him or her capable of celebrating the liturgy. It can be that a conscious and active participation cannot be attained. In this case one might consider what might help the person to such participation. Here an alteration or reform in liturgical rites can be justified.

⁵⁶⁶ Ratzinger, Preface to *The Organic Development of the Liturgy: The Principles of Liturgical Reform and Their Relation to the Twentieth-Century Liturgical Movement Prior to the Second Vatican Council* (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005), 9-13.

There is still the question of how radical such change might be. This is especially interesting, since for Ratzinger radical changes in the liturgy are not possible. He does not explain fully what a radical change consists in; rather it seems that whatever does not have precedence in liturgical tradition is already deemed radical. A new form cannot develop organically from an earlier form, because to be part of the Church's liturgy, it needs the acknowledgement of the Magisterium. When the decision of the Magisterium is what counts, then continuity can be only a secondary hermeneutical criterion.

Therefore any reform of the liturgy will always be between two fires. On the one side, the theological and historical principle of continuity and organic growth; on the other, liturgical praxis and the anthropological principle. There is no opposition between these two, but inevitably one or the other is more the focus, and therefore criticism from the other viewpoint can constantly be expressed. The ideal would be to find a balance between these two, although in practice this is probably not possible. I think, therefore, that discussion on the essence of the liturgical reform will always be unavoidable. This is what guarantees that the most precious gift for the Church, the liturgy, fulfills the reason for its existence and becomes fully the glorification of the one and living God.

CONCLUSION

The reform of the liturgy is, and will always be, a debating point in the field of the theology of the liturgy. Liturgical elements are subject to reform in light of the way liturgy is understood and defined. In Catholic theology of the liturgy there is a significant range of ideas about what constitutes liturgical reform, and how achievable it might be. Even though the term “reform” is usually used, what one generally understands by reform is instead renewal: renewal of what already is and what can and must be filled with the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit. Reform or renewal is therefore a constant task for the Church and its liturgy, and it is independent of the theological or liturgical position one or other theologian or liturgist takes.

My main question in this thesis was whether a leading figure of the Liturgical Movement, Romano Guardini, and a significant contemporary theologian who reached the chair of the apostle Peter, Joseph Ratzinger, the former Pope Benedict XVI, were radically different in their understanding of the liturgy, especially of liturgical reform. My question is significant, because, as I assumed, an unjustified contraposition of the two has developed in contemporary theology, in terms of which Guardini is branded a reformer and Ratzinger a radical traditionalist. I wanted to explore the theological and liturgical connection between the two, and ask whether the theological influence of Guardini on Ratzinger is as clear as is affirmed by Ratzinger himself.

In order to do this, I started with the historical and theological context and pointed out that a significant change in the understanding of the axiom *lex orandi – lex credendi*,

resulting from Pope Pius XII's *Mediator Dei*, had also radically changed the relationship between theology and liturgy between the periods when Guardini and Ratzinger were most active. This change in the theological context is significant in my opinion since Guardini represents the pre-encyclical period and views liturgy's defining force in relation to theology, while Ratzinger fits the post-encyclical thinking which sees the liturgy as the outer form for the content of the faith. Even though we cannot find clear reference in Ratzinger to the importance of *Mediator Dei*, I assume that given his faithfulness to the Magisterium, it was an unquestionable influence on all of his liturgical intellectual development.

In analysing Guardini and Ratzinger's liturgical thought, I wanted to shed light on their intellectual closeness in relation to the reform of the liturgy. Guardini defines four tendencies to be avoided in a period of liturgical reform. These tendencies offer significant help in elaborating his understanding of liturgical reform. He concentrates on people's ability to perform liturgical acts, which involve reacting to surrounding realities. He holds it is important that a person can think as a member of a community and not merely as an individual; that they can discover the connection between spiritual and material realities that are so important in the incarnation of the liturgy; and that they can discover that it is primarily the person who needs to be conformed to the liturgy and not the liturgy to the person. Of course, this description does not exclude any changes in the celebration of the liturgy. But we have seen that liturgical reform for Guardini is first of all formation: the formation of human beings that they might become capable of performing the liturgical act. This formation is not merely an intellectual explanation of everything that happens in the liturgy. It is instead a transformation whereby the human

being is enabled to live the liturgy and develop in personal prayer, meditation, use of the Scriptures and the religious interpretation of everyday life and personal existence.

Liturgical formation helps to bring all this about in order that the believer might partake in the life of Jesus Christ.

For Joseph Ratzinger the main goal of the liturgy is to conform human beings to Christ and to transform their whole life into liturgy. Life becomes liturgy when its main purpose is the glorification of God. This is the main purpose of liturgy as well. Therefore everything in the liturgy needs to be subordinated to this purpose. With these words Ratzinger expresses the view that there must be no human being at the center of the liturgical celebration, only God. This is the reason why liturgy cannot change radically and why Ratzinger uses the expression of hermeneutics of reform and criteria of organic development. These are the guarantees that the never-changing God can reach human hearts in his liturgy, which is celebrated in a way that reflects God's constancy.

Ratzinger does not criticize the conciliar liturgical reform, but instead judges that its implementation could not be successful because the nature of liturgy was given up. He also arrives at the conclusion that liturgical reform does not primarily mean ceremonial change, but that the human being needs to be formed in order to become completely conformed to Jesus Christ. We have discovered that Ratzinger uses the same term for liturgical reform as was used by Guardini, i.e. "formation." In explaining such a concept Ratzinger does not speak about the liturgical act itself, but emphasizes the priority of human transformation.

In my thesis I identified concrete criteria for the reform of the liturgy for both Guardini and Ratzinger. From Guardini's thought I extracted the following criteria: 1)

liturgical reform is formation; 2) it acknowledges the human person; 3) it operates at a communitarian level; 4) the objective character of liturgy needs to be maintained; 5) liturgical reform needs to concentrate on the liturgical act; and 5) the interconnectedness of certain elements, such as humans and things, spiritual and material, individual and communal, needs to be appreciated. Ratzinger's criteria are as follows: 1) in the process of liturgical reform one needs to have a clear understanding of the Church's faith; 2) it is important to acknowledge that the subject of the liturgy is Christ himself; 3) liturgy must be faithful to history and tradition and must apply the criteria of organic development; and 4) it is necessary to understand the nature of the liturgy and that liturgical reform is in essence formation of the human being.

I pointed out in my thesis that for Guardini the main purpose of liturgical formation is to make the human being capable of performing the liturgical act. Ratzinger, however, wants human beings to be capable of perceiving what liturgy has to offer. It seems that for Guardini formation is directed to helping people to act; while for Ratzinger it is making people capable of receiving. At a deeper level, Guardini and Ratzinger speak about similar realities when they explain the essence of liturgical reform. I affirm that the slight difference we can sense in their thinking derives primarily from the different viewpoints they adopt. Guardini looks at the liturgy from an anthropological viewpoint, while Ratzinger does so from a dogmatic one. In my vision Pius XII's change in the vision of the liturgy corresponds to the understanding of the liturgy of Joseph Ratzinger. Romano Guardini's idea, however, is closer to the theology of the liturgy as it was before *Mediator Dei*. Guardini and Ratzinger have both found the real essence of the liturgy in my opinion, even though they explain it through different concepts and

viewpoints. What is important for them is that liturgical reform is not merely planned and made, but that it is a process that meets theological, liturgical, historical and anthropological criteria. Even though it is realized by human beings and the Church, it is essential to look at the origin of every liturgical act, God himself, and to adjust our liturgy and ourselves to what he is and has to offer.

The question on the reform of the liturgy cannot remain at a merely theoretical level, but needs to be translated into the liturgical acts of everyday life. I pointed out that the simultaneous existence of two forms of the only Roman Rite cannot be a long-term solution, not only because of liturgical difficulties, but for theological and pastoral reasons as well. Probably the two forms will influence each other in a way that will be fruitful for both, but in the future the unity of the Roman Rite will be unavoidable. The most practical question, however, would be whether or not there is need for a reform of the conciliar liturgical reform. My position on the question is a careful one: it is necessary to think about the criticisms of those who emphasize that certain principles were applied wrongly after the Council. This cannot mean, however, that the other principles, such as formation and organic development, can be skipped over. A reform of the reform should be called, in the words of Ratzinger, a new liturgical awareness. It can happen only slowly, starting with the human being and not necessarily with liturgical elements and rites.

The question of the reform of the liturgy is a long term project that needs time, and the contribution of all the various theological and anthropological disciplines that have been explained in my work. My research covers only a small part of the question on the reform of the liturgy. It could be amplified with further research on several topics, such

as the concept of formation in the Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican Council; Christological and ecclesiological themes in both Guardini and Ratzinger; and the future of the Roman Rite. I hope that this thesis will make a modest contribution to knowledge of two great thinkers of the Catholic Church and their intellectual closeness, through which the reader might see their liturgical thinking in a more objective way, thus breaking down the wall of prejudice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

JOSEPH RATZINGER

Primary literature

- Benedetto XVI. “Una giusta ermeneutica per leggere e recepire il Concilio come grande forza di rinnovamento della Chiesa.” Pages 1018-32 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 1 (2005). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006.
- . “Nel canto noi possiamo sentire la presenza della liturgia celeste, un po’ della bellezza nella quale il Signore ci vuole comunicare la sua gioia.” Pages 1012-3 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 1 (2005). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006.
- . “L’amore che ricevete nella liturgia portatelo a tutti, specialmente dove vi accorgete che manca.” Pages 80-3 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 2/2 (2006). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007.
- . “Costruiamo insieme la casa di Dio nel mondo di oggi.” Pages 163-79 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 2/2 (2006). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007.
- . *Sacramentum Caritatis: Post Synodal Exhortation on the Eucharist*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 2007.
- . “Summorum pontificum: Lettera apostolica motu proprio data sull’uso della liturgia romana anteriore della riforma effettuata nel 1970.” Pages 20-4 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 3/2 (2007). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2008.
- . “Con grande fiducia: Lettera di accompagnamento alla lettera apostolica Summorum pontificum sull’uso della liturgia romana anteriore della riforma effettuata nel 1970.” Pages 25-9 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 3/2 (2007). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2008.
- . “La vera bellezza è la strada dell’umanesimo cristiano.” Pages 708-11 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 4/2 (2008). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009.

- . “La musica sacra aiuta a sfiorare la bellezza di Dio.” Pages 82-5 in *Insegnamenti di Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 5/1 (2009). Roma: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2010.
- . *Verbum Domini. Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2010.
- . “La liturgia rinnova la Chiesa.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (7 maggio 2011): 1, 7.
- . “Nella liturgia c'è la voce della chiesa.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (1 giugno 2011): 4.
- . “Ritorno al sacro.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (8-9 giugno 2012): 8.
- . “Dignità e coerenza nel rinnovamento liturgico.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (18-19 giugno 2012): 8.
- . “Il più bel ricordo del Concilio.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (9-10 luglio 2012): 7.
- . “La liturgia e servizio e partecipazione all'opera divina.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (27 settembre 2012): 8.
- . “La liturgia cristiana culto del cielo aperto a tutti.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (4 ottobre 2012): 8.
- . “Novità nella continuità.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (12 ottobre 2012): 12.
- . “L'intuizione di Papa Giovanni.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (13 ottobre 2012): 12.
- . “Il carpe diem del cristiano.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (28 gennaio 2013): 8.
- . “Al concilio pieno di entusiasmo e speranza.” *L'Osservatore Romano* (16 febbraio 2013): 4-5.
- Benedikt XVI. *Licht der Welt: Der Papst, die Kirche und die Zeichen der Zeit. Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Verlag Herder, 2010.
- . “Vom Auftrag der Theologie.” *Mitteilungen: Institut Papst Benedikt XVI*. Vol. 4. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer, Christian Schaller and Franz-Xaver Heibl. Regensburg: Verlag Schnell & Steiner, 2011.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. “Theologische Fragen auf dem II. Vatikanischen Konzil.” Pages 10-5 in *Protokoll der Dechanten-Konferenz vom 4-6.6.1963*. Münster, 1963.
- . *Ergebnisse und Probleme der dritten Konzilsperiode*. Köln: J. P. Bachem, 1965.

- . “Die Kirche nach dem Konzil.” *The Furrow* 18 (1967): 3-23.
- . “Ist die Eucharistie ein Opfer?” *Concilium* 3 (1967): 299-304.
- . “Glaube, Geschichte und Philosophie. Zum Echo auf Einführung in das Christentum.” *Hochland* 61 (1969): 533-43.
- . “Schlusswort.” *Hochland* 62 (1970): 157-9.
- , and Hans Urs von Balthasar. *Two Say Why. Why I Am Still a Christian. Why I Am Still in the Church.* Translated by J. Griffiths. London: Search Press; Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1971.
- . Lied des Glaubens. Predigt im Gottesdienst für hauptamtliche Kirchenmusiker in der Münchener Dreifaltigkeitskirche, 22.11.1978 in *MOK* Nr. 38 /23.11.1978
- . “Zur Frage nach der Struktur der liturgischen Feier.” *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift: Communio* 7 (1978): 488-97.
- . *Theologische Prinzipienlehre: Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie.* München: Erich Wewel Verlag, 1982.
- . “Theological Problems of Church Music.” Pages 214-22 in *Crux et cithara: Selected Essays on Liturgy and Sacred Music, Translated and Edited on the Occasion of the Seventieth Birthday of Johannes Overath.* Edited by Robert A. Skeris. Altötting: A. Coppenrath, 1983.
- . *Rapporto sulla fede: Vittorio Messori a colloquio con Joseph Ratzinger.* Cinisello Balsamo, Milano: Edizioni Paoline, 1985.
- . *Einführung in das Christentum.* München: Kösel, 1968.
- . “Von der Liturgie zur Christologie. Romano Guardinis theologischer Grundansatz und seine Aussagekraft.” Pages 121-44 in *Wege zur Wahrheit. Die bleibende Bedeutung von Romano Guardini.* Edited by Joseph Ratzinger. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985.
- . “Buchstabe und Geist des Zweiten Vatikanums in den Konzilsreden von Kardinal Frings.” in *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift: Communio* 16 (1987): 251-65.
- . *Der Wille der Väter: Geist und Beschlüsse des 2. Vatikanischen Konzils* (BR[F] Send.: 29.11.1990, <Prod./Archiv-Nr.=87714)

- . “L’intrépidité d’un vrai témoin.” Pages 6-8 in Klaus Gamber, *La réforme liturgique en question*. Le Barroux: Éditions Sainte-Madeleine, 1992.
- . *Das Fest des Glaubens. Versuche zur Theologie des Gottesdienstes*. Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1993.
- . Introduction to *Istruzione Donum Veritatis sulla vocazione ecclesiale del teologo*, by Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana: 1993.
- . *Wesen und Auftrag der Theologie: Versuche zu ihrer Ortsbestimmung im Disput der Gegenwart*. Einsiedeln, Freiburg: Johannes Verlag, 1993.
- . “The Meaning of Sunday.” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 21 (1994): 5-26.
- . Introduction to *The Lord*, by Romano Guardini. Washington, DC, Lanham MD: Regnery, 1996.
- . “Grußwort.” Pages 9-12 in *Die heilige Liturgie. Referate der „Internationalen Theologischen Sommerakademie 1997“ des Linzer Priesterkreises in Aigen/M*. Edited by F. Breid. Steyr: Ennsthaler Verlag, 1997.
- . *Salz der Erde: Christentum und katholische Kirche an der Jahrtausendwende: Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1997.
- . *Vom Wiederauffinden der Mitte: Grundorientierungen, Texte aus vier Jahrzehnte*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1997.
- . “Liturgia e potere.” *30 Giorni* 16, no. 12 (1998)
- . *Liturgie und Weltverantwortung: Vortrag beim Klerustreffen im Kölner Börsensaal am 26. Oktober 1998*. Köln: Presseamt des Erzbistums Köln, 1998.
- . *Unterschiedliche Liturgien - Ein Reichtum für die eine Kirche. Einführungsvortrag am 24. Oktober 1998 vor etwa 2500 Gläubigen im Hotel Ergife in Rom anläßl. der Wallfahrt von Priestern des „Instituts Christus König und Hoherpriester“ und der Priesterbruderschaft Sankt Petrus und des internationalen Verbandes Una Voce anläßl. derer Jubiläumswallfahrt nach Rom zum zehnjährigen Bestehen des Motu Proprio „Ecclesia Dei“* on <http://www.fssp.org/de/annivratz.htm>
- . *Aus meinem Leben. Erinnerungen 1927-1977*. München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2006.

- . *Bilder der Hoffnung: Wanderungen im Kirchenjahr*. Freiburg: Herder, 2000.
- . “Intervento del Cardinale Joseph Ratzinger sull’ecclesiologia della costituzione ‘Lumen Gentium’ al convegno internazionale sull’attuazione del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II promosso dal Comitato del Grande Giubileo dell’anno 2000, Domenica, 27 Febbraio 2000.” on http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000227_ratzinger-lumen-gentium_it.html
- . “Les dangers qui menacent la liturgie aujourd'hui. Un entretien pour La Croix.” *La Croix* (28 December 2001): 12-3.
- . “Um die Erneuerung der Liturgie. Antwort auf Reiner Kaczynski.” *Stimmen der Zeit* 219 (2001): 837-43.
- . “Cardinal Ratzinger on Why It's Not Time for Vatican III. Interview on 4 December 2002.” On Zenit, <http://www.zenit.org/article-5987?l=english>
- . *Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung*. Freiburg: Herder, 2002.
- . “‘Der Geist der Liturgie’ oder: die Treue zum Konzil. Antwort an Pater Gy.” *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 52 (2002): 111-5.
- . “Retrouver l’esprit de la liturgie.” Pages 43-58 in *Enquête sur L’Esprit de la liturgie*. Edited by Philippe Maxence. Paris: Éditions de L’Homme Nouveau, 2002.
- . *The Feeling of Things, the Contemplation of Beauty. Message of His Eminence Card. Joseph Ratzinger to the Communion and Liberation (CL) Meeting at Rimini (24-30 August 2002)* on http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20020824_ratzinger-cl-rimini_en.html
- . “The Great Mystery.” In *Inside the Vatican* (August-September 2002): 10-7.
- . *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens: Kirche als Communio*. Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich Verlag, 2002.
- . “40 Jahre Konstitution über die heilige Liturgie.” Rückblick und Vorblick. *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 53 (2003): 209-21.
- . “Assessment and Future Prospects.” Pages 145-53 in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*. Edited by Alcuin Reid. Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael’s Abbey Press, 2003.

- . “The Theology of the Liturgy.” Pages 18-31 in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger: Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*. Edited by Alcuin Reid. Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael’s Abbey Press, 2003.
- . “*The World Over: Cardinal Ratzinger Interview in 2003.*” on <http://www.ewtn.com/library/issues/ratzintv.htm>
- . “Versus Deum per Iesum Christum.” Pages 9-12 in Uwe Michael Lang, *Turning Towards The Lord. Orientation in Liturgical Prayer*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press 2004.
- . *Dogma und Verkündigung*. Donauwörth: Wewel, 2005.
- . *Gott ist uns nah. Eucharistie: Mitte des Lebens*. Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich Verlag, 2005.
- . *Gott und die Welt: Glauben und Leben in unserer Zeit: Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald*. München: Knauer, 2005.
- . *Grundsatzreden aus fünf Jahrzehnten*. Regensburg: Pustet Verlag, 2005.
- . *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn. Christusglaube und Liturgie in der Gegenwart*. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.
- . *Priester aus innerstem Herzen. Beiträge im Klerusblatt aus fünf Jahrzehnten*. München: Klerusblatt-Verlag 2007.
- . *Im Angesicht der Engel. Von der Musik im Gottesdienst*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder 2008.
- . “Kirche und Liturgie.” Pages 11-27 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 1. Edited by Franz-Xaver Heibl, Christian Schaller, and Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2008.
- . “Offenbarung und Heilsgeschichte nach der Lehre des heiligen Bonaventura. Die Geschichtstheologie des heiligen Bonaventura.” Pages 51-659 in Ratzinger, Joseph, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 2: *Offenbarungsverständnis und Geschichtstheologie Bonaventuras*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2009.
- . “Geleitwort zur koreanischen Ausgabe von Der Geist der Liturgie.” Pages 53-5 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 2. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer, Christian Schaller, and Franz-Xaver Heibl. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2009.

- . “Kosmische Liturgie.” Pages 31-5 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 2. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer, Christian Schaller, and Franz-Xaver Heibl. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2009.
- . *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009.
- . “Anmerkung zur Frage der Zelebrationsrichtung.” Pages 463-8 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Das gottesdienstliche Leben in den Gemeinden 15 Jahre nach dem Konzil. Predigt im Dom zu Fulda zum Abschluß der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz am 27.9.1979.” Pages 627-32 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Die organische Entwicklung der Liturgie. Rezension des Buches von Alcuin Reid, OSB: *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*.” Pages 713-8 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz.” Pages 197-214 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Eucharistie und Mission.” Pages 397-423 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Gestalt und Gehalt der eucharistischen Feier.” Pages 359-82 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Homo ludens: Theologisch-anthropologische Überlegungen zu Spiel, Kult und Liturgie.” Pages 11-27 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 3. Edited by Franz-Xaver Heibl, Christian Schaller, and Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2010.
- . “Kirchenmusikberuf als liturgischer und pastoraler Dienst.” Pages 607-10 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Réponse à la Lettre ouverte d’Olivier Bauer.” Pages 683-94 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.

- . “Theologie der Liturgie.” Pages 639-56 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Zum Begriff des Sakraments.” Pages 215-32 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Zur theologischen Grundlegung der Kirchenmusik.” Pages 501-26 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Theologie der Liturgie*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2010.
- . “Volk und Haus Gottes in Augustins Lehre von der Kirche.” Pages 41-418 in Joseph Ratzinger, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1: *Volk und Haus Gottes in Augustins Lehre von der Kirche*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2011.
- . “Cardinal Ratzinger’s Remarks Regarding the Lefebvre Schism” on <http://www.catholicculture.org/library/view.cfm?recnum=3032>

ROMANO GUARDINI

Primary literature

- Guardini, Romano. “Über die systematische Methode in der Liturgiewissenschaft.” *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 1 (1921): 97-108.
- . *Die Lehre des Heil. Bonaventura von der Erlösung: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und zum System der Erlösungslehre*. Düsseldorf: L. Schwann, 1921.
- . “Das Objektive im Gebetsleben. Zu P.M. Festugières «Liturgie catholique».” *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 1 (1921): 117-25.
- . *In gloria sanctorum. Liturgische Texte*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald-Verlag, 1928.
- . *Briefe über Selbstbildung*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1930.
- . *Heilige Zeit. Liturgische Texte aus Missale und Brevier*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald-Verlag, 1931.
- . *Vom Leben des Glaubens*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald-Verlag, 1935.
- . *Von heiligen Zeichen*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald Verlag, 1936.
- . *Das Gebet des Herrn*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald-Verlag, 1948.

- . “Die Liturgie und der geistige Situation unserer Zeit.” in *Eucharistiefeyer am Sonntag. Reden und Verhandlungen des Ersten deutschen liturgischen Kongresses*. Edited by Johannes Wagner and Damascus Zähringer. Trier: Paulinus, 1951.
- . *Briefe vom Comer See*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1953.
- . *Das Jahr des Herrn: Ein Betrachtungsbuch*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald-Verlag, 1953.
- . *Vorschule des Betens*. Einsiedeln, Zürich, Köln: Benziger, 1954.
- . *Der Rosenkranz unserer Lieben Frau*. Würzburg: Werkbund-Verlag, 1956.
- . “Die liturgische Erfahrung und die Epiphanie.” in Romano Guardini, *Die Sinne und die religiöse Erkenntnis*. Würzburg: Werkbund Verlag, 1958.
- . *Besinnung vor der Feier der Heiligen Messe*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald Verlag, 1961.
- . “Der Zusammenhang des christlichen Gebetslebens in unser Gottesdienst.” Pages 85-94 in *Unser Gottesdienst: Überlegungen und Anregungen: Ein Werkbuch*. Edited by Alfons Kirchgässner. Freiburg: Herder, 1961.
- . “Die mystagogische Predigt.” Pages 313-22 in *Unser Gottesdienst: Überlegungen und Anregungen: Ein Werkbuch*. Edited by Alfons Kirchgässner. Freiburg: Herder, 1961.
- . *Systembildende Elemente in der Theologie Bonaventuras: Die Lehren vom Lumen Mentis, von der Gradatio Entium und der Influentia Sensus et Motus*. Studia et Documenta Franciscana, vol. 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.
- . *Der Kreuzweg unseres Herrn und Heilandes*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald-Verlag, 1967.
- . *Berichte über mein Leben. Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1984.
- . *Der Gegensatz: Versuche zu einer Philosophie des Lebendig-Konkreten*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1985.
- . *Vom Sinn der Kirche: Fünf Vorträge. Die Kirche des Herrn: Meditationen über Wesen und Auftrag der Kirche*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1990.

- . *Liturgie und liturgische Bildung*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1992.
- . *Vom Geist der Liturgie*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1997.
- . *Predigten zum Kirchenjahr*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1998.

Secondary literature

- Aillet, Marc. *The Old Mass and the New. Explaining the Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum of Pope Benedict XVI*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2010.
- Aldazábal, José. “La liturgia es ante todo obra de Dios.” *Phase* 40 (2000): 181-6.
- Allen, John L. *Cardinal Ratzinger: The Vatican’s Enforcer of the Faith*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Álvarez Gonzalez, Luis Fernando. “Condiciones personales para la participación activa en la liturgia. A propósito del nº 55 de Sacramentum Caritatis.” *Isidorianum* 41 (2012): 121-132.
- Alzati, C. “Duo usus unici ritus romani: L’orizzonte ecclesiologicalo dell’intervento di Benedetto XVI.” in *Rivista liturgica* 94 (2007): 608-11.
- Angenendt, Arnold. *Liturgik und Historik: Gab es eine organische Liturgie-Entwicklung? Questiones Disputatae 189*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2001.
- . “Lobpreis der Alten Liturgie?” *Stimmen der Zeit* 228 (2010): 651-62.
- Anon. *Das Motu proprio „Summorum Pontificum“ und seine Diskussion: Im Kontext des Liturgieverständnisses von Joseph Ratzinger*. München: Grin Verlag, 2010.
- Ardui, Johan. “Cardinal Ratzinger and Rock Music: Is Conversation Possible?” Pages 893-906 in *Theology and Conversation: Towards a Relational Theology*. Edited by Jacques Haers. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.
- Arinze, Francis. “Active Participation in the Sacred Liturgy.” Pages 15-26 in Francis Arinze, Francis Eugene George, Jorge A. Medina Estévez and George Pell. *Cardinal Reflections: Active Participation and the Liturgy*. Chicago, IL: Hillenbrand Books, 2005.

- . “Some Liturgical Insights from Joseph Ratzinger.” *Notitiae* 493-494 (2007): 543-55.
- Arnau-García, Ramón. “Leyendo al Cardenal Ratzinger. Nota sobre ‘El espíritu de la liturgia. Una introducción’.” *Anales Valentinus* 54 (2001): 399-407.
- Arnold, Jochen. “Nüchterne Trunkenheit in liturgicis – eine evangelische Antwort auf Joseph Ratzingers Theologie der Liturgie.” Pages 82-104 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 2. Edited by Franz-Xaver Heibl, Christian Schaller and Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2009.
- Arocena Solano, Félix M. “Lenguaje simbólico en las primeras celebraciones pontificias de Benedicto XVI.” *Phase* 45 (2005): 311-7.
- Augé, Matthias. “Due «forme» per uno stesso rito?” *Rivista liturgica* 96 (2009): 687-95.
- Ayuso-Torres, Miguel. “Raising Questions about the Liturgical Reform.” Pages 124-9 in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference.* Edited by Alcuin Reid. Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael’s Abbey Press, 2003.
- Bagnasco, Angelo. “Teologia della liturgia. Presentazione del volume dedicato alla liturgia nell’opera omnia di Benedetto XVI.” *Rivista liturgica* 98 (2011): 335-41.
- Baccini, G. “Balancing Liturgical Form and Reform: An Interview with Archbishop Piero Marini.” *L’Osservatore Romano Weekly Edition in English* 41 (14 May 2008): 10.
- Baldovin, John F. “Klaus Gamber and the Post-Vatican II Reform of the Roman Liturgy.” *Studia Liturgica* 33 (2003): 223-39.
- . “Cardinal Ratzinger as Liturgical Critic.” Pages 211-27 in *Studia liturgica diversa: Studies in Church Music and Liturgy. Essays in Honor of Paul F. Bradshaw.* Edited by Maxwell E. Johnson and Paul Bradshaw. Portland: OR, 2004.
- . *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.
- . “The Uses of Liturgical History.” *Worship* 82 (2008): 2-18.
- . “Sacrosanctum Concilium and the Reform of the Liturgy: Forty-Five Years Later.” *Studia Liturgica* 39 (2009): 145-57.
- . “Reflections on Summorum Pontificum.” *Worship* 83 (2009): 98-112.

- . “Idols and Icons: Reflections on the Current State of Liturgical Reform.” *Worship* 84 (2010): 386-402.
- Barth, Heinz-Lothar. *Hermeneutik der Kontinuität oder des Bruches? Aspekte der Theologie Papst Benedikts XVI*. Stuttgart: Sarto Verlag, 2012.
- Bauer, Olivier. “Lettre ouverte à propos de L’esprit de la liturgie.” *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 135 (2003): 241-51.
- Bautz, Friedrich Wilhelm. “Guardini, Romano.” *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 2. Hamm: Bautz, 1976.
- Beauduin, Lambert. *La piété liturgique*. Montreal: Fides, 1947.
- Bendiscioli, Mario, “L’ora della liturgia. Romano Guardini e il movimento liturgico in Germania.” Pages 489-506 in Università cattolica del Sacro Cuore, *Miscellanea Carlo Figini*. Edited by Giovanni Colombo, Antonio Rimoldi and Ambrogio Valsecchi. Venegono Inferiore, Varese: Editrice La Scuola Cattolica, 1964.
- Berg, John. “Das Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum und die Fraternitas Sacerdotalis Sancti Petri.” Pages 217-9 in *Mit Maria – auf Christus schauen! Festschrift für Papst Benedikt XVI*. Edited by Gabriela Mihlig and Alexander Pytlik. Graz: Leopold Stocker Verlag, 2008.
- Biccini, G. “Interview with Cardinal Darió Castrillón Hoyos: A two-fold use of the one Roman rite.” *L’Osservatore Romano Weekly Edition in English* 41 (9 April 2008): 4.
- Birnbaum, Walter. *Die deutsche katholische liturgische Bewegung*. Tübingen: Katzmann-Verlag, 1966.
- Blanco, Pablo. “Liturgia y Eucaristía en la obra de Joseph Ratzinger.” *Scripta Theologica* 38 (2006): 103-130.
- Blanco Sarto, Pablo. “Logos. Joseph Ratzinger y la historia de una palabra.” *Límite* 1/14 (2006): 57-86.
- . “El corazón de la fe cristiana. Una aproximación a la teología litúrgica de Joseph Ratzinger.” *Phase* 279 (2007): 183-202.
- . *La teología de Joseph Ratzinger: Una introducción*. Madrid: Ediciones Palabra, 2011.
- . “La teología di Joseph Ratzinger. Argomenti centrali.” *Rivista teologica di Lugano* 16 (2011): 293-313.

- Blázquez Pérez, Ricardo. "Liturgia y Teología en Joseph Ratzinger." Pages 295-319 in *El pensamiento de Joseph Ratzinger: Teólogo y Papa*. Edited by Santiago Madrigal. Madrid: San Pablo, Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2009.
- Boeve, Lieven. "« La vraie réception de Vatican II n'a pas encore commencé » : Joseph Ratzinger, revelation et autorité de Vatican II." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 85 (2009): 305-39.
- . "Interpreting the Second Vatican Council." Pages 257-79 in *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey*. Edited by Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion. London-New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Bommer, Joseph. "Romano Guardini: Hinführung zur Liturgie" Pages 4-44 in *Romano Guardini: Entdeckung der Kirche (Rothenfelser Schriften)* 1975.
- Bonaccorso, Giorgio. "La forza simbolizzante della liturgia." *Rivista Liturgica* 98 (2011): 245-54.
- Bonagura, David G. "The Future of the Roman Rite: Reading Benedict in the Light of Ratzinger." *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 228-46.
- . "Logos to Son in the Christology of Joseph Ratzinger/Benedict XVI." *New Blackfriars* 93 (2012): 475-88.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Architecture et liturgie*. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- Braga, C. "La Sacrosanctum concilium nei lavori della Commissione preparatoria." *Notitiae* 20 (1984): 87-134.
- Bretschneider, W. "Zweifelhafte Begeisterung. Zum Gebrauch der römischen Liturgie in der Gestalt vor der Reform Papst Paul VI." *Musik und Kirche* 78 (2008): 16-9.
- Brüske, Gunda. "Spiel oder Anbetung? Romano Guardini und Joseph Ratzinger über den Sinn der Liturgie." Pages 91-110 in *Der Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009.
- Bubmann, Peter. "Papst Benedikt XVI. als Musiktheologe." *Musik und Kirche* 75 (2005): 292-93.
- Bugnini, Annibale. *La riforma liturgica*. Roma: CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1983.
- Bulzacchelli, Richard H. "The Εσχρατος Αδάμ and the Meaning of Sacrifice in the Theology of Joseph Ratzinger / Benedict XVI." *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 51-64.

- Burch Brown, Frank. "On Not Giving Short Shrift to the Arts in Liturgy: The Testimony of Pope Benedict XVI (Cardinal Ratzinger)." *Arts* 17 (2005): 13-19.
- Busani, Giuseppe. "I compiti del movimento liturgico: la proposta di Romano Guardini" Pages 83-138 in *Liturgia: temi e autori*. Edited by Franco Brovelli. Roma: CLV – Edizioni Liturgiche, 1990.
- Bux, Nicola. *La riforma di Benedetto XVI. La liturgia tra innovazione e tradizione*. Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 2008.
- Carr, Ephrem. "Sacrosanctum Concilium and Its Consequences: The Reform of the Liturgy." *Questions Liturgiques* 92 (2011): 183-94.
- Casel, Odo. "Glaube, Gnosis und Mysterium." *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 15 (1935): 155-305.
- . *Das christliche Kult Mysterium*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1960.
- . *Mysterientheologie: Ansatz und Gestalt*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1986.
- Cassetti, C. "Liturgische Versöhnung. Ein Kommentar zum Motu proprio Summorum pontificum." *Theologisches* 37 (2007): 267-8.
- Catela, Alceste. "La dimensione educativa della liturgia." *Rivista Liturgica* 98 (2011): 209-15.
- Cattaneo, Enrico. "La tradizione liturgica nella Chiesa: uno strumento vivo." *Rivista Liturgica* 95 (2008): 19-34.
- Centurelli, Antonio. *L'eucaristia nel pensiero di Joseph Ratzinger/Benedetto XVI*. Torino: Elledici, 2011.
- Clark, Anthony E. "Worshipping at the Feet of the Lord (April 28, 2005)." On http://www.ignatiusinsight.com/features2005/print2005/clark_benedictliturgy.html
- Clifford, Catherine E., *Decoding Vatican II. Interpretation and Ongoing Reception*. New York / Mahwah, NY: Paulist Press 2014.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. *Instruction on the Ecclesial Vocation of the Theologian*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1990.
- Corkery, James. *Joseph Ratzinger's Theological Ideas: Wise Cautions and Legitimate Hopes*. New York: Paulist Press, 2009.

- Corkery, Jim. "Joseph Ratzinger's Theological Ideas 7. Wise Cautions and Legitimate Hopes." *Doctrine & Life* 57/9 (2007): 2-21.
- Crescimanno, Claudio. *La riforma della riforma liturgica. Ipotesi per un "nuovo" rito della messa sulle tracce del pensiero di Joseph Ratzinger*. Verona: Fede & Cultura, 2009.
- Crouan, Denis. *The Liturgy after Vatican II: Collapsing or Resurgent?* Translated by Mark Sebanc. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2001.
- . *The History and the Future of the Roman Liturgy*. Translated by Michael Miller. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- De Clerk, Paul. "Lex orandi, lex credendi: The Original Sense and Historical Avatars of an Equivocal Adage." *Studia Liturgica* 24 (1994): 178-200.
- . "Theology of the Liturgy, 'for the Glory of God and the Salvation of the World': Keynote Address." *Studia Liturgica* 30 (2000): 14-31.
- . "La réforme liturgique: ce qui reste à faire." *Questiones liturgique* 91 (2010): 64-75.
- . "La constitution Sacrosanctum Concilium: Réflexions sur sa reception dans le long terme." *Questions liturgiques* 91 (2010): 142-55.
- Debuyst, Frédéric. *L'entrée en liturgie. Introduction à l'œuvre liturgique de Romano Guardini*. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- De Gaál, Emery. *The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI: The Christocentric Shift*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Delhayé, Philippe. "Pour une évaluation du Concile Vatican II. Le témoignage du Cardinal Ratzinger." *Esprit et vie* 95 (1985): 577-88.
- Dettloff, Werner. "Romano Guardini (1885-1968)." Pages 318-30 in *Klassiker der Theologie*, vol. 2. *Von Richard Simon bis Dietrich Bonhoeffer*. Edited by Heinrich Fries and Georg Kretschmar. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1983.
- Dirks, Walter. "Guardini als Führer zur Liturgie." *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1960): 202-10.
- Dobszay, László. "Ordo Antiquus: The 'Tridentine' Movement and the 'Reform of the Reform'." *Sacred Music* 128/3 (2001): 11-30.

- . “Perspectives on an Organic Development of the Liturgy.” *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 18-27.
- . *The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite*. London, New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Donini, Alberto. “Gregorian Chant in the Liturgy according to Joseph Ratzinger.” Pages 80-92 in *Benedict XVI and Beauty in Sacred Music: Proceedings of the Third Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2010*. Edited by Janet Elaine Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2012.
- Drew, Mark. “The Spirit or the Letter? Vatican II and Liturgical Reform.” Pages 49-67 in *Beyond the Prosaic*. Edited by Stratford Caldecott. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Driscoll, Jeremy. “Romans 12:1-2. Logiké Latreia in Exegesis and Liturgy.” *Ecclesia Orans* 26 (2009): 7-37.
- Duffy, Eamon. “Benedict XVI and the Spirit of the Liturgy.” *Doctrine & Life* 55/10 (2005): 30-50.
- . “Benedikt XVI. und die Liturgie.” *Inside the Vatican. Schönheit und Drama der Weltkirche* 4 (November 2006): 34-9.
- . “Benedict XVI and the Eucharist.” *New Blackfriars* 88. (2007):
- . “The New Pope and the Liturgy.” Pages 1-9 in *Ever Directed towards the Lord. The Love of God in the Liturgy of the Eucharist Past, Present and Hoped For*. Edited by Uwe Michael Lang. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Dulles, Avery. “From Ratzinger to Benedict.” *First Things* 160 (2006): 24-9.
- Dürig, Walter. “Zur Interpretation des Axioms «Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi».” Pages 226-36 in *Veritati Catholicae: Festschrift für Leo Scheffczyk zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Anton Ziegenaus, Franz Courth and Philipp Schäfer. Aschaffenburg: Pattloch Verlag, 1985.
- “Editorial on praying ad orientem and versus populum.” *Notitiae* 29 (1993): 245-9.
- Egenter, Nicolas. Review of Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung*. *Irénikon* 78 (2005): 373-5.
- Ellingsen, Mark. “Joseph Ratzinger (1927-): How Conservative Is Benedict XVI?” *Theology Today* 62 (2005): 388-98.

- Elliott, Peter J. "Benedict XVI and the Liturgy: Vision, Teaching, Action." Paper presented at Saint Mary of Victories Church. St Louis, MO, September 29, 2012.
- Engelmann, Henri and Ferrier, Francis. *Introduzione a Romano Guardini*. Giornale di teologia 22. Translated by Giuseppe Bugatti. Brescia: Queriniana, 1968.
- Extraordinary Synod – 1985, The*. Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1985.
- Faber, Eva-Maria. "Das Kirchenbild Guardinis: Impulse und Grenzen." Pages 68-80 in *Konservativ mit Blick nach Vorn. Versuche zu Romano Guardini*. Edited by Arno Schilson. Würzburg: Echter, 1994.
- Fagerberg, David W. *Theologia prima. What is Liturgical Theology?* Chicago, IL, Mundelein: Hillenbrand Books, 2004.
- Faggioli, Massimo. *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Colledgeville, MI: The Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Falsini, Rinaldo. "Lo spirito della liturgia: da R. Guardini a J. Ratzinger." *Rivista di pastorale liturgica* 39 (2001): 3-7.
- Farnés, Pere. "Una obra importante sobre liturgia que debe leerse en su verdadero contexto." *Phase* 42 (2002) Nr. 247: 55-76.
- Federer, Klaus. *Liturgie und Glaube. «Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi» (Tiro Prosper von Aquitanien): Eine theologische Untersuchung*. Paradosis: Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur und Theologie 4. Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1950.
- Ferrone, Rita. "Anti-Jewish Elements in the Extraordinary Form." *Worship* 84 (2010): 498-513.
- Folsom, Cassian. "The Hermeneutics of Sacrosanctum Concilium: Development of a Method and its Application." *Antiphon* 8 (2003): 2-9.
- . "The Roman Missal in *Summorum pontificum*." Pages 124-37 in *Benedict XVI and the Roman Missal: Proceedings of the Fourth Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2011*. Edited by Janet Elaine Rutherford and James O'Brien. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2013.
- Galvão, Henrique Noroña. "Il mistero della chiesa nella teologia di Joseph Ratzinger." *Rivista Internazionale di Teologia e Cultura: Communio* 226 (ottobre-dicembre) (2010): 26-33.

- Gamber, Klaus. *Liturgie übermorgen: Gedanken über die Geschichte und Zukunft des Gottesdienstes*. Freiburg: Herder, 1966.
- . *Ritus modernus: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Liturgiereform*. Studia Patristica et liturgica 4. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1972.
- . *Gemeinsame Erbe: Liturgische Neubesinnung aus dem Geist der frühen Kirche*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1980.
- . *Alter und neuer Messritus: Der theologische Hintergrund der Liturgiereform*. Studia Patristica et liturgica 10. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1983.
- . *The Reform of the Roman liturgy: Its Problems and Background*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press; Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993.
- Garrigues, Jean-Miguel. “La liturgie à Vatican II. L’Église comme sujet intégral de la liturgie.” *Revue Thomiste* 110 (2010): 293-306.
- Gassmann, Michael. “Der Geist und die Sinne. Zur Theologie der Kirchenmusik Joseph Ratzingers.” *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift Communio* 41 (2012): 341-7.
- Geffroy, Christophe. *Benoît XVI et ‘la paix liturgique’*. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- George, Francis Eugene. “Commemorating Sacrosanctum Concilium Anniversary Address: The Foundations of Liturgical Reform.” Pages 45-58 in Francis Arinze, Francis Eugene George, Jorge A. Medina Estévez and George Pell. *Cardinal Reflections: Active Participation and the Liturgy*. Chicago, IL: Hillenbrand Books, 2005.
- Gerhards, Albert. “Romano Guardini als Prophet des Liturgischen. Eine Rückbesinnung in Postmodern Zeit.” Pages 140-53 in Schuster, Hermann Josef, *Guardini Weiterdenken*. Berlin: Guardini Stiftung, 1993.
- . “Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Kardinal Ratzingers neuer Einführung in den christlichen Gottesdienst.” *Herder Korrespondenz* 54 (2000): 263-8.
- . “Die ‘alte’ und die ‘neue’ Messe. Versuch einer Sondierung der Positionen“ *Gottesdienst* 41 (2007): 57-9.
- . “Die Sorge der Päpste. Das Motu Proprio Benedikts XVI zur Wiedermulassung der alten Liturgie.” *Herder-Korrespondenz* 61 (2007): 398-403.
- . *Ein Ritus, zwei Formen: Die Richtlinie Papst Benedikts XVI. zur Liturgie*. Freiburg: Herder, 2008.

- Gerl, Hanna-Barbara. "Durchblick auf das Ganze. Romano Guardinis Werk in seiner Entfaltung" Pages 32-69 in *Wege zur Wahrheit. Die bleibende Bedeutung von Romano Guardini*. Edited by Joseph Ratzinger. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985.
- . *Romano Guardini 1885-1968: Leben und Werk*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1985.
- Gerl-Falkovitz, Hanna. *Romano Guardini: Konturen des Lebens und Spuren des Denkens*. Kevelaer: Topos plus Verlagsgemeinschaft, 2005.
- Gherardini, Brunero. "Per una pace liturgica." *Divinitas* 55 (2012): 24-34.
- . "Riforma della riforma." *Divinitas* 55 (2012): 225-35.
- Giampietro, Nicola. *The Development of the Liturgical Reform: As Seen by Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli from 1948 to 1970*. Fort Collins, CO: Roman Catholic Books, 2010.
- Giraud, C. "La liturgia nel solco della tradizione. Riflessioni in margine al motu proprio Summorum pontificum." *Rivista Liturgica* 95 (2008): 253-73.
- Glendinning, Chad. "Adopting Pre-Conciliar Liturgical Practices in the Celebration of the Ordinary Form of the Mass." Pages 61-7 in *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2009*. Edited by Sharon A. Euart and Siobhan M. Verbeek. Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America, 2009.
- . "Summorum Pontificum and the Use of the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite: A Canonical Analysis in Light of the Current Liturgical Law." PhD Diss. Saint Paul University, Ottawa, 2010.
- . "The Significance of the Liturgical Reforms Prior to the Second Vatican Council in Light of Summorum Pontificum." *Studia canonica*, 44 (2010): 293-342.
- . "Was the 1962 Missale Romanum Abrogated? A Canonical Analysis in Light of Summorum Pontificum." *Worship* 85 (2011): 15-37.
- Goyret, Philip. "Aspetti ecclesiologici nel primo capitolo della Sacrosanctum Concilium" *Ecclesia Orans* 26 (2009): 231-40.
- Gregur, Josip. "Fleischwerdung des Wortes – Wortwerdung des Fleisches. Liturgie als *logike latreia* bei Joseph Ratzinger." Pages 46-76 in *Der Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009.

- Gribbin, Anselm J. *Pope Benedict XVI and the Liturgy: Understanding Recent Liturgical Developments*. Leominster, UK: Gracewing, 2011.
- Grillo, Andrea. *La nascita della liturgia nel XX secolo. Saggio sul rapporto tra movimento liturgico e (post-) modernità*. Assisi: Cittadella, 2003.
- . “Ende der Liturgiereform? Das Motuproprio Summorum pontificum.” *Stimmen der Zeit* 225 (2007): 730-40.
- . “Eine Bilanz des Motu Proprio ‚Summorum Pontificum‘. Vier Paradoxien und eine vergessene Zielsetzung.” *Concilium* 45 (2009): 215-21.
- Guéranger, Prosper. *Institution liturgiques*, 4. vols. Paris: Société Générale de Librairie Catholique, 1885.
- Gurtner, Michael. *Reflexionen zur Theologie der Liturgie: Liturgie als Vorwegnahme des Himmels auf Erden*. Aadorf: Benedetto Verlag, 2009.
- . Rechte und Pflichten nach Summorum Pontificum. Ein liturgierechtliches Vademecum. Place of publication not indicated: Benedetto Verlag, 2012.
- Gy, Pierre-Marie. “L’Esprit de la liturgie du Cardinal Ratzinger est-il fidèle au Concile ou en reaction contre?” *La Maison-Dieu* 229 (2002): 171-8.
- . *The Reception of Vatican II Liturgical Reforms in the Life of the Church*. The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology 2003 (34). Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2003.
- Hahn, Scott. *Covenant and Communion. The Biblical Theology of Pope Benedict XVI*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009.
- Hahnenberg, Edward P. *A Concise Guide to the Documents of Vatican II*. Cincinnati, OH: St Anthony Messenger Press, 2007.
- Häring, Hermann. *Theologie und Ideologie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 2001.
- Harrison, Brian W. “The Postconciliar Eucharistic Liturgy: Planning a ‘Reform of the Reform’.” Pages 151-93 in Thomas M. Kocik, *The Reform of the Reform? A Liturgical Debate: Reform or Return*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2003.
- Hastetter, Michaela Christine. “Liturgie – Brücke zum Mysterium. Grundlinien des Liturgieverständnisses Benedikts XVI.” Pages 131-50 in *Symphonie des Glaubens: junge Münchener Theologen im Dialog mit Joseph Ratzinger/Benedikt XVI*. Edited by Michaela Christine Hastetter, Christoph Ohly and Georgios Vlachonis. St. Ottilien: Eos, 2007.

- Häußling, Angelus A. "Review of Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger." *Das Fest des Glaubens. Versuche zur Theologie des Gottesdienstes. Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 24 (1982): 61-3.
- . "Wie Maria verehren? Erwägungen eines Liturgiewissenschaftlers anlässlich einer Feststellung Joseph Ratzingers." Pages 231-41 in *Theologie und Leben: Festgabe für Georg Söll zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Anton Bodem. Roma: LAS, 1983.
- . "Der Geist der Liturgie: Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation." *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 43/44 (2001): 362-95.
- . "Kult und Reflexion. Joseph Ratzinger als Liturgietheologe." Pages 12-25 in *Der Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009.
- Hauke, Manfred. "The 'basic structure' (*Grundgestalt*) of the Eucharistic celebration according to Joseph Ratzinger." Pages 70-106 in *Benedict XVI and the Roman Missal: Proceedings of the Fourth Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2011*. Edited by Janet Elaine Rutherford and James O'Brien. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2013.
- Hauerland, Winfried. "Ein Ritus in zwei Ausdrucksformen. Hintergründe und Perspektiven zur Liturgiefeier nach dem Motu proprio ‚Summorum Pontificum‘." *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 58 (2008): 179-203.
- Heibl, Franz-Xaver. "Theologische Denker als Mitarbeiter der Wahrheit, Romano Guardini und Papst Benedikt." Pages 77-102 in *Symphonie des Glaubens: junge Münchener Theologen im Dialog mit Joseph Ratzinger/Benedikt XVI*. Edited by Michaela Christine Hastetter, Christoph Ohly and Georgios Vlachonis. St. Ottilien: Eos, 2007.
- Heim, Maximilian. "Konziliare Streitflichter auf die Theologie Joseph Ratzingers/Papst Benedicts XVI." Pages 50-58 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 4. Edited by Franz-Xaver Heibl, Christian Schaller and Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2011.
- Henrich, Franz. *Die Bünde katholischer Jugendbewegung: ihre Bedeutung für die liturgische und eucharistische Erneuerung*. München: Kösel, 1968.
- Henrich, Franz. "Leben, Persönlichkeit und Charisma Romano Guardinis." Pages 32-69 in *Wege zur Wahrheit. Die bleibende Bedeutung von Romano Guardini*. Edited by Joseph Ratzinger. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985.

- Heinz, A. "Aus Sorge um die Einheit. Das Motu Proprio ‚Summorum Pontificum‘ - eine Einladung zu innerkirchlicher Toleranz." *Klerusblatt* 87 (2007): 193-6.
- Hill, Roland. "A Chat with Ratzinger." *Sacred Music* 124 (1997): 18-20.
- Hitchcock, Helen Hull. "Pope Benedict XVI and the 'Reform of the Reform'." Pages 70-87 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*. Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- Hitchcock, James. "Continuity and Disruption in the Liturgy: A Cultural Approach." Pages 88-97 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*. Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- Hofmann, Peter. *Benedikt XVI. Einführung in sein theologisches Denken*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009.
- Hoping, Helmut. "Gemeinschaft mit Christus. Christologie und Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger." *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift: Communio* 35 (2006): 558-72.
- . "Kult und Reflexion: Joseph Ratzinger als Liturgiethologe." Pages 12-25 in *Der Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009.
- Hughes, Kathleen. "Romano Guardini's View of Liturgy: A Lens for Our Time." Pages 73-85 *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the Sacred in a Modern World*. Edited by Robert A. Krieg. Chicago, IL: Liturgy Training Publications, 1995.
- Hwang, Alexander Y. *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine*. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2009.
- Ivanov, Vladimir. "Der Geist der Liturgie von Joseph Ratzinger im Lichte der orthodoxen Theologie." *Orthodoxes Forum* 21 (2007): 141-52.
- Jeffery, Peter, Rita Ferrone, Joseph A. Komonchak, and Bernard P. Prusak. "The Old Rite Returns." *Commonweal* 134, no. 14 (2007): 10-9.
- Join-Lambert, Arnaud. "Richesses de Vatican II à (re)découvrir." *Questiones liturgiques* 91 (2010): 42-63.
- Joncas, Jan Michael. "Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics: A Review Article." *Worship* 85 (2011): 147-55.

- Johnson, Cuthbert. *Prosper Gueranger (1805-1875): A Liturgical Theologian. An Introduction to his Liturgical Writings and Work*. Studia Anselmiana 89. Roma: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1984.
- Joseph, Abitya. *The Theology of the Liturgy by Pope Benedict XVI. The Eucharist: Centre of all Liturgies*. Saarbrücken: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012.
- Jounel, Pierre. "Implementing the Liturgy Constitution." *Doctrine and Life* 15 (1965): 88-103.
- . "Principles of Liturgical Reform." *Doctrine and Life* 15 (1965): 138-55.
- . "Genèse et théologie de la constitution Sacrosanctum concilium." *La Maison-Dieu* 155 (1983): 7-29.
- Kaczynski, Reiner. "Toward the Reform of the Liturgy." Pages 189-257 in *History of Vatican II*, vol. 3. Edited by Giuseppe Alberigo. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002.
- . "Angriff auf die Liturgiekonstitution? Anmerkungen zu einer neuen Übersetzer-Instruktion." *Stimmen der Zeit* 219 (2001): 651-68.
- . "Theologischer Kommentar zur Konstitution über die heilige Liturgie Sacrosanctum Concilium." Pages 1-227 in *Herder Theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, vol. 2. Edited by Peter Hünemann and Bernd Hilberath. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 2004.
- Kaes, Dorothee. *Theologie im Anspruch von Geschichte und Wahrheit. Zur Hermeneutik Joseph Ratzingers*. St. Ottilien: E-os Verlag, 1997.
- Kaiser, Matthias. *Die zwei Formen des einen römischen Messritus: Liturgie/Motu proprio/Alte und Neue Messe*. München: Grin Verlag, 2008.
- Kasper, Walter. "Das Wesen des Christlichen." *Theologische Revue* 3 (1969): 182-8.
- . "Theorie und Praxis innerhalb einer theologia crucis: Antwort auf Joseph Ratzingers Glaube, Geschichte und Philosophie. Zum Echo auf Einführung in das Christentum." *Hochland* 62 (1970): 152-7.
- Kiczek, Steven A. "Pope Benedict XVI's Summorum Pontificum: Reconciling Conflicting Values." *Journal of Religious & Theological Information* 8 (2009): 37-64.

- Kirchgessner, Bernhard. "Ein Fest, in dem das Große auf uns zutritt": Mosaiksteine einer Theologie der Liturgie Joseph Ratzingers - Papst Benedikt XVI. Passau: Bischöfliches Seelsorgeamt, 2011.
- Kirchner, Hubert. "Review of Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith. Approaches to a Theology of the Liturgy*." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 113 (1988): 286. "
- Kissler, Alexander. "Am Scheideweg: Benedikt XVI. und das Christentum des 21. Jahrhunderts." *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift: Communio* 35 (2006): 623-36.
- Kleiber, Hansruedi. *Glaube und religiöse Erfahrung bei Romano Guardini*. Freiburger Theologische Studien 130. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1985.
- Klößener, Martin. "Wie Liturgie verstehen? Anfragen an das Motu proprio 'Summorum Pontificum' Papst Benedikts XVI." *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 50 (2008): 268-305.
- Knoll, Alfons. "Die Seele wiederfinden – Romano Guardini auf der Suche nach einer anderen Theologie." Pages 11-31 in *Konservativ mit Blick nach Vorn. Versuche zu Romano Guardini*. Edited by Arno Schilson. Würzburg: Echter, 1994.
- Koch, Kurt. "Zwei Formen des einen römischen Messritus: Liturgietheologische Hinführung zum Motu Proprio von Papst Benedikt XVI." *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift: Communio* 36 (2007): 422-30.
- . "Liturgie braucht die Tiefe der Anbetung. Liturgietheologische Hintergründe des Motu proprio 'Summorum Pontificum'." Pages 127-45 in *Das Geheimnis des Senfkorns. Grundzüge des theologischen Denkens von Papst Benedikt XVI*. Edited by Kurt Koch. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2010.
- . "Dalla liturgia antica un ponte ecumenico." *L'Osservatore Romano* (15 maggio 2011): 7.
- . *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil: Die Hermeneutik der Reform*. Augsburg: Sankt Ulrich Verlag, 2012.
- Kocik, Thomas M. *The Reform of the Reform? A Liturgical Debate: Reform or Return*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2003.
- . "The 'Reform of the Reform' in Broad Context: Re-engaging the Living Tradition." *Antiphon* 12 (2008): 26-44.

- Koester, Adam. "The Local Churches and the Universal Church: Reflections on the Kasper/Ratzinger Debate." *Obsculta* 3 (2010): 12-21.
- Komonchak, Joseph A. "Interpreting the Second Vatican Council." *Landas* 1 (1987): 81-90.
- . "Benedict XVI and the Interpretation of Vatican II." *Cristianesimo nella storia* 28 (2007): 323-37.
- Kranemann, Benedikt. "Mehr Engagement für die erneuerte Liturgie." *Theologie der Gegenwart* 50 (2007): 273-5.
- . "Anmerkungen zur Hermeneutik der Liturgie." *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 50 (2008): 128-61.
- Kreiml, Josef. "Mitarbeiter der Wahrheit: Theologische Grundüberzeugungen des Papster Benedikt XVI." Pages 9-34 in *Christliche Antworten auf die Fragen der Gegenwart: Grundlinien der Theologie Papst Benedikts XVI*. Schriften der Pphilosophisch-Theologischen Hochschule St. Pölten, 1. Edited by Josef Kreiml. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2010.
- Krieg, Robert A. *Romano Guardini. A Precursor of Vatican II*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
- Kuehn, Heinz R. "Fires in the Night: Germany 1920-1950." Pages 1-14 in *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the Sacred in a Modern World*. Edited by Robert A. Krieg. Chicago, IL: Liturgy Training Publications, 1995.
- Kuehn, Regina. "Romano Guardini in Berlin." Pages 87-91 in *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the Sacred in a Modern World*. Edited by Robert A. Krieg. Chicago: Liturgy Trainings, 1995.
- Kuhn, Helmut. *Romano Guardini: Der Mensch und das Werk*. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1951.
- Kunzler, Michael. *Liturge sein: Entwurf einer Ars celebrandi*. Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007.
- . *Die „Tridentinische“ Messe: Aufbruch oder Rückschritt?* Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2008.
- . "Die kosmische Dimension der Eucharistiefeier. Zu Fragen ihrer liturgischen Gestalt bei Joseph Ratzinger." Pages 182-204 in *Der Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009.

- Lam Cong Quy, Joseph. *Theologische Verwandtschaft: Augustinus von Hippo und Joseph Ratzinger/Papst Benedikt XVI.* Würzburg: Echter, 2009.
- Lamberigts, Mathijs. "The Liturgy Debate." Pages 107-66 in *History of Vatican II*, vol.2. Edited by Giuseppe Alberigo. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002.
- Lang, Uwe Michael. *Conversi ad Dominum: Zur Geschichte und Theologie der christlichen Gebetsrichtung.* Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 2010.
- . "The Crisis of Sacred Art and the Sources for Its Renewal in the Thought of Pope Benedict XVI." Pages 98-115 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008.* Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- . *The Voice of the Church at Prayer: Reflections on Liturgy and Language.* San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2012.
- Lang, Walter. *Die Liturgie der heiligen Messe: Ein Beitrag zur liturgischen Erneuerung.* München, 2005.
- "Les étapes préparatoires du schema de la constitution sur la liturgie." *La Maison-Dieu* 155 (1983): 31-53.
- Lohmann, Hermann. "Fragen nach der Lektüre. Das Konzil und der frühe Ratzinger." *Renovatio* 52 (1996): 52-53.
- Maas-Ewerd, Theodor. *Die Krise der liturgischen Bewegung in Deutschland und Österreich: zu den Auseinandersetzungen um die „Liturgische Frage“ in den Jahren 1939 bis 1944.* Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1981.
- . "Anwalt des liturgischen Anliegens: Guardini und die Liturgische Bewegung." Pages 163-83 in *Christliche Weltanschauung: Wiederbegegnung mit Romano Guardini.* Edited by Walter Seidel. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985.
- Maas-Ewerd, Theodor and Klemens Richter. "Die Liturgische Bewegung in Deutschland." Pages 629-48 in *Liturgiereformen: historische Studien zu einem bleibenden Grundzug des christlichen Gottesdienstes.* Edited by Martin Klöckener. *Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen* 88. Münster: Aschendorff, 2002.
- Magee, Michael K. "Receiving the Tradition: Three Windows into the Thought of Pope Benedict XVI on the Liturgy." *Antiphon* 12 (2008):107-25.

- Maggiani, Silvano. "Per una definizione del concetto di liturgia: le categorie di 'gratuità' e di 'gioco'. La proposta di Romano Guardini." Pages 89-114 in *Mysterion: nella celebrazione del mistero di Cristo, la vita della Chiesa : miscellanea liturgica in occasione dei 70 anni dell' Abate Salvatore Marsili*. Torino: Leumann Elle Di Ci, 1981.
- Malone, Richard. "Eucharist: Sacrifice According to the Logos." *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 65-83.
- Mannion, M. Francis. "Liturgy and the Present Crisis of Culture." *Worship* 62 (1988): 98-123.
- . "The Catholicity of the Liturgy: Shaping a New Agenda." Pages 11-48 in *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement*. Edited by Stratford Caldecott. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- . "The Musification of the World: Cardinal Ratzinger's Theology of Liturgical Music." *Josephinum Journal of Theology* 5 (1998): 47-66.
- Mannion, Gerard. "Teaching and Authority: Dimensions of Magisterium." Pages 179-223 in *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey*. Edited by Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion. London-New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
- . "Liturgy, Catechesis and Evangelization." Pages 225-56 in *The Ratzinger Reader: Mapping a Theological Journey*. Edited by Lieven Boeve and Gerard Mannion. London-New York: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Marini, Guido. *La liturgie: Mystère du salut*. Perpignan: Éditions Artège, 2010.
- Marini, Piero. *Serving the People of God: Remembering Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Ottawa: Novalis, 2006.
- . *Cérémoniaire des papes: entretiens sur la liturgie avec Dominique Chivot et Vincent Cabanac*. Paris: Bayard, 2007.
- . *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal, 1963-1975*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- . "Some Challenges of the Liturgical Reform: Memories and Testimonies." *Questions liturgiques* 91 (2010): 165-79.
- . "Memoria di un'esperienza vissuta nelle celebrazioni liturgiche presiedute dal Papa Giovanni Paolo II." *Rivista Liturgica* 99 (2012): 461-83.

- Marschall, Martin. *In Wahrheit beten: Romano Guardini - Denker liturgischer Erneuerung*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1986.
- Marsili, Salvatore. "Teologia liturgica." Pages 1508-25 in *Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia*. Edited by Domenico Sartore and Achille M. Triacca. Roma: Edizioni Paoline, 1988.
- Massa, James. "The Gift We Cannot Give Ourselves: The Eucharist in the Theology of Pope Benedict XVI." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 72 (2008): 163-79.
- Mattei, Roberto de. "Reflections on the Liturgical Reform." Pages 130-44 in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*. Edited by Alcuin Reid. Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2003.
- Mazza, Enrico. "Los misales de Pablo VI y de Juan XXIII: una comparación." *Phase* 295 (2010): 11-36.
- McDonnell, Kilian. "The Ratzinger/Kasper Debate: The Universal Church and the Local Churches." *Theological Studies* 63 (2002): 227-50.
- McManus, Dennis. "Translation Theory in Liturgiam Authenticam." Pages 116-31 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*. Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- Medina Estévez, Jorge A. "Participating in the Sacred Liturgy." Pages 27-44 in Francis Arinze, Francis Eugene George, Jorge A. Medina Estévez and George Pell. *Cardinal Reflections: Active Participation and the Liturgy*. Chicago, IL: Hillenbrand Books, 2005.
- Mejía, Jorge Maria. "The Problem of Translation: Some Linguistic and Other Considerations." Pages 17-23 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*. Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- Meyer zu Schlochtern, Josef. "Streit um das Konzil" Pages 147-68 in *Kirche im Wandel. Pallotinsche Optionen*. Edited by Manfred Probst and Paul Theinbay. St. Ottilien 1999.
- Miller, Michael J. "Cardinal Ratzinger on Liturgical Music." *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 100 (2000/10): 13-22.
- Mitchell, Nathan. "Directions in Ritual Studies." *Worship* 84 (2010): 71-83.

- Moss, Rodney. "Benedict XVI and the Liturgy: Back to the Future." *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 38 (2012): 165-77
- Murphy, Joseph. *Christ, Our Joy: The Theological Vision of Pope Benedict XVI*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2008.
- . "Joseph Ratzinger and the Liturgy: A Theological Approach." Pages 132-155 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*. Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- Muschalek, G. "Die Rehabilitierung der Alten Messe durch Benedikt XVI." *Forum katholischer Theologie* 23 (2007): 300-16.
- Müller, Sabine. "Eucharistie und liturgisches Feiern als Lebensmittelpunkt der Kirche und kirchlichen Handelns: Liturgietheologische Aspekte Benedikts XVI." Pages 93-109 in *Wo Gott ist, da ist Zukunft: Zentrale Themen im Denken von Joseph Ratzinger/Benedikt XVI*. Freiburg: Erzbischöfliches Seelsorgeamt, 2011.
- Nasini, Francesco. "Il «gioco» liturgico in Romano Guardini e Odo Casel." *Rivista Liturgica* 99 (2012): 484-509.
- Neunheuser, Burkhard. "Romano Guardini. Ein Rückblick." *Benediktinische Monatschrift* 44 (1968): 483-8.
- . "Romano Guardini and His Vision of the Liturgy." *Liturgy O.C.S.O.* 29 (1995): 73-61.
- Nichols, Aidan. *Looking at the Liturgy: A Critical View of its Contemporary Form*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996.
- . "Zion and Philistia: The Liturgy and Theological Aesthetics Today." *The Downside Review* 115 (1997): 53-73.
- . *A Pope and a Council on the Sacred Liturgy: Pope Pius XII's Mediator Dei and the Second Vatican Council's Sacrosanctum Concilium with a Comparative Study*. Farnborough, UK: St. Michael's Press, 2002.
- . *The Thought of Pope Benedict XVI. New Edition. An Introduction to the Theology of Joseph Ratzinger*. London, New York: Burns & Oates, 2007.
- Nientiedt, Klaus. "Traditionalisten: Fortdauernde Unklarheiten." *Herder-Korrespondenz* 52 (1998): 602-603.

- Nocent, Andrien. *Liturgia semper reformanda. Rilettura della riforma liturgica*. Magnano: Qiqajon, 1993.
- Nordhofen, Eckhard, ed. *Tridentinische Messe – Ein Streitfall*. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 2009.
- Nowak, Marian. *Giovinezza ed autoformazione secondo Romano Guardini*. Roma: Università Pontificia Salesiana, 1989.
- Nussbaum, Otto. *Der Standort des Liturgen am christlichen Altar vor dem Jahre 1000: eine archäologische und liturgeigeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1965.
- O'Malley, John W. *What Happened at Vatican II*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.
- . “The Hermeneutic of Reform: A Historical Analysis.” *Theological Studies* 73 (2012): 517-46.
- . “Ressourcement and Reform at Vatican II.” *Concilium* 2012/3: 47-55.
- Ofrasio, Timoteo J.M. “On the Reformed Mass of Vatican II and Benedict XVI’s Letter Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum.” *Landas* 23 (2009): 122-34.
- Ormerod, Neil. “Vatican II – Continuity or Discontinuity? Toward an Ontology of Meaning.” *Theological Studies* 71 (2010): 609-36.
- Oxford Liturgy Conference, “*Declaration on the Liturgy*.” Online at <http://www.secondspring.co.uk/spirituality/declaration.htm>
- Parsons, John P. “A Reform of the Reform?” Pages 211-56 in Thomas M. Kocik, *The Reform of the Reform? A Liturgical Debate: Reform or Return*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2003.
- Pascher, Joseph. “In memoriam Romano Guardini.” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 83 (1969): 126-8.
- Pazat De Lys, Charbel. “Towards a New Liturgical Movement.” Pages 98-114 in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*. Edited by Alcuin Reid. Farnborough/UK: Saint Michael’s Abbey Press, 2003.
- Pesarchick, Robert A. “Worship in accord with the Logos – Incarnation, Liturgy and Inculturation.” *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 28-50.

- Pesch, Hermann Otto. *Das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil: Vorgeschichte – Verlauf – Ergebnis – Wirkungsgeschichte*. Kevelaer: Topos Plus, 2011.
- Pham, John P. “Faith in Christ and Contemporary Liturgy.” *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 97 (1997/9): 48-52.
- Pichon, Olivier and Grégoire Celier. *Benoît XVI et les traditionalistes*. Paris: Entrelacs 2007.
- Pius IX. *The Immaculate Conception: The Bull “Ineffabilis Deus.”* Mazonod, Basutoland: Catholic Centre, 1954.
- Pius XII. *Mediator Dei: Encyclical Letter on the Sacred Liturgy*. Boston, MA: St. Paul Editions, 1948.
- Plunkett, Patrice de. *Benoît XVI et le plan de Dieu*. Paris: Presses de la Renaissance, 2005.
- Power, David N. “Contrast and Complementarity: Two Approaches to the Thought of Joseph Ratzinger.” *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 5 (2005): 256-64.
- Pozzo, Guido. “Il significato dell’istruzione Universae Ecclesiae.” *L’Osservatore Romano* (15 maggio 2011): 7.
- Prada, Juan Manuel de. “Liturgical Dress According to Ratzinger.” *L’Osservatore Romano Weekly Edition in English* (9 July 2008): 8.
- Prahl, Franz-Karl. “Psallite sapienter. Joseph Ratzinger und seine Schriften zur Kirchenmusik.” Pages 278-300 in *Der Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009.
- Prétot, Patrick. “La réforme de la semaine sainte sous Pie XII (1951-1956), Enjeux d’un premier pas vers la réforme liturgique de Vatican II.” Paper presented in Leuven, Belgium, 18-19 May 2012.
- Prosper. *De Vocatione Omnium Gentium*. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 97. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009.
- Prosper Aquitanus. *Opera Omnia*. Patrologia Latina 51. Paris, 1846.
- Pytlík, Alexander. “Die liturgietheologische Versöhnungskurs des Heiligen Vaters Benedikt XVI.” Pages 226-36 in *Mit Maria – auf Christus schauen! Festschrift*

- für Papst Benedikt XVI.* Edited by Gabriela Mihlig and Alexander Pytlik. Graz: Leopold Stocker Verlag, 2008.
- Rahner, Karl. *Chancen des Glaubens. Fragmente einer Spiritualität.* Herder-Bücherei 389. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1971.
- Rausch, Thomas P. *Pope Benedict XVI: An Introduction to his Theological Vision.* New York: Paulist Press, 2009.
- Rehak, Martin. *Der außerordentliche Gebrauch der alten Form des Römischen Ritus: Kirchenrechtliche Skizzen zum Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum vom 07.07.2007.* St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 2009.
- Reid, Alcuin. "Benedict XVI and Liturgical Reform." *AD 2000* 18 (2005/15): 9.
- . *The Organic Development of the Liturgy: The Principles of Liturgical Reform and Their Relation to the Twentieth-Century Liturgical Movement Prior to the Second Vatican Council.* San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- . "Looking Again at the Liturgical Reform." *The Downside Review* 124 (2006): 238-58.
- . "Sacrosanctum concilium and the Reform of the Ordo Missae." *Antiphon* 10 (2006): 277-95.
- . "The Fathers of Vatican II and the Revised Mass: Results of a Survey." *Antiphon* 10 (2006): 170-90.
- . "The Liturgical Reform of Pope Benedict XVI." Pages 156-80 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008.* Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- . "Ut mens concordat voci: Sacred Music and Actual Participation in the Liturgy." Pages 93-126 in *Benedict XVI and Beauty in Sacred Music: Proceedings of the Third Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2010.* Edited by Janet Elaine Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2012.
- . "The Reformed Liturgy: A «Cadaver decomposed»? Louis Bouyer and Liturgical Theological Ressourcement." *Antiphon* 16 (2012): 37-51.
- Reinecke, Martin. *Musica Sacra, klingende Liturgie: Die katholische Kirchenmusik im Lichte des Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum Papst Benedikts XVI.* Aachen: Verlagsgruppe Mainz, 2009.

- Reppes, Walter. "Das Konzil und der frühe Ratzinger." *Renovatio* 51 (1995): 193-203.
- Reyes, Ricardo. *L'unità nel pensiero liturgico di Joseph Ratzinger*. Roma: Centro Liturgico Vincenziano, 2011.
- Richter, Klemens. Review of Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger, *Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung*. *Theologische Revue* 96 (2000): 324-5.
- Robinson, Jonathan. *The Mass and Modernity: Walking to Heaven Backward*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- Romero Pose, Eugenio. "Presentación del libro de J. Ratzinger El espíritu de la Liturgia: una introducción." *Teología y Catequesis* 81 (2002): 91-104.
- Ronchi, Mario. "Per essere liturgica la musica deve essere universale." *L'Osservatore Romano* (27 luglio 2011): 4.
- Rose, André. "Problems of the Liturgical Reform." Pages 87-97 in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*. Edited by Alcuin Reid. Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2003.
- Rothe, Wolfgang F. "Liturgische Gegenreform(ation)? Vom Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil zum Apostolischen Schreiben Summorum Pontificum." *Una Voce Korrespondenz* 38 (2008): 152-70.
- . *Liturgische Versöhnung: Ein kirchenrechtlicher Kommentar zum Motu proprio Summorum Pontificum für Studium und Praxis*. Augsburg: Dominus-Verlag, 2009.
- Routhier, Gilles. "The Hermeneutic of Reform as a Task for Theology." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 77 (2012): 219-243.
- Rowland, Tracey. *Ratzinger's Faith: The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- . *Benedict XVI: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London-New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Roy, Neil J. "Summorum Pontificum: The Widening of Hearts and the Broadening of Minds." *Antiphon* 11 (2007): 202-5.
- Ruh, Ulrich. "Joseph Ratzinger – Der Kritiker der Moderne." Pages 119-28 in Meier-Hamidi, Frank and Schumacher, Ferdinand, *Der Theologe Joseph Ratzinger*. Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2007.

- Rush, Ormond. *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles*. New York: Paulist Press, 2004.
- . “Toward a Comprehensive Interpretation of the Council and Its Documents.” *Theological Studies* 73 (2012): 547-69.
- Schilson, Arno. *Theologie als Sakramententheologie: Die Mysterientheologie Odo Casels*. Tübinger Theologische Studien 18. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1982.
- . “Romano Guardini: Wegbereiter und Wegbegleiter der liturgischen Erneuerung.” *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 36 (1986): 3-27.
- . “Vom Geist der Liturgie: Versuch einer Relecture von Romano Guardinis Jahrbuchenschrift.” *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 51 (2001): 76-89.
- Schinella, Ignazio. “Benedetto XVI.” *Rivista liturgica* 92 (2005): 437-48.
- Schlosser, Marianne. “‘... ut fructum redemptionis in nobis iugiter sentiamus’ Ein Versuch zum Verhältnis von Liturgie und Kontemplation im Werk Joseph Ratzingers.” Pages 105-20 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 2. Edited by Franz-Xaver Heibl, Christian Schaller and Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2009.
- Schmemmann, Alexander, *Liturgy and Tradition. Theological Reflexions of Alexander Schmemmann*. Edited by Thomas Fisch. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1990.
- Schneider, Michael. *Zur Beurteilung der Liturgiereform und der Tridentinischen Messe im theologischen Werk Joseph Ratzingers*. Köln: Patristisches Zentrum Koinonia-Oriens, 2007.
- . *Einführung in die Theologie Joseph Ratzingers*. Köln: Patristisches Zentrum Koinonia-Oriens, 2008.
- . “Zur Erneuerung der Liturgie nach dem II. Vatikanum. Ihre Beurteilung in der Theologie Joseph Ratzingers auf dem Hintergrund seiner Reden in der Abtei Fontgombault.” Pages 139-70 in *Der Logos-gemäße Gottesdienst. Theologie der Liturgie bei Joseph Ratzinger*. Edited by Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2009.
- . “Zur Grundlegung und Erneuerung der Liturgie nach der Theologie Joseph Ratzingers - Papst Benedikts XVI. Vortrag anlässlich des Treffens des Neuen Schülerkreises zum Thema ‘Liturgie und Wahrheit bei Joseph Ratzinger’, vom

- 24.-26. April 2009 in Fulda.” on http://www.ratzinger-papst-benedikt-stiftung.de/theol_liturgie.html [Access: July 23, 2016]
- . *Zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion um die Liturgie: Eine dogmatische Standortbestimmung und Reflexion über eine mögliche Reform der Reform.* Köln: Patristisches Zentrum Koinonia-Oriens, 2009.
- . *Die Erneuerung der Liturgie nach dem II. Vatikanum und ihre Beurteilung in der Theologie Joseph Ratzingers.* Köln: Koinonia Oriens, 2010.
- . “Der »logosgemäße Gottesdienst« nach Papst Benedikt XVI.” on http://www.kath.de/zentrum/texte/archiv_texte/vortrag_2010/logos.pdf
- Schönberger, Andreas. “Eine neue „Liturgische Bewegung“?” *Una-Voce-Korrespondenz* 32 (2002): 15- 25.
- Schrott, Simon. “The Need for Discontinuity: Considerations on a Hermeneutic of Liturgical Reform according to Sacrosanctum Concilium.” *Studia Liturgica* 41 (2011): 56-67.
- Searle, Mark. *Called to Participate: Theological, Ritual, and Social Perspectives.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006.
- Smith, Philip Carl. “The “Hermeneutic of Continuity” and Twentieth-century Legislation on Sacred Music.” *Antiphon* 13 (2009): 247-63.
- Society of Saint Pius X. *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform: A Theological and Liturgical Study.* Kansas City, MO: Angelus Press, 2001.
- Soltner, Louis. *Solesmes and Dom Gueranger 1805-1875.* Orleans, MS: Paraclete Press, 1995.
- Spaemann, Robert. “‘The Reform of the Reform’ and the Old Roman Rite.” Pages 115-23 in *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger. Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference.* Edited by Alcuin Reid. Farnborough, UK: Saint Michael’s Abbey Press, 2003.
- Stuflesser, Martin. *Memoria Passionis: Das Verhältnis von lex orandi und lex credendi am Beispiel des Opferbegriffs in den Eucharistischen Hochgebeten nach dem II. Vatikanischen Konzil.* Münsteraner Theologische Abhandlungen 51. Altenberge: Oros Verlag, 1998.
- . “Actuosa participatio: Between Hectic Actionism and New Interiority. Reflections on Active Participation in the Worship of the Church as Both Right and Obligation of the Faithful.” *Studia Liturgica* 41 (2011): 92-126.

- Stosur, David A. "Liturgy and (Post) Modernity: A Narrative Response to Guardini's Challenge." *Worship* 77 (2003): 22-41.
- Taft, Robert. "How Liturgies Grow: the Evolution of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 43 (1977): 355-78.
- Tanner, Norman, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. London: Sheed & Ward; Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990.
- Tattersall, Glen, "Pasch and Eschaton in Ecclesia: Joseph Ratzinger's Theology of the Liturgy." *Priest* 11 (2007): 12-15. 21-23.
- Tena, Pere. "El motu proprio 'Summorum Pontificum'. Análisis y reflexiones." *Phase* 280 (2007): 275-88.
- Tewes, Ernst. "Romano Guardini: Eine Gedenkrede zu einem Tod." *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 19 (1969): 129-49.
- Tomatis, Paolo. "La liturgia, forma fidei – forma vitae: un'obbedienza feconda." *Rivista Liturgica* 98 (2011): 231-44.
- Torevell, David. *Losing the Sacred. Ritual, Modernity and Liturgical Reform*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- Triacca, Achille M. "Theologia della liturgia o theologia liturgica?" *Rivista liturgica* 80 (1993): 267-89.
- Trippen, Norbert. "Joseph Ratzinger als Mitgestalter des II. Vatikanischen Konzils." *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift: Communio* 35 (2006): 541-4.
- Tuzik, Robert L. *How Firm a Foundation: Leaders of the Liturgical Movement*. Chicago, IL: Liturgy Training Publications, 1990.
- Tück, Jan-Heiner: "Ein «reines Pastoralkonzil»? Zur Verbindlichkeit des Vatikanum II." *Internationale katholische Zeitschrift Communio* 41 (2012): 441-57.
- Twomey, Vincent D. *Pope Benedict XVI: The Conscience of our Age: A Theological Portrait*. San Francisco, CA: Ignatius Press, 2007.
- . Introduction to *The Essential Pope Benedict XVI. His Central Writings and Speeches*. Edited by John F. Thornton and Susan B. Varenne. New York: HarperOne, 2008.
- . "Benedict XVI, Pope and Leiturgos." Pages 13-6 in *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference*,

2008. Edited by Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2010.
- . “Introduction: On the Theological Basis for Church Music According to Joseph Ratzinger.” Pages 15-23 in *Benedict XVI and Beauty in Sacred Music: Proceedings of the Third Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2010*. Edited by Janet Elaine Rutherford. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2012.
- . “*Verbum Domini*: Word and Rite in Ratzinger’s Sacramental Theology.” Pages 9-20 in *Benedict XVI and the Roman Missal: Proceedings of the Fourth Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2011*. Edited by Janet Elaine Rutherford and James O’Brien. Dublin: Four Courts Press; New York: Scepter Publishers, 2013.
- Tyrrell, George. *Through Scylla and Charybdis or The Old Theology and the New*. London: Longmans, Green, 1907.
- Urdeix, Josep. “A propósito del ‘Misal Romano’ del Beato Juan XXIII (1962).” *Phase* 280 (2007): 289-310.
- Van Tongeren, Louis. “Liturgical Renewal Never Ends.” Pages 365-84 in *Vatican II and its Legacy*. Edited by Mathijs Lamberigts and Leo Kenis. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Dudley, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters Leuven, 2002.
- Versnel-Mergaerts, Petra J. “Tendenzen in der Liturgischen Bewegung und der Liturgiewissenschaft des 20. Jahrhunderts.” *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 62 (2012): 18-35.
- Verweyen, Hansjürgen. *Joseph Ratzinger - Benedikt XVI. Die Entwicklung seines Denkens*. Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2007.
- . “Liturgie in den frühen Schriften Joseph Ratzingers.” Pages 74-89 in *Ein hörendes Herz: Hinführung zur Theologie und Spiritualität von Joseph Ratzinger/Papst Benedikt XVI*. Ratzinger Studien 5. Edited by Michaela Christine Hastetter and Helmut Hoping. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2012.
- Von Balthasar, Hans Urs. *Romano Guardini: Reform aus dem Ursprung*. Münchener Akademie-Schriften 53. München: Kösel Verlag, 1970.
- Vorgrimler, Herbert. “Vom Geist des Konzils.” Pages 25-52 in *Das Konzil war erst der Anfang. Die Bedeutung des II. Vatikanums für Theologie und Kirche*. Edited by Klemens Richter. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald Verlag, 1991.

- Wachinger, Lorenz. "Der andere Guardini. Autobiographisches, Tagebücher, Briefe." *Stimmen der Zeit* 226 (2008): 693-704.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life*. London: Epworth Press, 1980.
- Weimann, Ralph. "Hermeneutik der Reform als Erneuerung in Kontinuität." Pages 59-82 in *Mitteilungen des Institut-Papst-Benedikt XVI.*, vol. 4. Edited by Franz-Xaver Heibl, Christian Schaller and Rudolf Voderholzer. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner, 2011.
- Whelan, Gerhard. "Vatican II. Questions of Style, Meaning, Truth." *Gregorianum* 92 (2011): 606-16.
- Whitehead, Kenneth D. *Mass Misunderstandings: The Mixed Legacy of the Vatican II Liturgical Reforms*. South Bend, IN: St. Augustine's Press, 2009.
- Wicks, Jared. "More Light on Vatican Council II." *CHR* 94 (2008): 75-101.
- . "Six Texts by Joseph Ratzinger as Peritus before and during Vatican Council II." *Gregorianum* 89 (2008): 233-311.
- Wijlens Myriam. "Summorum Pontificum and ecclesial unity." Pages 449-65 in *In the Service of Truth and Justice: Festschrift in Honour of Prof. Augustine Mendonça, Professor Emeritus* Edited by Victor G. D'Souza. Bangalore: Centre of Canon Law Studies, St Peter's Pontifical Institute, 2008.
- Zahner, Walter. *Rudolf Schwarz, Baumeister der Neuen Gemeinde: ein Beitrag zum Gespräch zwischen Liturgietheologie und Architektur in der Liturgischen Bewegung*. Altenberge: Oros, 1992.
- Zucal, Silvano. "The Intellectual Relationship between Joseph Ratzinger and Romano Guardini." *L'Osservatore Romano Weekly Edition in English* (10 December 2008): 8.
- . "Ratzinger e Guardini, un incontro decisivo." *Vita e pensiero* 4 (2008):
- . "Conosci nella misura in cui sei: San Bonaventura nel pensiero di Romano Guardini." *L'Osservatore Romano* (5 giugno 2011): 4.