

**MUTUAL LITURGICAL ENRICHMENT:
JURIDICAL CONSIDERATION OF 20TH AND 21ST CENTURY
CONCILIAR, PAPAL AND CURIAL DOCUMENTS**

by
John G. Lessard-Thibodeau

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Canon Law
Saint Paul University, Ottawa, Ontario,

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Canon Law,

and in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Saint Paul University
©2022, John G. Lessard-Thibodeau, Ottawa, Ontario

ABSTRACT

On 7 July 2007, Pope Benedict XVI promulgated Apostolic Letter *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*, providing *inter alia* nearly universal faculties for use of the 1962 *Missale Romanum*. In his accompanying letter *Con grande fiducia*, he referred to the 1962 Roman Missal as the Extraordinary Form and the Roman Missal revised following the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council the Ordinary Form. Furthermore, he referred to these as two liturgical Forms of one Latin Rite. At the same time, he called for what has become known as “mutual enrichment” between the two liturgical Forms. In this, he specifically invited the addition of Eucharistic Prefaces and the celebration of more recently canonized Saints into the 1962 Roman Missal. He called conceptually for a renewed sacralization of the Ordinary Form by the Extraordinary Form.

This study seeks to contribute a comprehensive juridical history of the development of mutual liturgical enrichment, which also serves the purpose of placing the matter in juridic and historical context (Chapter I). Furthermore, it examines the development of the Eucharistic Prefaces and Roman Calendar to, in turn, develop an understanding of what of these elements could be added to the Extraordinary Form in a way that is consistent with its development since the reforms following the Ecumenical Council of Trent (Chapters II and III). Finally, this work seeks to contribute to the field by developing a way of determining what could be used to enrich the Ordinary Form licitly so that various disputed matters, such as who has the authority to make changes to the Mass liturgy, may be resolved, in some cases even by the celebrant himself (Chapter IV).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	VII
ABBREVIATIONS.....	VIII
GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	10
CHAPTER I THE PATH TO MUTUAL ENRICHMENT FROM VATICAN II ..	16
Introduction.....	16
1.1 – Under the Pontificate of Pope Paul VI: 1963-1978	26
1.1.1 – Legislation Affecting Use of the Older Rites	30
1.1.1.1 – Introducing Exceptions for Use of the Older Rite for Mass	31
1.1.1.2 – Exceptions during Ongoing Liturgical Change	33
1.1.1.3 – Simplifying Requests for Exception	35
1.1.1.4 – Local Requests for Exceptional Use of the Older Rite	37
1.1.1.5 – Exceptional Use while Maintaining Primacy of the New Missal	40
1.1.2 – Notable Prohibitions on Use of Former Rubrics.....	45
1.1.3 – The Influence of the Society of Saint Pius X.....	50
1.2 – Under the Pontificate of Pope John Paul II: 1978-2005	51
1.2.1 – The “Indult Masses” of <i>Quattuor abhinc annos</i>	52
1.2.2 – <i>Ecclesia Dei</i> and the Excommunication of the Society of St. Pius X.....	55
1.3 – Under the Pontificate of Pope Benedict XVI: 2005-2013	60
1.3.1 – <i>Summorum Pontificum</i> and Universal Allowance of the Older Rite	62
1.3.2 – <i>Con grande fiducia</i> accompanying <i>Summorum Pontificum</i>	65
1.4 – Under the Pontificate of Pope Francis: 2013-.....	66
1.4.1 – <i>Cum Sanctissima</i> : Celebrating New Saints in the <i>Forma extraordinaria</i>	67
1.4.2 – <i>Quo Magis</i> : New Eucharistic Prefaces for the <i>Forma Extraordinaria</i>	69
1.4.3 – <i>Traditionis custodes</i> : Regulating Use of the Extraordinary Form	71
1.4.4 – CDWDS: <i>Responsa ad dubia</i> , 4 December 2021	75
Conclusion	76
CHAPTER II ENRICHMENT OF THE LITURGICAL YEAR.....	78
Introduction.....	78
2.1 – Historical Source Texts.....	80
2.2 – Overview of the Liturgical Year and General Roman Calendar.....	87
2.3 – Development of the Temporal Cycle of the Liturgical Year	88
2.3.1 – The Prominence of Sunday	90
2.3.2 – Marking the Natural Seasons: Ember Days and Rogation Days	93
2.3.3 – <i>Tempus Adventus</i>	96

2.3.4 – <i>Tempus Nativitatis</i> and <i>Tempus Epiphaniae</i>	102
2.3.5 – <i>Tempus Septuagesimae</i>	109
2.3.6 – <i>Tempus Quadragesimae</i> and <i>Tempus Passionis</i>	112
2.4 – <i>Hebdomada Sancta</i>	118
2.4.1 – <i>Triduum Sacrum</i>	120
2.4.2 – <i>Missa Chrismatis</i> and <i>Missa Solemni Vespertina in Cena Domini</i>	121
2.4.3 – <i>Feria Sexta in Passione et Morte Domini</i> and <i>Sabbato</i>	123
2.5 – <i>Tempus Paschatis</i>	124
2.5.1 – <i>Sabbato Sancto, de Vigiliae Paschalis</i>	127
2.5.2 – <i>Dominica Resurrectionis</i> and <i>Octava Paschae</i>	131
2.5.3 – <i>Dominica in Albis in Octava Paschae</i>	133
2.6 – Twentieth Century Alterations to the Sacred Liturgies of Holy Week.....	136
2.7 – <i>Tempus per annum ante Septuagesimam</i> and <i>post Pentecosten</i>	138
2.8 – Development of the Sanctoral Cycle of the General Roman Calendar	141
2.8.1 – Post-Tridentine Reforms of the Sanctoral Cycle	143
2.8.2 – Subsequent Changes between the Councils of Trent and Vatican II	144
2.9 – The Second Vatican Council and <i>Sacrosanctum Concilium</i>	149
2.10 – Post-Vatican II Changes to the Temporal Cycle of the Liturgical Year	153
2.11 – General Norms and the Creation of a New General Roman Calendar	159
2.11.1 – Ranking of Feasts.....	159
2.11.2 – The Prominence of Sunday	161
2.11.3 – Ember Days and Rogation Days	162
2.11.4 – Advent.....	164
2.11.5 – Christmas, Christmastide and Epiphany	165
2.11.6 – <i>Septuagesima</i>	169
2.11.7 – Lent and the Fast.....	170
2.11.8 – The Sacred Paschal Triduum	174
2.11.9 – Eastertide.....	175
2.11.10 – <i>De Tempore</i> , after the Baptism of the Lord and after Pentecost.....	177
2.12 – Changes to the Sanctoral Cycle of the General Roman Calendar	179
2.13 – Promulgation of GRC/1969	181
2.14 – Post-Promulgation Modifications to the General Roman Calendar	185
2.15 – Particular Calendars for Local Churches	189
2.16 – <i>Cum Sanctissima</i> Permitting Celebration of New Saints in the EF	194
2.17 – Presentation of a Proposed <i>Proprium Sanctorum</i> for Canada and the USA....	198
Conclusion	200

CHAPTER III ENRICHMENT OF EUCHARISTIC PREFACES	204
Introduction.....	204
3.1 – Definition and Description of the Eucharistic Preface	205
3.2 – The Eucharistic Preface and Hebrew Patrimony	210
3.3 – Purpose of the Eucharistic Preface	212
3.4 – Structure of the Eucharistic Preface.....	215
3.5 – The Eucharistic Preface in the pre-Tridentine Era.....	221
3.6 – Post-Tridentine Reform of the Eucharistic Preface	229
3.7 – The Eucharist Preface from the post-Tridentine Reform to Vatican II	233
3.8 – The post-Vatican II Reform of the Eucharistic Preface.....	238
3.8.1 – Texts Resulting from the Reform and Thereafter	242
3.8.2 – Principles and Methodology Used to Revise the Eucharistic Prefaces.....	246
3.8.3 – Sources of the Reform and Their Difficulties.....	252
3.9 – <i>Quo Magis</i> Admitting Seven Eucharistic Prefaces for Use in the EF	259
3.10 – Presentation of Proposed Eucharistic Prefaces for Use in the EF	262
Conclusion	263
CHAPTER IV SYNTHESIS AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION.....	266
Introduction.....	266
4.1 – Liturgical Reconciliation	268
4.1.1 – John Paul II, Benedict XVI and Francis on Liturgical Reconciliation	268
4.1.2 – The Diocesan Bishop as Reconciler, Moderator and Facilitator	273
4.2 – Goals and Principles of Liturgical Reform	278
4.2.1 – Goals and Principles of the Liturgical Movement in Juridical Sources.....	278
4.2.1.1 - Pius X (1903-14), Benedict XV (1914-22) Pius XI (1922-39)	279
4.2.1.2 – Pius XII (1939-1958)	283
4.2.1.3 - John XXIII (1958-1963).....	289
4.2.1.4 - Paul VI (1963-1978).....	291
4.2.1.5 - <i>Sacrosanctum Concilium</i> , 1963.....	291
4.2.1.6 - Instructions on the Implementation of Liturgical Reform.....	294
4.2.1.7 - John Paul II (1978-2005) and Benedict XVI (2005-2013).....	298
4.2.2 – The Fundamental Goal of Consilium and Its Results	301
4.3 – Identifying Goals and Sources for Mutual Enrichment in the 21 st Century	309
4.4 – Juridic Considerations.....	310
4.4.1 – Observing the Methods of the PCED, the CDF and the CDWDS.....	311
4.4.1.1 – Observing Pontifical Commission <i>Ecclesia Dei</i>	312
4.4.1.2 – Observing the CDF in <i>Quo magis</i> and <i>Cum Sanctissima</i>	315
4.4.1.3 – Observing the CDWDS in <i>Responsa ad dubia</i>	317

4.4.2 – Tools for Licit Recognition of Liturgical Change	318
4.4.2.1 – Inculturation	318
4.4.2.2 – Custom	323
4.4.3 – Canon 846, §1 and the Authority of the Celebrant	326
4.4.4 – <i>Traditionis custodes</i>	331
4.4.5 – <i>Responsa ad dubia</i> , 4 December 2021	339
4.5 – Formulating Principles for Mutual Enrichment in the Twenty-first Century	342
4.5.1 – Particular Opportunities for Mutual Enrichment	343
4.5.2 – Balancing Conservation and Innovation	344
4.5.3 – Ensuring that Changes are Beneficial	345
4.5.4 – Retaining a Recognizable Roman Unitarity	346
4.5.5 – Respecting Organic Development	349
4.6 – Identifying Kinds of Mutual Enrichment	350
4.6.1 – Elements and Permissions Currently Authorized	350
4.6.2 – Elements within the Provisions of the Ordinary Form Introduced by the Celebrant on His Own Accord	352
4.6.3 – Elements Neither Provided nor Prohibited by the Ordinary Form Introduced by the Celebrant on His Own Accord for Pastoral Purposes	353
4.6.4 – Elements External to the Provisions of the Ordinary Form	355
4.7 – Practical Assessment of Synthesis	357
Conclusion	363
GENERAL CONCLUSION	367
APPENDIX I DECREE <i>CUM SANCTISSIMA</i> WITH <i>NOTA PRAEVIA</i>	373
APPENDIX II A PROPOSED EXTRAORDINARY FORM <i>PROPRIUM SANCTORUM</i>	382
APPENDIX III DECREE <i>QUO MAGIS</i> WITH <i>NOTA PRAEVIA</i>	392
APPENDIX IV SEVEN NEW EUCHARISTIC PREFACES FOR THE <i>FORMA EXTRAORDINARIA</i>	397
APPENDIX V ADDITIONAL PREFACES PROPOSED FOR USE IN THE <i>FORMA EXTRAORDINARIA</i>	404
APPENDIX VI <i>TRADITIONIS CUSTODES</i>	409
APPENDIX VII <i>COME GIÀ</i>	412
APPENDIX VII <i>RESPONSA AD DUBIA</i>	421
BIBLIOGRAPHY	430
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE	495

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The preparation of this dissertation involved the close assistance and encouragement of many individuals. I am deeply indebted to my thesis director, Dr. Chad J. Glendinning, to whom I owe the inspiration for the topic treated herein. I wish to convey my gratitude for his generous expertise, guidance, encouragement and availability, all amplified by his patience.

I extend profound gratitude and dedicate this work to Rev. Msgr. John J. Bonzagni, JCL, MEd, JD, for the risks he has taken to bring me to the practice of Canon Law, who has supported my education unquestioningly, encouraged my efforts and spent many tedious hours in review of this work.

I am deeply grateful to the Most Reverend Timothy A. McDonnel, Bishop Emeritus of the Diocese of Springfield, who formally invited me to graduate studies in canon law, to the Most Reverend Mitchel T. Rozanski, Archbishop of Saint Louis, who provided essential material and personal support of this endeavor and to the Most Reverend William D. Byrne, Bishop of Springfield, who has encouraged me in particular by placing his confidence in me and giving me the opportunity to practice the skills I have learned.

I am grateful for the generosity of the Faculty of Canon Law of St. Paul University where it has been truly a privilege to study. I am grateful as well for the librarians and staff of the Jean-Léon Allie Library and Archives at St. Paul University, of the John K. Mullen of Denver Library at the Catholic University of America and of the William D. Walsh Family Library at Fordham University.

I am grateful to my coworkers, colleagues and parishioners who so generously supported my endeavors, understood my absences and reminded me of their care.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AAS</i>	<i>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</i> , Rome, 1909-
<i>ASS</i>	<i>Acta Sanctae Sedis</i> , Rome, 1865-1909
c.	Canon of the Code of Canon Law
cc.	Canons of the Code of Canon Law
ca.	<i>Circa</i>
CCCC	The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops
<i>CCEO</i>	<i>Codex canonum ecclesiarum orientalium auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus fontium annotatione auctus</i>
CDF	Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
CDW	Congregation for Divine Worship
CDWDS	Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments
<i>CGF</i>	BENEDICT XVI, <i>Con grande fiducia</i> , Letter accompanying <i>Summorum Pontificum</i>
<i>CIC/17</i>	<i>Codex iuris canonici Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu digestus</i>
<i>CIC/83</i>	<i>Codex iuris canonici, auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus, fontium annotatione et indice analytico-alphabetico auctus</i>
<i>CLD</i>	T. BOUSCAREN and J. O’CONNOR, <i>Canon Law Digest</i> , 13 vols.
Consilium	<i>Consilium ad Exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia</i>
<i>DOL</i>	<i>Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979: Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts</i>
ECEW	EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE OF ENGLAND AND WALES
EF	The Extraordinary Form or <i>Forma extraordinaria</i> of the Latin Rite, using <i>MR/1962</i>
<i>GIRM</i>	<i>General Instruction of the Roman Missal</i>
<i>GIRM/2008usa</i>	<i>General Instruction of the Roman Missal</i> , 2008, for Dioceses of the United States of America
<i>GNLYC</i>	<i>General Norms for the Liturgical Year and the Calendar</i>
GRC/1568	The General Roman Calendar, 1568
GRC/1960	The General Roman Calendar, 1960

GRC/1970	The General Roman Calendar, 1970
ICEL	INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY
MR/1570	PIUS V, <i>Missale Romanum, editio princeps</i> , 1570
MR/1962	JOHN XXIII, <i>Missale Romanum</i> , 1962
MR/1965	JOHN XXIII, <i>Missale Romanum</i> , 1965
MR/1969	PAUL VI, <i>Missale Romanum, editio typica</i> , 1970
MR/1975	PAUL VI, <i>Missale Romanum, editio typica altera</i> , 1975
MR/1985	JOHN PAUL II, <i>Missale Romanum, editio typica secunda</i> , 1985
MR/2000	JOHN PAUL II, <i>Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia</i> , 2000
MR/2008	BENEDICT XVI, <i>Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia emendata</i> , 2008
MR/2008usa	BENEDICT XVI, <i>The Roman Missal</i> , third typical edition, emended, 2008, for use in the USA
marg.	Margine/Marginal
NCCB	National Conference of Catholic Bishops
OF	The Ordinary Form or <i>Forma ordinaria</i> of the Latin Rite, using the latest edition of the post-Conciliar Roman Missal
OLM	<i>Order of the Lectionary for Mass/Ordo lectionem Missae</i>
PCED	Pontifical Commission <i>Ecclesia Dei</i>
PL	<i>Patrologia cursus completus: Series Latina</i> , 217 vols
RGMR	<i>Rubricae Generales Missalis Romani</i> , 1962
<i>Roman Replies</i>	<i>Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions</i>
RSCM	<i>Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae</i>
SC	SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, Constitution on the Liturgy, <i>Sacrosanctum Concilium</i>
SCDW	Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship
SCR	Sacred Congregation of Rites
SP	BENEDICT XVI, apostolic letter motu proprio <i>Summorum Pontificum</i>
SSPX	The Priestly Society of Saint Pius X
TC	FRANCIS, apostolic letter motu proprio <i>Traditionis custodes</i>
USCC	United States Catholic Conference
USCCB	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Doctor Chad Glendinning was referring to the two “Forms” of the Latin Rite of the Church when he expressed in his doctoral dissertation, “[...] It remains unclear how these two forms may serve as [...] a mutually enriching gift to the Church’s liturgical patrimony.”¹ The context in which this was written was an examination of the newly-promulgated motu proprio *Summorum Pontificum*² and accompanying letter *Con grande fiducia*³ of Pope Benedict XVI. It was within this context that Benedict called for what has become known as “mutual enrichment” between the older and newer Mass rituals, which he coined respectively as the Extraordinary Form and Ordinary Form of the one Latin Rite of the Latin Church.⁴ The Holy Father specifically requested that Saints canonized after the post-Vatican II reforms be celebrated in the Extraordinary Form calendar and that some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces be inserted into the Extraordinary Form Missal. This study seeks to examine the request of Pope Benedict XVI and further the work of Dr. Glendinning.

When one might question the right of an ecclesiastical lawyer to delve into liturgical matters, Jesuit Father John Baldovin adopts Aiden Nichols’ tongue-in-cheek remark that

¹ C.J. GLENDINNING, *Summorum Pontificum* and the Use of the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite: A Canonical Analysis in Light of the Current Liturgical Law, JCD Thesis, Ottawa, Saint Paul University, 2010, 332.

² BENEDICT XVI, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, 7 July 2007, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 777-781, English translation in *Origins*, 37 (2007-2008), 129-132.

³ BENEDICT XVI, Letter to Bishops Accompanying the Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum* *Con grande fiducia*, 7 July 2007, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 795-799, English translation in *Origins*, 37 (2007-2008), 132-134.

⁴ The terms “Ordinary Form” and “Extraordinary Form” are retained in this work. Rationale will be treated below when considering papal documents that have succeeded *Summorum Pontificum*.

“Liturgy is too important to be left to liturgists.”⁵ Experiencing the Mass of the Latin Church is to experience ecclesiastical law tangibly. Liturgical law is ecclesiastical law in action and thus affects the faithful most perceptibly.

A Doctor of any system of law should be expert in the variety of contentious trials that occur within that structure. A Doctor of Canon Law, however, should be expert in the larger context of the *ius vigens*. At least partly for this reason that the Legislator cites liturgical law immediately in the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* as c. 2: “Codex plurimque non definit ritus, qui in actionibus liturgicis celebrandis sunt servandi....” This declaration that liturgical law is external to the *Code of Canon Law* is likewise an implicit declaration that liturgical law is ecclesiastical law. Indeed, it is its largest part.

Legislation of liturgical law is left to means external to the Code particularly by approval and promulgation of the *Praenotanda* of the various rituals as well as other forms of legislative texts. This legislation issues from the Roman Pontiff, the declarations of ecumenical and particular councils, episcopal conferences and diocesan bishops. The historical corpus of liturgical law is immense.

It is lamentable that for so long lawyers and liturgists have been disconnected in their respective studies; the Mass is of interest to every discipline for it draws upon most every aspect of human thought. Dr. Glendinning broke this divide by his examination of the ramifications of a juridic document upon tangible liturgical matters in the lives of the faithful. Liturgists, rubricists, activists and historians study, discuss, debate and propose what may or should constitute the Mass, what is already in the Mass or what they wish would comprise the Mass. However, the object of their actions, the sacred liturgy itself,

⁵ J.F. BALDOVIN, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to Critics*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2008, 59.

exists *a priori* to them as the result of the Church's law, i.e., as legislation determined, decreed and promulgated by the Holy See.⁶

Many secular lawyers are not attorneys at law; they are experts in a particular area, far removed from the activities that movies and television would ascribe to them. Canon lawyers have less opportunity to specialize, though various persons develop expertise. The days of the dusty codebook are gone, permanently. For instance, today we are serving as Promoters of Justice lodging charges against clergy and sitting as judges in causes we may have not imagined even a relatively short time ago. In addition to this, many canonists have the grace and privilege of the sacrament of Holy Orders. We stand at the altar of the Lord, frequently incognizant that the actions we execute and the prayers we offer there are as much determined by the Church's law as juridical proceedings in the tribunal chambers.

The Pontifical Licentiate Canon Law program at Saint Paul University is known for its promotion of what is practical, focusing on pastoral care through just and authentic application of the law for the greater honor and glory of God and for the salvation of souls. The following dissertation, with its practical proposals, seeks to reflect these values and extend and continue that same direction.

Motivated by Benedict XVI, directed by Dr. Glendinning and formed by the faculty of Saint Paul University, with deep devotion to the Mass and to the Law, a juridical and practical examination of mutual enrichment of the *Forma ordinaria* to the *Forma extraordinaria* follows.⁷

⁶ For example, see c. 838, §§1-2. Even in many cases of local/national adaptations, the Holy See is involved to some degree. Cf. c. 838, §§3-4.

⁷ Generally, only Sundays and Obligation Days, celebrated within a secular diocesan setting, are treated herein, with exception only as necessary for comprehensive treatment.

This work is divided into four Chapters. The first traces mutual enrichment from the past and brings it into the present context. The second and third treat specific matters in the present context. The fourth looks at the present and proposes expansion into the future.

Chapter I traces the time from the Second Vatican Council, presents the juridical pathway that has led to the environment in which matters of mutual enrichment may be discussed and proposed in a practical juridic manner. This section of study includes the most recent decrees from Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), Pope Francis' apostolic letter *motu proprio Traditionis custodes*⁸ and the *Responsa ad dubia* from CDWDS.⁹

Chapters II and III seek to inform, raise questions, propose answers and propose the exercise of mutual enrichment between the Missals of the Latin Rite regarding the two substantial matters specified by Benedict XVI in *CGF*: Insertion of new Saints into the 1960 liturgical calendar and insertion of some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces into the 1962 *Missale Romanum*, the normative Missal for use in the *Forma extraordinaria*.

Chapter II addresses the General Roman Calendar or "Liturgical Year." Because the proceedings of the post-Tridentine reforms have been lost to time, a degree of historical examination is presented to reverse-engineer, so to speak, the results of their work. This will aid understanding of the General Roman Calendar of 1568, since it was received in many ways into the General Roman Calendar of 1960, the basic structure of which then became the 1970 General Roman Calendar in the post-Vatican II reforms. This study will

⁸ FRANCIS, Apostolic Letter *motu proprio data Traditionis custodes*, 16 July 2021, English translation in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 23 July 2021, 4. For the full text in the official English translation, please see Appendix VI.

⁹ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, *Responsa ad dubia*, On Certain Provisions of the Apostolic Letter *Traditionis Custodes*, 4 December 2021, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_2021_1204_responsa-ad-dubia-traditionis-custodes_en.html (11 January 2022).

reveal that much of the development of the calendar is consistent and has grown out of logical development, though not without complexity and controversy.

A practical application of Chapter II results in the proposal of a *Proprium sanctorum*, the 1960 version of a particular calendar, for the dioceses of Canada and of the United States of America, presented as Appendix II. This is accomplished by application of the juridical requirements governing the 1960 calendar under the guidance of the post-conciliar juridical documents governing the development of particular calendars. Specific direction is provided by the example of the provisions of decree *Cum sanctissima*, issued by the CDF, the text of which is presented as Appendix I.

The study presented in Chapter III parallels that of Chapter II in many ways. This was necessary in order to arrive at a determination of how particular texts were chosen to become the corpus of Eucharistic Prefaces in the Roman Missal of 1570 and received, with some modification, into the Roman Missal of 1962.

A practical application of Chapter III results in the proposal of several Eucharistic Prefaces for use in the Extraordinary Form curated from those in use in the Ordinary Form. These are presented as Appendix V. This selection was made based upon consistency with the sources and historical development of the Eucharistic Prefaces in the Mass of the Latin Church. Texts of the seven Eucharistic Prefaces introduced into the Extraordinary Form by means of the CDF decree *Quo magis*, presented as Appendix IV, provide a valuable benchmark against which selection of other Eucharistic Prefaces may be made.

The relatively recent decrees issued by the CDF mentioned above demonstrate that in every aspect, the sacred and divine liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in the Latin Church continues, in every aspect, to be a matter of law.

Chapter IV synthesizes several historical and juridical considerations that would allow for and facilitate present and future mutual liturgical enrichment. This includes a brief juridical examination of Francis motu proprio *Traditionis custodes* and the *Responsa* that followed, an effort necessary in order to determine the status and value of the examination of mutual liturgical enrichment, which, considering these documents, may become more important than previously thought. Goals and principles are established, supported as necessary by history in order to retain consistency. Opportunities for mutual enrichment are then proposed and, in order for their application to be within the licit practice of the Church, various elements of mutual enrichment are identified so that the possibility of their application may be examined.

CHAPTER I

THE PATH TO MUTUAL ENRICHMENT FROM VATICAN II

Introduction

The Ecumenical Council of Trent (1545-1563), the nineteenth such Council of the Catholic Church, convened in one of the most chaotic times in the Church's history. Due to the influence of the Protestant reformation, use of texts for the Mass and the manner of celebration had become subjective in many places. Texts of questionable orthodoxy and/or of manifest heterodoxy were adopted; many priests introduced their own reforms. In some areas of Europe, the Eucharistic Prayer itself was eliminated.¹⁰ For the good of the Catholic faithful, the Fathers of the Council responded with a focus that was concentrated on clarity of doctrine. In order to counter unbridled subjectivity, uniformity of practice was sought.¹¹

On 4 December 1563, in the fourth year of the pontificate of Pope Pius IV, the Fathers of the Ecumenical Council of Trent sitting in the twenty-fifth session¹² ordered, *inter alia*, reform of "the Missal."¹³ The same Fathers ordered that whatever work of its reform that already had been accomplished "be given over to the most holy Roman Pontiff, that it may,

¹⁰ See K. PECKLERS, "History of the Roman Liturgy from the Sixteenth until the Twentieth Century," in A. CHUPUNGO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997, 156, and 156, footnote 9. Additionally, he states, "Liturgically, the Council of Trent dealt primarily with the Mass and the Liturgy of the Hours" (PECKLERS, "History of the Roman Liturgy," 156). Cf. J. JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite: Missarum Sollemnia*, 2 vols., Allen, TX, Christian Classics/Thomas More Publishing, 1986, vol. 1, 133-135, esp. 134.

¹¹ See PECKLERS, "History of the Roman Liturgy," 156. Significant at the same time was the decision of the Council Fathers that the "solemn celebration of Mass was to become the normative Eucharistic liturgy rather than the unadorned low Mass" (PECKLERS, "History of the Roman Liturgy," 158). See also R. CABIÉ, "The Celebration of the Eucharist in the West from the Council of Trent to Vatican Council II," in A.G. MARTIMORT, *The Church at Prayer Volume II: The Eucharist*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1987, 175.

¹² "Twenty-fifth Session, which is the ninth and last under the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IV, begun on the third and closed on the fourth day of December 1563" (*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, trans. H. SCHROEDER, Rockford, IL, TAN Books and Publishers, 1978 [reprint of 1941], 255).

¹³ "After 25th Session, Chapter XXI, Continuation of the Session on the fourth day of December: Concerning the Index of Books and the Catechism, Breviary and Missal" (*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 255).

by his judgment and authority, be completed and made public.”¹⁴

The first fruits of reform came in 1568 in the form of GRC/1568, a General Roman Calendar of the Temporal and Sanctoral Cycles of the liturgical year. This was promulgated along with a restored *Breviarium Romanum*.¹⁵ Both were intended for observance throughout the Latin Church.

On 14 July 1570, in the fifth year of his pontificate, Pope Pius V issued Apostolic Constitution *Quo primum*.¹⁶ In so doing, he ordered and promulgated the publication of a Roman Mass book styled *Missale Romanum* (MR/1570).¹⁷ This book contained the Holy Scripture extracts, prayer formularies, Eucharistic Canon and all other texts necessary for offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass of the Latin Church. *Quo primum* presents MR/1570 as a careful and faithful restoration of ancient Roman liturgical practices in response to the mandate of the Council of Trent.¹⁸ Pius V declared this *Missale Romanum* normative for the Latin Church, with exception provided for bicentenarian rituals:

This new rite alone is to be used unless approval of the practice of saying Mass differently was given at the very time of the institution and confirmation of the church by the Apostolic See at least 200 years ago, or unless there has prevailed a custom of a similar kind which has been continuously followed for a period of not less than 200 years, in which most cases We in no wise rescind their above-mentioned prerogative or custom.¹⁹

¹⁴ *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 255.

¹⁵ *Breviarium Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum Apud Paulum Manutium*, Rome, 1568. Facsimile reprint: A. M. TRIACCA, *Breviarium Romanum, Editio princeps (1568)*, Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999.

¹⁶ PIUS V, Apostolic Constitution *Quo primum*, 14 July 1570, promulgating the revised Roman Missal, in *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio prima iuxta typicam*, Paris, Mame, 1962, viii-ix, English translation with accompanying Latin divided into paragraphs available at <http://www.theholymass.com/part9.htm> (11 January 2022). Because the document is not officially divided, the paragraph references used herein are taken from the divisions provided in the cited online source.

¹⁷ *Missale Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum*, Rome, Apud heredes Bartholomei Faletti, Ioannem Variscum et Socios, 1570. Facsimile reprint: A. M. TRIACCA, *Missale Romanum, Editio princeps (1570)*, Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012.

¹⁸ *Quo primum*, §3.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, §5. Given these exceptions, it is evident that from the beginning of the period of the Holy See's juridic exercise of regulation of the liturgy of the Latin Church, exceptions were granted whereby not all priests were obligated to adopt the new Missal. Cf. P. VERE, *More Catholic than the Pope: An Inside Look at Extreme Traditionalism*, Huntington, IN, Our Sunday Visitor Publishing, 2004, 125.

Those exempted were nonetheless invited to adopt the new rite if they chose.²⁰ Apart from these exceptions, Pius V ordered that all others “discontinue and completely discard all other rubrics and rites of other missals, however ancient, which they have customarily followed....²¹ [...] For it is most becoming that there be in the Church [...] only one rite for the celebration of Mass.”²²

Pius V asserted the authority of the Supreme Pontiff and of the Missal itself as he warned against alterations to it by anyone of lesser authority, stating, “[...] We order and enjoin that nothing must be added to Our recently published Missal, nothing omitted from it, nor anything whatsoever be changed within it under the penalty of Our displeasure.²³ [...] And they must not, in celebrating Mass, presume to introduce any ceremonies or recite any prayers other than those contained in this Missal.”²⁴

From this moment, the Roman Missal and the directive documents contained therein exist by juridic act, as a matter imposed, promoted, preserved, protected and regulated by the Roman Pontiff. Divine Worship that had been regulated by means of custom and local authority became the product of legislation by the Holy See. Ecclesiastical law, the core around which liturgical practice had been flowing, was repositioned as the encompassing structure within which the liturgy exists.

Significant practical direction was promulgated as *praenotanda* to *MR/1570* in three instructional documents: *Rubricae generales Missalis*, *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missarum* and *De defectibus Missae*. Observance of their contents is compulsory.

²⁰ *Quo primum*, §5.

²¹ *Ibid.*, §6.

²² *Ibid.*, §2.

²³ *Ibid.*, §5.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, §6.

The *Missale Romanum* of 1570 underwent revision soon after promulgation under Clement VIII in 1604,²⁵ Urban VIII in 1634²⁶ and furthermore by subsequent popes.²⁷ Of greater significance to our interests are the changes made by Pope John XXIII, resulting in a new typical edition promulgated as *MR/1962*. As all the editions preceding it, *MR/1962* is a recognizable continuation of *MR/1570*. The 1962 *editio typica* is the last edition of *Missale Romanum* published before the influence of the Second Vatican Council.

In December of 1963, nearly four hundred years after the Tridentine mandate, in homage to and in imitation of it, Pope Paul VI and the Fathers of the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican set forth the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.²⁸ The Constitution contains, *inter alia*, extensive principles and norms “concerning the promotion and reform of the liturgy.”²⁹ Similar to the Council of Trent, the

²⁵ CLEMENT VIII, *Cum sanctissimum* on the revision of the Roman Missal, 7 July 1604, in *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio prima iuxta typicam*, Paris, Mame, 1962, ix-x, English translation available at <http://sanctaliturgia.blogspot.com/2005/11/cum-sanctissimum-english.html> (11 January 2022). The primary impetus for change was that heterodox texts were being added and unauthorized alterations were being made to *MR/1570* almost immediately upon its introduction. In addition to condemning these acts and declaring all such adulterated Missals null and void, Clement VIII made improvements to some texts, including the instructional documents. The Pontiff adds, “These improvements, however, flowing as it were from the same sources and principles, seem rather to represent and complete the meaning of the rules and rubrics than to introduce anything new” (Ibid., §3 of the English translation).

²⁶ URBAN VIII, *Si quid est* on the revision of the Roman Missal, 2 November 1634, in *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio prima iuxta typicam*, Paris, Mame, 1962, x, English translation available at <http://sanctaliturgia.blogspot.com/2005/11/si-quid-est-english.html> (11 January 2022). The primary impetus for the changes made by Urban VIII are similar to those experienced by his predecessor, Clement VIII. In parallel vein, Urban VIII adds, “The rubrics which had been allowed to degenerate gradually from the old usage and rite have been restored to their former pattern; those which did not seem to be easily intelligible to the readers have been more clearly stated; and moreover, having compared the pertinent texts with the Vulgate edition of Holy Writ, the differences which had crept into the Missal have been emended according to this standard and norm” (Ibid., §4 of the English translation).

²⁷ For a well-detailed treatment of changes to *MR/1570* following promulgation, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see C.J. GLENDINNING, “The Significance of the Liturgical Reforms Prior to the Second Vatican Council in Light of *Summorum Pontificum*,” in *Studia Canonica*, 44 (2010), 293-342.

²⁸ SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, Conciliar constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* on the sacred liturgy, 4 December 1963, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 97-138, English translation in *Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979: Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1982, doc. 1, 4-27.

²⁹ *SC*, no. 3.

Second Vatican Council remanded the practical work of reform to others apart from the Council. Dissimilar to Trent, *SC* provided goals, principles and demands of liturgical reform. The Constitution reasserted the exclusive authority of the Apostolic See in matters pertaining to the Mass and of the Roman Missal itself.³⁰

As a result of instruction *Inter oecumenici* issued in 1964,³¹ changes were made to the Mass in 1965; additional changes were promulgated by means of instruction *Tres abhinc annos* in 1967.³² These are sometimes referred to as the “interim” Missals. Neither of these was promulgated as a typical edition. Rather, they are known as modifications to *MR/1962*, though the changes they enacted were significant. The era of these Missals was also one of experimentation, authorized and otherwise.

In April of 1969, Paul VI issued Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*.³³ In so doing, he promulgated the texts of the reformed Mass and its formularies,³⁴ promoted as fulfillment of the mandates of *SC*. This collection of texts continued to be styled *Missale*

³⁰ “Therefore, no other person, even if he is a priest, may on his own add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy” (*SC*, no. 22, §3).

³¹ See SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Instruction (first) *Inter oecumenici* on the orderly carrying out of the sacred liturgy, 26 September 1964, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 877-900, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 6, 73-99. See also SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree *Nuper edita instructione*, promulgating the new *Ordo Missae* and the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae*, 27 January 1965, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 408-409, English translation in *DOL*, 1982, doc. 196, 449.

³² See SACRED CONGREGATION FOR RITES, Instruction (second) “*Instructio altera*,” *Tres abhinc annos*, on the orderly carrying out of the Constitution on the Liturgy, 4 May 1967, in *AAS*, 59 (1967), 442-448, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 39, 135-140. See also SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree *Per instructionem alteram*, promulgating the text on changes in the *Ordo Missae*, 18 May 1967, in *Notitiae*, 3 (1967), 195, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 201, 456.

³³ PAUL VI, Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, approving the new Roman Missal, 3 April 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 217-222, and in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 142-146, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 202, 458-461. See also SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Decree, 26 March 1970, prot. no. 166/70, English translation in *Roman Missal Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI and Revised at the Direction of Pope John Paul II*, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing, 2011, 9*.

³⁴ In Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, §5, Paul VI refers to “the new composition of the Roman Missal.”

Romanum, MR/1969. Paul VI ordered that observance of its prescriptions and use of its contents become effective 30 November 1969.³⁵

As with the *Missale Romanum* promulgated by Pius V in 1570, so this Roman Missal promulgated by Paul VI was intended to be normative for the entire Latin Church. The Pontiff manifested his will that this be the case by stating, “We decree that these laws and prescriptions be firm and effective now and in future, notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and amendment.”³⁶ The document in whole concludes in similar words with a general revocation formula: “We wish that these Our decrees and prescriptions may be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by Our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation.”³⁷

By this, it becomes clear that the juridic status of MR/1570 and successive editions is imitated in the new: the form of the Mass of the Latin Church exists by juridic act of the Holy See. The contents of this new Roman Missal, as well as the actions of and related to the celebration of those contents, are regulated by juridic acts that were issued by the Holy See.

The new MR/1969 eliminated the *praenotanda* of earlier editions and introduced in their place the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*, the *General Instruction of the Roman*

³⁵ An exception for other rites in existence at the time, such as that provided by *Quo primum*, is not explicitly mentioned in SC or Apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum*.

³⁶ Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, §13.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, §15.

Missal, the contents of which were to be observed in the celebration of Mass.³⁸ This new single document differs greatly from its predecessor documents; its contents are highly catechetical, containing comparatively fewer explicit directions replaced by more general guidance.

Because the Mass of the Latin Church is subject to the vigilance of the Holy See, matters pertaining to it are treated by juridical means. Considering this, therefore, approximately six weeks prior to the 30 November 1969, the effective date of Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship issued *Constitutione apostolica*,³⁹ the first document on the gradual execution of SC. In it, closely circumscribed exceptions to the use of MR/1969 are presented, allowing some priests to continue use of the *Missale Romanum* as it existed at the time of the decree.

³⁸ See SACRED CONGREGATION FOR RITES (CONSILIUM), Decree *Ordine Missae*, promulgating the *editio typica* of the *Ordo Missae* and issuing the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, 6 April 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 147, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 203, 461. Latin text of the 1969 edition of the *GIRM* may be accessed at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5FHI25-yjGbMDkzZDI2MGYtZjYyNS00OWY0LTk4NzMtZTk0ODY0ODg4Nzk0/view> (11 January 2022). The *GIRM* underwent four main revisions following its original 6 April 1969 promulgation, beginning very shortly thereafter with clarifications on 18 November 1969, included with a second printing of the new *Ordo Missae*. Identification of edition numbers of subsequent texts is inconsistent. They are sometimes denoted by the edition of the Missal and sometimes denoted with an edition number of its own. In any event, the timeline is as follows: 26 March 1970; 23 December 1972; 27 March 1975. For a notated amalgam of the first four publications of the *GIRM* in English, see *DOL*, doc. 208, 465-533. Another edition was issued with the third *editio typica* of the Roman Missal, which was promulgated in an anticipatory way on 20 April 2000. Once created, the instruction accompanying it became *GIRM/2002*, with an official version for the United States of America made available in 2003. It is not until 2010 that an official English translation of the 2008 *editio typica tertia emendata* of the Roman Missal became available and with it, the Instruction that became known as *GIRM/2008*. This document is sometimes denoted as *GIRM/2011* or *GIRM/2008*, emended. For the sake of simplicity, reference herein to this document is *GIRM/2008usa*, parallel to *MR/2008usa*. For the official English translation of *GIRM/2008usa*, see ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO, *The Liturgy Documents Volume Two: Essential Documents for Parish Sacramental Rites and Other Liturgies*, Second Edition, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 2012, 92-177. The official translation of the latest *GIRM* for use in dioceses of Canada is available at <https://www.ccwatershed.org/pdfs/8890-canadian-girm-2010-general-instruction-roman-missal/download/> (11 January 2022). It is always the latest version of the *GIRM* that regulates celebration of Mass in the OF.

³⁹ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction *Constitutione apostolica*, on the gradual carrying out of Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* 3 April 1969, 20 October 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 749-753, and in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 418-423, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 209, 634-538.

These exceptions would be reiterated, expanded and restricted over a relatively short course of time in other documents, of greater and lesser bearing. Among these are *Instructione de Constitutione*⁴⁰ and the so-called “Heenan” or “Agatha Christie” indult,⁴¹ both issued in 1971. In 1971 as well, a reprint of the still new *MR/1969* appeared as an amended version, *MR/1971*, not promulgated as a second edition, though at times curiously referred to as an *editio altera*. The second *editio typica*, *MR/1975*, was promulgated by Paul VI in 1975.⁴²

Existing exceptions for use of a prior edition of the Roman Missal were superseded later by a broader grant by Pope John Paul II. He did so first in 1984 by the provisions of *Quattuor abhinc annos*.⁴³ Later, upon the occasion of grave difficulties with the Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX), these exceptions were expanded in motu proprio *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Notification *Instructione de Constitutione*, on the Roman Missal, the book of the Liturgy of the Hours and the Calendar, 14 June 1971, in *AAS*, 63 (1971), 712-715, and in *Notitiae*, 7 (1971), 215-217, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 216, 544-546.

⁴¹ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, rescript permitting the use of the 1962 Missal in England and Wales, 5 November 1971 (=Heenan Indult), in *CLD*, vol. 10, 147-148. In July of 1971, the *Times* of London published an open petition to Paul VI asking him to consider the affects that abandoning the traditional *Ordo Missae* would have upon culture and civilization. Several leaders and other personalities were signatories, many of them not Catholic. Among them was author Agatha Christie. It was said that Paul VI, a fan of her writing, made verbal note of her name. Grant of the “Heenan Indult” is perceived to have been at least somewhat influenced by this petition and is therefore frequently called the “Agatha Christie Indult” (see Y. CHIRON, trans. J. PEPINO, *Annibale Bugnini, Reformer of the Liturgy*, Brooklyn, NY, Angelico Press, 2018, 149). Chiron cites *The Times (London)*, 6 July 1971, as the original organ of publication.

⁴² SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Decree concerning the second typical edition, 27 March 1975, prot. no. 1970/74, English translation in *MR/2008usa*, 10*. The naming of the editions can be confusing. The *MR/1975* is referred to as *editio altera* and as the second typical edition. In Latin numbering, frequently a second edition is termed *altera*; subsequent editions become numbered sequentially as *tertia* and so forth. In this way, both *altera* and *secunda* are apt for *MR/1975*. However, another *editio typica secunda* was promulgated by John Paul II in 1985. Thus, the *editio typica tertia* is the fourth edition, rather than the titular third.

⁴³ See CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Circular letter *Quattuor abhinc annos*, 3 October 1984, in *Communicationes*, 17 (1985), 3-4, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 7, 3-4.

⁴⁴ JOHN PAUL II, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, 2 July 1988, in *AAS*, 80 (1988), 1495-1498, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 12, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1991, 805-808.

John Paul II promulgated a third *editio typica* of the Roman Missal in the Jubilee Year of 2000, *MR/2000*, which was not published until March of 2002.⁴⁵ To this point in time, there had been no explicit provision for an interchange or exchange between the older and newer rites. In fact, there had been explicit prohibition against mixture of the rites in the two Missals, by means of both private replies and universal decree.

The practice of limited exception for use of an edition or version of *Missale Romanum* prior to *MR/2000* would be substituted with nearly universal allowance in 2007 by Pope Benedict XVI in motu proprio *Summorum Pontificum*. Within the document, Benedict XVI would designate the rite contained in the *MR/1962* the *Forma extraordinaria* or Extraordinary Form and the rite contained in the Missal promulgated by John Paul II the *Forma ordinaria* or Ordinary Form.⁴⁶ In *Con grande fiducia*, his letter accompanying *SP*, Benedict XVI would call for what has become known as “mutual enrichment” between these two forms of the Latin Rite by the admission of new Saints and introduction of some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces from the OF into the EF.⁴⁷ Benedict XVI would make some minor corrections and editions to *MR/2000*, promulgated as *editio typica emendata* in 2008,⁴⁸ the Roman Missal governing the OF celebration of the Mass throughout the Latin Church at the time of this writing.

The pontificate of Francis brought the first material application of mutual enrichment between *MR/1962* and *MR/2008*. In February 2020, the CDF concomitantly presented two

⁴⁵ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, 2002, promulgated in an anticipatory way in 2000 by CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Decree concerning the third typical edition, 20 April 2000, prot. no. 143/00/L, English translation in *MR/2008usa*, 11*-12*.

⁴⁶ *SP*, art. 1.

⁴⁷ *CGF*, §9.

⁴⁸ Latin typical edition: *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum, Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum, iuxta typicam tertiam emendatam*, Downers Grove, IL, Midwest Theological Forum, 2015.

decrees: *Cum sanctissima*⁴⁹ with accompanying *Nota praevia*⁵⁰ providing a general possibility for the optional celebration of more recently canonized Saints and *Beati* in the EF along with Decree *Quo magis*⁵¹ with accompanying *Nota praevia*⁵² allowing optional celebration of seven additional Eucharistic Prefaces in the EF.

Five months after these significant additions to *MR/1962* and modifications to *GRC/1960*, the same Pontificate issued new legislation by means of *motu proprio Traditionis Custodes*, withdrawing the universal faculties to offer the *usus antiquior* and remanding the matter to the diocesan bishop. Restrictions were imposed regarding the grant of faculties to use *MR/1962*,⁵³ the location for celebration of the EF⁵⁴ and the establishment of new personal parishes and groups of the faithful attached to the EF.⁵⁵

Five months after *motu proprio Traditionis Custodes*, the CDWDS issued *Responsa ad dubia* as means of clarification to *TC*. These responses provided some clarification and also served to raise yet more questions in need of clarification.

⁴⁹ CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, Decree *Cum sanctissima*, 20 February 2020, on celebrating recently canonized Saints in the *Forma extraordinaria* of the Latin Rite, prot. no. 137/2009S – ED, available at www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20200222_decreto-cum-sanctissima_la.pdf (11 January 2022).

⁵⁰ CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, note for the presentation of the Decree *Cum sanctissima*, (= *Nota praevia*, *Cum sanctissima*), on the liturgical celebration in honor of Saints in the *Forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, not dated, prot. No. 137/2009S-ED, English translation available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20200222_nota-decreto-cumsanctissima_en.html (11 January 2022).

⁵¹ CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, Decree *Quo magis* on adding seven Eucharistic Prefaces to the *Forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, 20 February 2020, prot. no. 137/2009P – ED, available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20200222_decreto-quo-magis_la.html (11 January 2022).

⁵² CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, Note for the presentation of the Decree *Quo magis* (= *Nota praevia*, *Quo magis*), on the liturgical celebration in honor of Saints in the *Forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, not dated, prot. no. 137/2009S – ED, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20200222_nota-decreto-quomagis_en.html (7 July 2022).

⁵³ See *TC*, arts. 2; 4; 5.

⁵⁴ See *ibid.*, arts. 3, §2; 3, §5

⁵⁵ See *ibid.*, arts. 3, §2; 3, §6.

This chapter will undertake a juridic and practical examination of these actions of the Holy See restricting and permitting use of an older Missal for celebration of the Mass in the period following the post-Vatican II reforms. It was these juridical acts that have paved the pathway to mutual enrichment.

1.1 – Under the Pontificate of Pope Paul VI: 1963-1978

The Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican was convened 11 October 1962, under the pontificate of John XXIII (1958-1963). Dying only eight months later on 3 June 1963, Paul VI was elected on 21 June 1963; his coronation took place on 30 June 1963. The Council continued.

On 4 December 1963, at the end of the Council's second session, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was promulgated. This Constitution requires:

[T]hat the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times.⁵⁶ [...] In this restoration, both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify; the Christian people, so far as possible, should be enabled to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively and as befits a community.⁵⁷

In the same vein as *Quo primum* of Pius V, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* asserts the authority of the Church over the Mass, warning against alterations by subordinate authority, stating, "Regulation of the sacred liturgy depends solely on the authority of the Church, that is, on the Apostolic See and, as laws may determine, on the bishop."⁵⁸ [...] Therefore, no other person, even if he be a priest, may add, remove or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority."⁵⁹

⁵⁶ *SC*, no. 4.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 21.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 22, §1.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 22, §3. This would become canonized in *CIC/83* as c. 846, §1: "In celebrating the sacraments the liturgical books approved by competent authority are to be observed faithfully; accordingly, no one is to add, omit, or alter anything in them on one's own authority." While directly reflecting *SC*, the canon also strengthens *CIC/17* c. 733, §1: "In confecting, administering and receiving the Sacraments, the rites and ceremonies that are prescribed in the approved ritual books of the Church are to be accurately observed."

In order to execute the mandates contained in *SC*, Paul VI created *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem liturgicam Sacrosanctum Concilium* by means of *motu proprio Sacram liturgiam*.⁶⁰ Paul VI personally chose Fr. Annibale Bugnini as secretary to this body, which would become known as “Consilium.”⁶¹ In keeping with *SC*, no. 25,

Another form of this, presented in disciplinary terms, is found in the 2004 corrective document *Redemptionis Sacramentum*: “They ought not to detract from the profound meaning of their own ministry by corrupting the liturgical celebration either through alteration or omission, or through arbitrary additions” (CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum* on certain matters to be observed or to be avoided regarding the Most Holy Eucharist, 25 March 2004, in *AAS*, 96 [2004], 549-601, here, art. 31, English translation available at http://m.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20040423_redemptionis-sacramentum_en.html [11 January 2022]). See also ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session VII, 3 March 1547, Decree on the Sacraments, canon 13. Additionally, the same document states, “The reprobated practice by which priests, deacons or the faithful here and there alter or vary at will the texts of the Sacred Liturgy that they are charged to pronounce, must cease. For in doing thus, they render the celebration of the Sacred Liturgy unstable, and not infrequently distort the authentic meaning of the Liturgy” (*Redemptionis Sacramentum*, art. 59). Other juridic documents issued by the Holy See since the promulgation of *SC* have included a re-assertion of the same prohibition found therein against changes made to the Mass by subordinate authority. The most recent significant example is found in the *GIRM*: “Nevertheless, the priest must remember that he is the servant of the Sacred Liturgy and that he himself is not permitted, on his own initiative, to add, to remove or to change anything in the celebration of Mass” (*GIRM*/2008usa, no. 24). Notably, a question was posed in 1966 regarding the ability for the celebrant to make changes to the vernacular texts. The Sacred Congregation for Rites (Concilium) responded in the negative, recalling *SC*, no. 22, §3 (see *DOL*, 92, footnote R⁴). This may indicate a position held by some that vernacular texts do not bear quite the same value as Latin typical texts.

⁶⁰ PAUL VI, *motu proprio Sacram Liturgiam*, 25 January 1964, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), English translation in *DOL*, doc. 20, 84-87. *Sacram Liturgiam* also decreed certain prescriptions of *SC*, such as the institution of diocesan liturgical commissions and the requirement for approval by the Holy See for all liturgical texts.

⁶¹ No name was given to the body in the *motu proprio*; it was decided later (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 49-50, footnote 1). Birth of this body began in December of 1963, when Paul VI requested propositions for a commission to implement *SC* from both Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro and the Conciliar Liturgical Commission. Lercaro in turn asked Bugnini to draft a plan while the Conciliar Commission gave the task to its Secretariat. The plan presented by the Conciliar Commission principally followed the plan of the Preconciliar Preparatory Commissions with a secretariat identical to that of the Conciliar Commission. It would be a minor commission and not attached to the Congregation of Rites or to the Conciliar Commission. It would have fourteen study groups and could be composed, for example, of five bishops and eight experts. A list of selected individuals was attached; the plan was forwarded to Paul VI on 19 December 1963 (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 60). Alternatively, the plan presented by Bugnini was articulated in detail and with a clear and extensive bureaucratic structure. The plan included re-creation and restructuring of the Mass, the Divine Office and Pontifical; of the rites, sacraments and sacramentals; of music, chant, the Martyrology, liturgical law and the rites of the papal chapel. By its outline, it was to be a thorough historical, stylistic, theological, scriptural, musical, pastoral, artistic and juridical revision with room for adaptation and use of the vernacular. Nothing was excepted from revision in the Bugnini plan (see *ibid.*, 63-68). The Bugnini structure would consist of a secretariat assisted by *periti*, the commission proper consisting of a cardinal president and twenty to thirty bishops along with a “super commission” of cardinals. The proposal included several study groups with a clear methodology. The time frame proposed was five years for completion of the total reform if the body were to act decisively (see *ibid.*, 60-61). What transpired remains unknown. What is known is that on 3 January 1964, Bugnini was appointed to organize what became Consilium. They met first as a constituent assembly on 15 January 1964 during which meeting Bugnini presented a detailed

bishops and *periti*, necessary for the many roles within Consilium, were selected from various parts of the world.⁶²

On 3 April 1969, Paul VI granted juridic approval to the new *Ordo Missae* for use in the Latin Church by means of Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*.⁶³ The new *Ordo* of MR/1969 is viewed as the principal fruit of Consilium; the newly reordered volume

formula for the entire project (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 61). Bugnini recalls, “The sketch presented a few days after Consilium was created contained a set of perspectives and programs that would appear, substantially unchanged, in the definitive redaction of the ‘General Plan for Liturgical Reform,’ a booklet of fifty-three pages that was presented to the Holy Father on 15 March 1964” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 62). In short, on 29 January 1964, Consilium was chaired by Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, archbishop of Bologna. The body comprised fifty cardinals and bishops and over two hundred liturgiologists; Annibale Bugnini served as secretary. The body was entrusted with revising liturgical books according to the directives of SC, of educating the entire Church about the revised liturgy as well as addressing the appeal of the Council Fathers for full and active participation in the Mass by the faithful. Consilium’s work lasted five years until it was assumed into the Congregation for Divine Worship in 1969 (see PECKLERS, *History of the Roman Liturgy*, 177).

⁶² Consilium appeared at first to be a consultative body. Then it appeared to be a subsidiary of, headed by and subject to, the Sacred Congregation of Rites. These arrangements did not work (For a thorough discussion of the divergence between the Congregation of Rites and Consilium, see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 69-95). From a juridic perspective, competencies were confusing. From a human perspective, there was infighting as well as incompatible mentalities pertaining to vision, goals and methods of implementation (see *ibid.*, 88-89). Consilium assumed a unique juridical role via the Secretariat of State in a letter to Lercaro dated 29 February 1964. In it, the body is described as entrusted with oversight and coordination of the work of the study groups, preparing an instruction that carried out the practical application of *Sacram liturgiam*. It was entrusted also with outlining the competence of ecclesiastical authorities of territories, applying SC in letter and spirit by responding to the conferences of bishops and questions that arise regarding the correct implementation of SC, along with suggesting persons to be in charge of study groups that would be responsible for the revision of the liturgical books and the rites themselves. Consilium was granted the authority to make appeals of their decisions and to seek solution for grave, particularly sensitive or entirely new matters directly to Paul VI (see SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter, *Mi onoro di comunicare* of Cardinal A. Cicognani to Cardinal G. Lercaro, President of Consilium, on the organization and work of Consilium, 29 February 1964, [Italian], English translation in DOL, doc. 77, 214). The same letter granted authority to Consilium to decide on the personnel to work on the liturgical revisions. Additionally, it indicated that Consilium would act independently of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Bugnini recalls that, by this letter, Consilium had been made “an authoritative study group that also had temporary administrative functions and was directly dependent on the Pope. Consilium was therefore closer in nature to an agency of the Curia than to a commission” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 51). Because this arrangement was rather weak from a working juridic perspective, a second letter from the Secretariat of State on 7 January 1965 “further clarified the competencies of the Congregation of Rites and Consilium by giving to the latter the duty of overseeing and regulating the experimental phase of new rites, and to the former the duty of giving juridical force to the definitive publication of these rites. [...] [O]ther responsibilities were given to Consilium as the work proceeded” (*ibid.*, 52, footnote 4). Bugnini does not enumerate these “other responsibilities.” See also SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter *Compio il venerato incarico* of Cardinal A. Cicognani to Cardinal A. M. Larraona, Prefect of the Congregation of Rites, on the respective competencies of the Congregation and of Consilium, 7 January 1965, in R. KACZYNSKI (ed.), *Enchiridion Documentorum instaurationis liturgicae I (1963-1973)*, Rome, 1976, English translation in DOL, doc. 82, 221. Cf. PAUL VI, Address to Consilium, 13 October 1966, in AAS, 58 (1966), 1145-1150, English translation in DOL, doc. 84, 223-226.

⁶³ Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, §4.

continues to be styled *Missale Romanum*. In the Apostolic Constitution, the Pontiff explains that the revision process included the enrichment of worship in the Latin Church with ancient non-Western texts:

Just after the Council of Trent, the study ‘of ancient manuscripts in the Vatican library and elsewhere,’ as St. Pius V attests in the Apostolic Constitution *Quo primum*,⁶⁴ helped greatly in the correction of the Roman Missal. Since then, however, other ancient sources have been discovered and published and liturgical formularies of the Eastern Church have been studied. Accordingly, many have had the desire for these doctrinal and spiritual riches not to be stored away in the dark, but to be put into use for the enlightenment of the mind of Christians and for the nurture of their spirit.⁶⁵

Immediately thereafter, on 6 April 1969, by means of decree *Ordine Missae*, Paul VI manifested his will that the newly ordered *MR/1969* and its accompanying *GIRM* would be promulgated throughout the Latin Church and replace all that had preceded it. This mandate became effective 30 November 1969.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ *Quo primum*, §3, which states, in part: “Hence, We decided to entrust this work to learned men of our selection. They very carefully collated all their work with the ancient codices in Our Vatican Library and with reliable, preserved or emended codices from elsewhere. Besides this, these men consulted the works of ancient and approved authors concerning the same sacred rites; and thus, they have restored the Missal itself to the original form and rite of the holy Fathers” (*Quo primum*, §3).

⁶⁵ Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, §4. This statement of Paul VI would be incorporated into an introduction added to the *GIRM* at its second printing. This text had the goal of defending the redesigned Roman Missal as a testimony of unaltered faith and uninterrupted tradition in response to opinions that the revised Missal was a rupture with liturgical continuity. This text endures in the latest version: “[...] St. Pius V was first of all concerned with preserving the more recent tradition, then unjustly assailed, introducing only very slight changes into the sacred rite. In fact, the Missal of 1570 differs little from the very first printed edition of 1474, which in turn faithfully takes up again the Missal used in the time of Pope Innocent III [1198-1216]. Moreover, manuscript books in the Vatican Library, even though they provided material for several textual emendations, by no means made it possible to pursue inquiry into ‘ancient and approved authors’ further back than the liturgical commentaries of the Middle Ages. Today, however, innumerable writings of scholars have shed light on the ‘norm of the holy fathers,’ which the revisers of the Missal of St. Pius V assiduously followed” (*GIRM/2008usa*, nos. 7-8). This ostensible diminution of the work done by the post-Tridentine liturgical reform could be informed by a closer reading of *Quo primum* and appreciation of the time in which it was promulgated. *Quo primum* indicates that sources consulted were not limited to those of the Vatican Library. The post-Tridentine Reformers were convinced that the Roman Mass in use at the time had retained its structure faithfully from the time of the most ancient texts available. Liturgical studies in the twentieth century revealed that the euchological texts found in *MR/1570* are, indeed, to be found in the most ancient extant sources. It would appear, then, that the purpose of the post-Tridentine research was to provide confirmation and clarification of what existed in order to preserve it, not the creation of a new *Ordo Missae*.

⁶⁶ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR RITES, Decree *Ordine Missae*, promulgating the *editio typica* of the *Ordo Missae* and issuing the General Instruction of the Roman Missal, 6 April 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 147, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 203, 461. Cf. Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, and SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction *Constitutione apostolica*, on the gradual carrying out of the Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* (3 April 1969), 20 October 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 749-753, and in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 418-423, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 209, 534-538.

On 25 May 1969, the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship promulgated the new *Ordo lectionem Missae*.⁶⁷ The *OLM* prescribes and contains the full texts of all of the Holy Scripture readings for the Mass celebrated throughout the Temporal and Sanctoral cycles of the liturgical year. This volume accompanied the new Roman Missal in a greatly expanded “Liturgy of the Word,” a reordering of the “Mass of the Catechumens” as known in *MR/1962*. The *OLM* differed greatly from the lectionary cycle as received in *MR/1962* in the texts and number of lections in each Mass formulary. The Holy Scripture lections for weekdays were expanded into a two-year rotating cycle while those for use on Sundays were expanded into a three-year rotating cycle. This expansive collection needed to be contained under separate cover.⁶⁸ The effective date for the new *OLM* was 30 November 1969, the same as that of the new Missal and *GIRM*.

1.1.1 – Legislation Affecting Use of the Older Rites

Due to the radical nature of the changes to the Order of Mass and the complexities of the new *OLM* and Roman Breviary, which underwent radical reform, a degree of sensitivity was granted to clerics who had difficulty shifting to their use. Initially, these clerics were placed into classifications and granted exception to continue use of the liturgical books that had been in effect prior to the time the prescribed changes were to take effect. The classes, as well as the means of requesting and granting this exception, were modified over time.

⁶⁷ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, *Ordo lectionem Missae*, 25 May 1969, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1969, English translation in *Roman Missal Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI, Lectionary for Mass*, English translation, *Approved by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See*, New York, NY, Catholic Book Publishing Company, New York, NY, 1970, 1. See also SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction *Decreto quo*, on editions and use of the new Lectionary for Mass, 25 July 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 548-549, and in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 238-239, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 233, 586-587.

⁶⁸ This led to a frequent designation of the volume containing the euchological formularies for the Mass as the Sacramentary and that containing the Sacred Scriptures as the Lectionary. This is of practical assistance. Truly, however, both volumes, as well as subtexts of the Lectionary such as the Book of the Gospels, comprise what is officially styled “The Roman Missal.”

1.1.1.1 – Introducing Exceptions for Use of the Older Rite for Mass

On 20 October 1969, the SCDW issued the Instruction *Constitutione apostolica*.⁶⁹ This document contains the first public juridic provision, an exceptional derogation, for continued use of the rites as they were in existence at the time of the Instruction's issue instead of the shortly forthcoming newly reordered rites.

This Instruction identifies two classifications of priests who, by matter of exception, could be permitted to continue using the existing rites. The qualifications for each class are presented and the ecclesiastical authorities who may grant permission to make use of the existing rites are respectively designated:

19. Elderly priests who celebrate Mass without a congregation and who might encounter serious difficulty in taking up the new Order of Mass and the new texts of the Roman Missal and *Lectionary for Mass*, may, with the consent of their ordinary, retain the rites and texts now in use.⁷⁰

20. Special cases of priests who are infirm, ill or otherwise disabled are to be submitted to this Congregation.

In article 19, the first of two classes enumerated is designated as that of *sacerdotes aetate*.⁷¹ Provision is granted making it possible for such priests to be allowed continued use of the existing texts.⁷² A number of requirements for qualification and use are presented:

1. The priest must be *aetatis*. This is a specific and exclusive reference to the physical age of the petitioning priest;⁷³

⁶⁹ *Constitutione apostolica*, nos. 19 and 20.

⁷⁰ Within this work and the documents quoted herein, the terms “ordinary” and “local ordinary” refer to the diocesan bishop or his equivalent in law.

⁷¹ The term *sacerdos* indicates that this document pertains to bishops and presbyters. A bishop would make request to his competent authority.

⁷² Dated 20 October 1969, the “rites and texts now in use” refers to *MR/1962* as it had been emended in 1965 and 1967. The Divine Office as well and the other rituals would be those versions as revised by *Inter Oecumenici*, issued 26 September 1964, effective 7 March 1965. These changes and emendations took place during and shortly after Vatican II. Therefore, it must be understood that the “rites in use at the time” are not the rites now used in either Form.

⁷³ The threshold age for one to be “elderly” (or, perhaps better, “aged”) is not defined. Meaning of the term has varied parallel to the variances of life expectancies and circumstances. The common estimation of persons in the petitioner's locale and/or achieving the age of retirement may inform the definition. The *CIC/17*, in force at the time, provides no specific age for the retirement of priests. However, timely for those priests who may be considered for the exceptions granted by this Instruction, *motu proprio Ecclesiae sanctae*

2. The elderly priest granted the exception must celebrate the Mass of the rites in existence as of the date of the document;
3. The priest granted the exception must celebrate the older rite *sine populo*;
4. The petitioning priest must be motivated to make his petition because “in taking up the new Order of Mass and the new texts of the Roman Missal and Lectionary for Mass,”⁷⁴ he has encountered:
 - a) a difficulty⁷⁵
 - b) that is recognized as “serious.”⁷⁶
5. Consent of the petitioning priest’s ordinary is required.⁷⁷

of Paul VI of 6 August 1966 does make such a distinction: “So that the prescription of no. 31 of the Decree *Christus Dominus* may be carried out, all pastors are asked of their own free will to submit their resignation from office to their own bishop not later than at the completion of their 75th year” (Paul VI, *motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae*, norms for carrying out certain of the decrees of Vatican Council II, 6 August 1966, in *AAS*, 58 [1966], 757-787, here, no. 20, [3], English translation at http://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-vi_motu-proprio_19660806_ecclesiae-sanctae.html [11 January 2022]). This lent specificity to what had been left as a generality found in *Christus Dominus*, no. 31. This Conciliar decree states, in part: “Pastors who are unable to fulfill their office properly and fruitfully because of the increasing burden of old age, or some other serious reason, are urgently requested to tender their resignation voluntarily upon the invitation of the bishop” (SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, Conciliar decree *Christus Dominus* on the pastoral office of bishops, 28 October 1965, no. 31, English translation in W. ABBOTT [gen. ed.], *The Documents of Vatican II*, Piscataway, NJ, New Century Publishers, 1966, 396-433, here, 419-420).

⁷⁴ Given the use of a coordinating conjunction “and,” it appears that the serious difficulty must lie in taking up not one or two but all three of the major components of the new Missal, i.e., its significantly modified order, texts and Lectionary for Mass.

⁷⁵ The term “difficulty” is not defined. *Prima facie*, the Instruction could be interpreted as too vague to be implemented or that any degree of difficulty would be sufficient. At the same time, it is reasonable to assume that every physically capable priest and bishop at the time, even those most enthusiastic for the changes, would have encountered some degree of “difficulty” in making the transition to the revised rite.

⁷⁶ “Difficulty” is modified by the adjective “serious.” This likewise needs to be interpreted subjectively.

⁷⁷ It seems logical that this ordinary would be the one to determine the subjective terms “elderly,” “serious” and “difficulty” together with the question of “the priest who celebrated Mass without a congregation.” The ordinary with the competence to grant the favor would consider *CIC/17*, c. 50 (cf. *CIC/83*, c. 36), which continues the ancient legal practice of interpreting matters which restrict rights narrowly and others, such as favors, broadly. This would bring him to consider further *CIC/17*, c. 68 (cf. *CIC/83*, c. 77), which provides that when in doubt, a determination of granting a privilege is to include the determination that an actual benefit is granted by it. Finally, the ordinary would receive guidance in *CIC/17*, c. 85 (cf. *CIC/83*, c. 92) which reminds him that the faculty for dispensing for a certain cause is itself subject to strict interpretation. This would allow the ordinary to understand his limitation when determining who would qualify for the favor and that he could not dispense the favor with caprice by, for instance, granting it to those who manifestly do not fit within the categories enumerated in the Instruction. Under the provisions of this Instruction, the matter could become quite complex. The subjective judgment of the ordinary could depend heavily upon that ordinary’s sympathetic nature, or lack thereof, making for ease or difficulty in obtaining the permission. These decisions could foster disunity or resentment among clergy. It could give rise to scandal as some might question why certain able-bodied but elderly clergy no longer offered Mass with a congregation once use of the new *Ordo* was mandated on 30 November 1969.

Once the condition of the petitioning priest had been determined and the remaining conditions were found acceptable by the ordinary, that ordinary could then grant consent to the petitioning priest for use of “the rites and texts now in use.”⁷⁸

The second classification of priests who could petition for exception from celebrating the forthcoming revised Mass is found in no. 20 of the same Instruction. This class of “special cases” comprises priests suffering from some incapacity of a physical nature. “Special cases” is implicitly defined by a circumscription that includes only the “infirm, ill or otherwise disabled.”⁷⁹ Petitions from priests laboring under these conditions were to be submitted to SCDW.⁸⁰

1.1.1.2 – Exceptions during Ongoing Liturgical Change

On 18 November 1969, the SCDW presented the *GIRM* that accompanied a second printing of the Order of Mass. Along with clarifications to the original *GIRM*, it contains an explanation of itself:

[... T]he Instruction should not be looked on as a doctrinal, that is to say, dogmatic document. Rather it is a pastoral and ritual instruction: it outlines the celebration and its parts in the light of the doctrinal principles contained in the documents noted. For the rites both have doctrine as their source and give to doctrine its outward expression.

⁷⁸ The term “consent” is present: *de consensu sui Ordinarii*. However, the terms “permit,” “grant,” “necessary,” “require,” “valid” and “licit” are absent. The terminology present in the document leads one to believe that the provisions contained in the document are a matter of a favor or, less specifically, an “indult.” Due to the absent terminology, however, an argument could be made that it is not necessary for a priest to be experiencing the stated conditions in order for him to continue use of the older rite. However, granting his consent facilitates the ordinary’s vigilance over liturgical matters in his diocese. This notion would take form in *CIC/83*, c. 392, §2.

⁷⁹ Creation of this second general classification acknowledges that the conditions present in “special cases” do not necessarily arise from age.

⁸⁰ It would seem intuitive that matters dealing with disturbed physical capacity of the priest would fall under the more proximate and swift authority of the local ordinary, but such is not the case in this Instruction. Rather, those requesting the favor while suffering physical hardship need to have their requests forwarded to the SCDW. As such, it could be argued in either direction: this class is more important because involvement of the Holy See is required; this class is less important because attention is greatly delayed due to the need for correspondence with the possibly distant Holy See.

The Instruction thus seeks to provide guidelines for catechesis of the faithful and to offer the main criteria for Eucharistic celebration to be used by those who take part in the celebration according to their different orders and ranks.⁸¹

At first, there is specific disavowal of a notion that the *GIRM* is a doctrinal or dogmatic document. This is helpful in that it ostensibly responds to a position held by some that anything but the most assiduous observance of the rubrics and the contents of the earlier *Praenotanda* was morally unacceptable.⁸²

The document then described the *GIRM* as an outline of ritual practice and guideline for catechesis. Because the terms “outline” and “guideline” are not precise juridic terms, it could have appeared that the Holy See was indicating that the contents of the *GIRM* could be viewed as somewhat fluid. From this perspective, it would seem plausible that a priest could celebrate the new *Ordo Missae* to some degree informed by the earlier rubrics and, therefore, to some degree, enriched by the style of those rubrics. One might perceive that the celebrant could call upon his knowledge and presumably well-formed habits from his

⁸¹ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Declaration *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*, on the occasion of a second printing of the *Ordo Missae*, clarifying the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, 18 November 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 417-418, §§3-4, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 204, 461-462, here, 462. The Secretary of State will reflect the quote above, stating: “The preliminary and introduction to the new Missal is the *Institutio Generalis*. This *General Instruction* is not a mere collection of rubrics, but rather a synthesis of theological, aesthetical, pastoral principles that are indispensable to a doctrinal knowledge of the Mass, to its celebration, its catechesis and its pastoral dimensions” (SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter of Cardinal J. Villot to Bishop C. Rossi, President of the Centro di Anziane Liturgica, on the occasion of the 22nd National Liturgical Week of Italy at Oropa, 30 August – 3 September 1971, on the new Roman Missal, 30 August 1971, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 4 September 1971, 1, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 217, 546-548, here, 547).

⁸² On the other hand, the frequent assertion by the Holy See that it has exclusive authority over the Mass of the Latin Church makes it clear that the *GIRM* is far more than an outline. That is to say, observance of the *GIRM* is not entirely devoid of moral consequence, and by its nature, cannot be. Huels offers some clarity by identifying different purposes of the directives provided within the *GIRM* and the rubrics. Some of these take the present indicative tense, imposing a requirement and are therefore preceptive. For example, “On reaching the altar, the priest and ministers make a profound bow” (*GIRM*/2008usa, no. 122). This norm makes a statement that this act is to be performed as described. Huels distinguishes this species of directive from those expressed in the jussive subjunctive mood. In English, these frequently appear as “should” or “is to.” These impose an obligation in a more general sense and, as such, are more open to exception (see J. M. HUELS, *Liturgy and Law: Liturgical Law in the System of Roman Catholic Canon Law*, Montréal, Wilson & Lafleur, 2006, 106). These distinctions are helpful for a celebrant who wishes not to overextend the liberty afforded him by the *GIRM*. They could also spawn conversation on the moral value of the observance of some elements in the *GIRM*.

experience as celebrant of the Mass for years or even decades prior to the post-Conciliar reforms. This perception may not have been shared by the Holy See.

In the ongoing effort to carry out the liturgical changes in an orderly way, the SCDW issued Instruction *Liturgicae instaurationes* on 5 September 1970.⁸³ This document was a partial response to the request that the Holy See “bring its authority to bear on the preservation and growth in the liturgy.”⁸⁴ The document does not contain exceptions or revisions. Rather, it reasserts the now-familiar statement regarding authority of the official Church over the Mass: “The liturgical texts themselves, composed by the Church, are to be treated with the highest respect. No one, then, may take it on himself to make changes, substitutions, deletions or additions.”⁸⁵

The statement’s choice of terminology intimates a response to those who disregarded the value of the new Missal’s texts and the authority of the Church during the period of transition to the new *Ordo*. The document reasserts that the texts of the Mass originate from the authority of the Church, suggesting that as such they belong to the entire Church. Therefore, the authority to make any changes to the texts does not reside in any subordinate individual or group. These points will be important to bear in mind for matters considered below.

1.1.1.3 – Simplifying Requests for Exception

Twenty months after issuing *Constitutione apostolica*, the SCDW issued the Notification *Instructione de Constitutione*. During the twenty intervening months, changes to the liturgy had been ordered frequently and swiftly. This latest document presents rules

⁸³ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction (third) *Liturgicae instaurationes*, 5 September 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 692-704, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 52, 159-167.

⁸⁴ *Liturgicae instaurationes*, §5.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 3. See also *SC*, no. 22, §3.

for the use of new Roman Missal, the General Roman Calendar as well as the redesigned Roman Breviary, restyled “Liturgy of the Hours.”⁸⁶ Additionally, it provides solutions to problems regarding the arrangement of GRC/1970 for the liturgical year 1972/1973.⁸⁷

This Instruction generally maintains the same exceptions for some priests to celebrate the rites in effect prior to the promulgation of *MR*/1969. The document contains a contextual update and simplifies implementation of the exception and the qualifications for receiving it:

Continued use, either in whole or in part [*sive ex toto sive ex parte*], of the *Missale Romanum* in the 1962 *editio typica*, as amended by the 1965 and 1967 decrees and of the *Breviarium Romanum* formerly in use is allowed [*retinere*; preserved/retained], with the consent of the ordinary and only in celebrations without a congregation, for all those who because of their advanced years or illness find serious difficulties in using the new Order of Mass in the Roman Missal, the Lectionary for Mass, or the book of the Liturgy of the Hours.⁸⁸

The significant contextual difference between this Instruction of 14 June 1971 and the earlier *Constitutione apostolica* of 3 April 1969, is that in the interim, the new *Ordo Missae*, *OLM* and Liturgy of the Hours had become the normative liturgical books for the Latin Church as of 30 November 1969. Because of this, *Instructione de Constitutione* uses a shift in terminology in reference to the Missal and Breviary as those “formally in use.” These are the same texts described as “currently in use” in *Constitutione apostolica*.

With *Instructione de Constitutione*, identification of those who may petition for the exception to use the former rites is broadened. Absent from this Instruction is the identification of distinct classes of priests who qualify to request the exception; they are coalesced simply into those of “advanced years or illness.”⁸⁹ Absent as well are the distinct

⁸⁶ Nonetheless, both the older Roman Breviary and the reformed Liturgy of the Hours are officially the Divine Office.

⁸⁷ See *Instructione de Constitutione*, §§1-3.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 3.

⁸⁹ In addition to determining what may constitute “advanced years” or “elderly,” questions may be raised regarding the seriousness/gravity of illness, such as whether it would need to be chronic, transient or

authorities attached to the former two classes. There is no longer any need to involve the Holy See; the local ordinary⁹⁰ grants the exception. Added is the phrase that these exceptional rites may be celebrated “in whole or in part.”⁹¹

The requirements that the exceptional rites must be celebrated without a congregation and with the consent of the ordinary are maintained. The earlier questions related to these requirements, therefore, remain.

That one suffers “serious difficulties” in using the new *Ordo* of MR/1969, *OLM* or Liturgy of the Hours remains a qualification. At the same time, the requirement is significantly relaxed by replacing the coordinating conjunction *and* in *Constitutione apostolica* above with the correlative *or*. Therefore, the matter with which a priest suffers serious difficulty is specified herein as at least any one of the new books rather than all three. This expands the provisions as previously granted and potentially facilitates obtaining the exception.⁹²

1.1.1.4 – Local Requests for Exceptional Use of the Older Rite

Five months later, on 5 November 1971, the SCDW replied to a submission by His Eminence John Cardinal Heenan, requesting exceptional use of the former rites in England and Wales. This rescript comprises the so-called “Heenan Indult.”⁹³

permanent. Here again, the broad terms of the provision require subjective but wise assessment and compassionate judgment on the part of the ordinary.

⁹⁰ Within the context of this Indult, as elsewhere, the terms “ordinary” and “local ordinary” refer to the diocesan bishop or his equivalent in law.

⁹¹ The terminology used here is curious. It describes the provision as, “Continued use, *sive ex toto sive ex parte*, of the *Missale Romanum* [...] and of the *Breviarium Romanum* formerly in use is allowed....” One may wonder if the Holy See was opening the door, inadvertently or consciously, to allowing mixture of the older and newer rites. It is a matter of speculation.

⁹² If there had been one, this document removes a doubt that its provisions include use of the former *Breviarium Romanum*; the texts that fall under the favor are listed in this instruction specifically as the Missal and the Breviary and not merely as “texts” as mentioned in *Constitutione apostolica*. Meanwhile, the other sacramental rites were being reformed more slowly and may not have been in use yet.

⁹³ Heenan’s request and the Holy See’s response may have been motivated by the blood shed by the Catholic Martyrs of the English Reformation or “Martyrs for the Mass,” as they are known.

This indult appears to provide three exceptions:

1. To the bishops of England and Wales to permit the exceptional Masses;
2. To the faithful of England and Wales to attend them;
3. To celebrants who would offer them.

The exceptions involve these persons only. Consent of the ordinary is required, and the episcopal conference is called-upon to determine a praxis that will not disturb ecclesiastical unity. The Missal that must be used is identified as *MR/1962* as amended in 1965 and 1967, consistent with previously granted exceptions.⁹⁴

The stipulations of the indult depart from related general legislation up to that time by including the faculty for the faithful to congregate at such celebrations and for priests to use the older texts with a congregation, under some circumstances. There is no mention of the age or the presence of physical disability on the part of the celebrating priest. A “special occasion” within the particular Church’s territory replaces these prerequisites.⁹⁵

The exception was to be granted to the priest by the ordinary “on occasion” only.⁹⁶ There is no provision for an ongoing regular celebration of Mass using this rite. The exception allows for the authorized priest to offer this Mass in the presence of a congregation, which may convene on said special occasions only and must comprise certain groups only.

As a guarantor against the favor being used outside of its intended constraints, “agreement among the bishops of the Episcopal Conference as to how this faculty is to be

⁹⁴ See *Heenan Indult*, art. 1. In an exchange between Cardinal Vincent Nichols, Archbishop of Westminster, and Archbishop Arthur Roche of the CDWDS in July/August 2021, their correspondence suggests that this indult may have been for Requiem Masses. For the texts, see <https://onepeterfive.com/a-letter-from-the-vatican-on-traditionis-custodes/> (11 January 2022).

⁹⁵ *Heenan Indult*, art. 2.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, art. 2.

exercised will be a further guarantee of unity of praxis in this area.”⁹⁷ This encourages the Bishops of the Conference of England and Wales to develop directives or norms to ensure uniformity of practice within their dioceses. In turn, the document requires: “Priests who on occasion wish to celebrate Mass according to the above-mentioned edition of the Roman Missal may do so by consent of their Ordinary and in accordance with the norms given by the same.”⁹⁸

Though granted to a limited population within a small geographic circumscription, the provisions of this Indult were more generous than the exceptions made available to priests in the rest of the Latin Church. Significantly, this Indult was granted soon, not quite two years, after *MR/1969* was made effective and normative for the Latin Church. The action appears indicative of the Holy See relaxing the universal observance of the new *Ordo Missae*, of recognition by the Holy See that there may be persons, groups of persons or particular Churches that find use of the older rites preferable. Thus, the document becomes significant in the timeline on the way to mutual enrichment.

After the comparatively liberal favor granted to England and Wales in 1971, the Holy See gave different responses to similar requests made by two other prelates. In 1974, the then-Archbishop of Ottawa, Joseph-Aurèle Plourde “requested authorization to permit the celebration of Mass according to *MR/1962* for a group of the faithful.”⁹⁹ As such, the request was for neither a general indult nor the authorization to grant one. By means of rescript dated 24 May 1974, the SCDW denied the Archbishop’s request. The Response

⁹⁷ *Heenan Indult*, art. 1.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, art. 2.

⁹⁹ C.J. GLENDINNING, “Was the 1962 *Missale Romanum* Abrogated: A Canonical Analysis in Light of *Summorum Pontificum*,” in *Worship*, 85, no. 1 (2011) 28, footnote 34. See *La Documentation catholique*, 73 (1976), 242.

was unequivocal: the new Roman Missal is the only Missal of the Latin Rite of the Catholic Church.¹⁰⁰

The following year, the President of the French Episcopal Commission on the Liturgy, Bishop Robert Coffy, made a similar request. In this case, it was the Secretariat of State that responded to Bishop Coffy on 11 October 1975. The rescript states unequivocally in the negative to the request, declaring that the new Missal must replace the old.¹⁰¹

1.1.1.5 – Exceptional Use while Maintaining Primacy of the New Missal

Rather closely between the responses to Plourde in May 1974, and to Coffy in October 1975, the SCDW issued *Conferentiarum Episcopaliū* on 28 October 1974, a notification on the obligatory nature of the *MR/1969*.¹⁰² This document, as its descriptive title suggests, reasserts the obligation to use the new *Ordo Missae*. This Notification asserts that once an episcopal conference decrees that the translated Missal, in whole or in part, is obligatory, it is required to be celebrated as such and in accord only with the *editio typica* of 3 April 1969.¹⁰³ The Notification, *inter alia*, expounds upon the obligatory, normative and licit

¹⁰⁰ “Depuis la Constitution apostolique ‘*Missale Romanum*’ du 3 avril 1969, le Missel romain révisé selon les principes établis par la Constitution liturgique du II^e Concile du Vatican est devenu obligatoire comme le seul Missel du rite Latin dans l’Église catholique romaine. Le Saint-Père a rappelé plusieurs fois cette obligation, par des instructions et des documents divers, depuis la publication du nouveau Missel romain en 1970” (SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, private response to Archbishop Plourde’s request for permission to allow use of the 1962 Missal within the Archdiocese of Ottawa, 24 May 1974, in *La Documentation catholique*, 73 [1976], 242).

¹⁰¹ “Par la constitution *Missale Romanum*, le Pape prescrit, comme vous le savez, que le nouveau Missel doit remplacer l’ancien, nonobstant les Constitutions et Ordonnances apostoliques de ses prédécesseurs, y compris par conséquent toutes les dispositions figurant dans la Constitution *Quo Primum*” (SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Response to Bishop Coffy, 11 October 1975, in *Notitiae*, 12 [1976], 82-83, quoted in GLENDINNING, *Was the 1962 Missale Romanum Abrogated?* 28, footnote 34).

¹⁰² SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Notification *Conferentiarum Episcopaliū*, on the obligatory nature of the Roman Missal of Paul VI, 28 October 1974, in *Notitiae*, 10 (1974), 353, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 219, 549.

¹⁰³ See *Conferentiarum Episcopaliū*, §2.

nature of *MR/1969*. Additionally, it quashes the argument of the use of the former rites on the basis of immemorial custom.¹⁰⁴

Nonetheless, the document reiterates the derogating exception for certain priests.¹⁰⁵ The requirement of “serious difficulties” remains. Those serious difficulties must be found in using the new *Ordo Missae* in *MR/1969* or the *OLM*. The Missal to be used is specified, consistently, as the 1967 emended version of the *MR/1962*. The phrase “in whole or in part” is retained; the questions regarding this phrase thus remain. The Mass must be celebrated without a congregation; ordinaries do not have the authority to grant an exception for celebration with a congregation. No mention is made of the older *Breviarium Romanum* or other rites.¹⁰⁶

Finally, the Notification exhorts and demands “that all priests and people of the Roman Rite duly accept the Order of Mass in the Roman Missal,” that is, *MR/1969*, as the normative Mass of the Latin Church, with all due respect to other lawfully recognized liturgies, but with no exception for any others, even due to immemorial custom. It is asserted that the new *Ordo Missae* is the only lawful celebration of the Mass.¹⁰⁷ Use of the older Missal is granted only by exception with the requirements and restrictions somewhat consistently set forth beginning with *Constitutione apostolica*. Thus, as quickly as it may have been perceived that the Heenan Indult indicated some relaxation of use of the older rites by the authority of the Holy See, there came clarity regarding restriction of their use.

Then came a fiasco. On 7 June 1972, one unidentified priest from France requested permission from the SCDW for a one-time use of the older Missal, in one specific place,

¹⁰⁴ See *Conferentiarum Episcopatum*, §3.

¹⁰⁵ See *ibid.*, §2.

¹⁰⁶ See *ibid.*, §3.

¹⁰⁷ See *ibid.*

for one special occasion. In an immediate reply dated 16 June 1972, the dicastery remanded the matter to the priest's local ordinary with the recommendation that the ordinary consider whether such a Mass would be pastorally prudent and would not instead cause dissension.¹⁰⁸

Apparently, this reply was disseminated quickly, perhaps with a lack of absolute accuracy or not in its entirety. The rumored version of the response gave the appearance that the ordinary, any ordinary, had been granted the authority to approve use of the former Missal, at least *ad causam*. This distorted interpretation, presented as fact, was received with immense joy by many. In order to clarify, the following comment appeared in *Notitiae*:

Some people, ignoring the petition of the writer, have concluded that a local ordinary has the power to allow as a matter of course celebration of Mass according to the unreformed Roman Missal. The petition and the reply make it clear that this case involves a single Mass, "for a specific and limited group," and "in a given instance." Any other inference is unwarranted and false.¹⁰⁹

To the chagrin of some and the joy of others, the interpretation was refuted as fake news.

On 27 March 1975, the SCDW promulgated the *editio typica altera* of the Roman Missal, *MR/1975*.¹¹⁰ It contains no statement on the status of the prior Missal or exceptions for its use.

On 24 April 1975, the Episcopal Conference of England and Wales published a statement on the reformed *Ordo Missae*.¹¹¹ In it, they asserted to their faithful the unique liceity of the Missal promulgated by Paul VI. The bishops exhorted their clergy and faithful to be obedient by conforming to ecclesiastical law as it is expressed in the latest *Ordo* of

¹⁰⁸ See SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Reply to the Abbé Charles Lardic (Diocese of Le Mans, France) on the use of the Missal of St. Pius V, 16 June 1972, in *Notitiae*, 9 (1973), 48, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 218, 548-549.

¹⁰⁹ *Reply to the Abbé Charles Lardic*, §8.

¹¹⁰ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Decree *Cum Missale Romanum* on the second *editio typica* of the Roman Missal, 27 March 1975, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1975), 297, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 207, 464.

¹¹¹ EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE OF ENGLAND AND WALES, Statement on the New Roman Missal, 24 April 1975, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1975), 143-144.

the Mass.¹¹² At the same time, they used the opportunity to repeat the exception for the use of the former Missal privately by elderly and infirm priests. The document reiterates the Heenan indult and the conditions for its use.¹¹³

On 11 October 1975, once again by means of a letter from the Secretariat of State, Cardinal J. Villot reiterated to Bishop R. Coffy, President of the liturgical commission of France, the obligatory use of what by then had become *MR/1975*:

Through the Constitution *Missale Romanum* Pope Paul, as you know, orders that the new Missal is to replace the former one, notwithstanding any constitutions or apostolic ordinances of his predecessors¹¹⁴ – including, therefore, all the determinations of the Constitution *Quo primum*. No one, in France or anywhere else, can therefore claim an indult granted by *Quo primum* and allowing use of the former Missal. This can be used exclusively in the case envisioned by the notification of the Congregation for Divine Worship, 14 June 1971, approved by Pope Paul.¹¹⁵ The notification of 28 October 1974¹¹⁶ made it explicit once again that Ordinaries do not have the power to grant this permission (to use the former Order of Mass) for celebration with a congregation ... notwithstanding any custom, even one from time immemorial.¹¹⁷

The Secretary of State used firm and clear terms to state that the new Missal utterly and entirely replaces any earlier Missal; all it contains, and all associated with it. No right may be claimed for the use of any Missal prior to that promulgated by Paul VI. He reiterated

¹¹² See ECEW, Statement on the New Roman Missal, §1.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, §2. In context, there appears to have been an understanding that the two Missals could coexist in the same local Church at least to some degree, with deference of observance obediently granted to the newer Missal. The indult itself does not directly order the development of norms, just agreement on policy. Assessing elements such as “special occasion” could be rather subjective. Nonetheless, the response of the Episcopal Conference of England and Wales provides important guidance to the local ordinaries. Though not binding individual ordinaries, they are useful for their guidance. These could inform the norm mentioned in the Indult’s art. 2, above, indicating that the celebrant is obligated to follow norms created by the ordinary who grants the favor.

¹¹⁴ “The effective date for what we have prescribed in this Constitution shall be the First Sunday of Advent of this Year, 30 November. [Note: This sentence is left out of the first printing of the Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* as it appeared in the *editio typica* of the *Ordo Missae*.] We decree that these laws and prescriptions be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding, to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and amendment” (Apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum*, §13).

¹¹⁵ See *Instrukione de Constitutione*.

¹¹⁶ Reference to *Conferentiarum Episcopaliūm*.

¹¹⁷ SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter of Cardinal J. Villot to Bishop R. Coffy, President of the liturgical commission of France, on the obligatory use of the Roman Missal, 11 October 1975, in *Notitiae*, 12 (1976), 81-83, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 220, 550-551, here, 550.

that immemorial custom may not be invoked as an argument in defense of a general exception. The letter continues, stating:

Neglect or contempt regarding liturgical rules that are meant to safeguard the reverence owed to the Blessed Sacrament, the carrying out of unauthorized experimentation or capricious novelties and in particular the substitution of unauthorized Eucharistic prayers must not be tolerated. The liturgy, above all the liturgy of the Mass, is the prayer of the Church. Even as the Church addresses the concrete life of the community in the parts of the liturgy designed for this purpose, it still is celebrating the mystery of Christ, and this cannot be left up to the interpretation of the celebrant or those taking part.¹¹⁸

The rule that no one may take it upon himself to change anything in the Mass is re-presented. Unauthorized experimentation, the introduction of novelties and the use of unauthorized Eucharistic Prayers are referred to as “contempt” for liturgical rules.¹¹⁹ The letter continues by expressing once again the authority of the official Church over the Mass in the clearest terms, even calling upon the gravity of obedience to that ecclesiastical authority. The Cardinal cautions, “Whoever exploits the reform as a way of indulging in arbitrary experiments dissipates energy and outrages the *sensus Ecclesiae*.”¹²⁰

On 24 May 1976, Paul VI addressed a consistory of Cardinals of the Roman Church in order to state the primacy of the new *Ordo*:

For our part, in the name of tradition, we beseech all our children and all Catholic communities to celebrate the rites of the restored liturgy with dignity and fervent devotion. Use of the new *Ordo Missae* is in no way left up to the choice of priests or people. The instruction of 14 June 1971¹²¹ provided that celebration of Mass according to the former rite would be permitted, by faculty from the ordinary, only for aged or sick priests offering the sacrifice without a congregation. The new *Ordo Missae* was promulgated in place of the old after careful deliberation and to carry out the directives of Vatican Council II. For a like reason our predecessor St. Pius V, after the Council of Trent, commanded the use of the Roman Missal revised by his authority.¹²²

¹¹⁸ SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter of Cardinal J. Villot to Bishop R. Coffy, 550.

¹¹⁹ This redounds to the earlier observation that the *GIRM* is not a toothless document.

¹²⁰ SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter of Cardinal J. Villot to Bishop R. Coffy, 550. See PAUL VI, Address to a general audience, proposing a decalogue for prayer, 22 August 1973, in *Notitiae*, 9 (1973), 297-300, here, I, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 55, 171-173, here, 172. Cf. SECRETARIAT OF STATE, *Letter of Cardinal J. Villot to Bishop R. Coffy*, 550-551.

¹²¹ General reference to *Instrukione de Constitutione*.

¹²² PAUL VI, Address to a consistory, excerpt on loyalty to the Church and the Council, 24 May 1976, in *AAS*, 68 (1976), 369-378, no. 2, a, §4, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 59, 176-180, here, 178.

In passionate terms, Paul VI reasserts the primacy and unique liceity of the Roman Missal he had promulgated for the Latin Rite, reminding his audience that said Missal had come into use by juridical decree, not by the choice of clergy or faithful. He states unequivocally that the latter Missal was promulgated in place of the former; the Mass is always to be offered according to the way the Holy See has decreed and no other way.

The Pontiff used the opportunity to repeat, without alteration, the exception for priests who are aged or sick to use the former Missal. In this case, he used the term “faculty” to describe the authority of the ordinary in these cases; he makes no mention of exceptions for use of other rites or the *Breviarium Romanum*. Apart from the exceptions granted, the Pope admits no choice of which Missal to use.

1.1.2 – Notable Prohibitions on Use of Former Rubrics

As mentioned, the *GIRM* replaced the former *praenotanda* and shifted the focus of the celebrant away from performance of the rubrics to the actions of the Mass. While the older *praenotanda* are guides with clear practical purpose, the precise purpose of the *GIRM* is not so easy to determine. The *GIRM* provides more catechesis surrounding what takes place in the rites of the Mass than its predecessor instructive documents but provides less explanation of how to perform those rites.

As mentioned above, the *GIRM* presented itself as a framework and intimated that it was to effect a movement away from “rubricism” to “experience.”¹²³ As part of this, the *GIRM* exhorts a celebrant to make accommodation to local needs, in part by using the plethora of options contained in the new Missal.¹²⁴

¹²³ The Secretary of State will express this attitude, stating “[... E]xperiential knowledge and wide use of these texts will bring priests to see how it is possible and necessary to restore the style and spirit of liturgical prayer without recourse to an out-of-place, arbitrary improvisation” (*Letter to Bishop Rossi*, 547, no. 1, §6).

¹²⁴ For example: “Because, however, the celebration of the Eucharist, like the entire Liturgy, is carried out through perceptible signs that nourish, strengthen, and express faith, the utmost care must be taken to

The *GIRM* permits accommodations by inviting to the celebrant to use his own judgment in some action. For instance, the celebrant “may” most briefly introduce the Mass of the day or add explanations at other times in the Mass.¹²⁵ Other forms of invitation are expressed as “if appropriate,” such as at the time for exchanging the sign of peace,¹²⁶ or “in similar words” as may appear in invitations and instructions, such as in the invitation to pray prior to the blessing of water in the Rite of Blessing and Sprinkling Holy Water.¹²⁷ Furthermore, accommodation extends beyond specific ritual acts to the needs of the local faithful. These include selection of Scriptural and euchological texts for a specific celebration of Mass.¹²⁸

Given the ostensibly broad allowances granted to the celebrant in the *GIRM*, many bishops and priests who had access to the document and gave it due attention, embraced it as the framework it presents itself as being, within which the celebrant and others may work, a framework that is broad and frequently lacks specificity by design.¹²⁹ Some interpreted the lack of specificity in the *GIRM* as indicative of a presumption that its receivers were familiar with the rubrics of the older rites. Thus, we return to the earlier

choose and to arrange those forms and elements set forth by the Church that, in view of the circumstances of the people and the place, will more effectively foster active and full participation and more properly respond to the spiritual needs of the faithful” (*GIRM/2008usa*, no. 20). Highlighting the complexity of the situation is not intended to devalue the many options presented in the reordered Missal. Huels states that the goals of active participation by the faithful for their best possible spiritual profit “cannot be accomplished by a lifeless, rote recitation of fixed texts but requires planning, attention to the actual circumstances of the assembly, and prayerful ministers who make a ‘full and intelligent’ use of the options and other adaptations permitted in the rites” (HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 125, and *MR/2008usa*, Appendix II, no. 2).

¹²⁵ See *GIRM/2008usa*, no. 31.

¹²⁶ See *MR/2008usa*, *Ordinary of Mass*, no. 23.

¹²⁷ See HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 124.

¹²⁸ *GIRM/2008usa*, nos. 24 and 352. Cf. HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 124.

¹²⁹ For example, *GIRM/2008usa*, no. 277, describes the manner of incensing the altar: “The altar is incensed with single swings of the thurible in this way: [...] If the altar is freestanding with respect to the wall, the priest incenses walking around it; if the altar is not freestanding, the priest incenses it while walking first to the righthand side, then to the left.” This provides minimal direction; interpretation could result in numerous possibilities.

consideration that one might interpret the *GIRM*'s lack of detailed direction as an allowance to work within certain broad parameters, always guided by reason and respect and, as the case may be, informed by experience with the older rites. Because no priest alive at the time was unfamiliar with the older rites, one could reasonably assume that he could continue to do what had been done when faced with lack of specific instruction in the *GIRM* and/or rubrics.

Embracing this interpretation, many celebrants believed they behaved logically, consistently and obediently when they allowed their prior liturgical experience to inform their choice of action when the newer directives lacked specific direction. As well, such behavior, it would seem, assuaged the conscience of a celebrant who, when calling upon his experience, could be assured he was not acting capriciously or arbitrarily. This approach reflects Aillet's recognition that the Roman Rite's beautiful gestures "have not been abolished on the pretext of their having been simplified in the new Missal."¹³⁰

This is, however, at odds with the sense one receives from the documents quoted above. Personal interpretation was proscribed and the rule that that no one, not even a priest, may add, remove or change anything in the Missal, was repeated frequently. Replies emanating from the Holy See were sometimes perplexing.¹³¹

¹³⁰ AILLET, *The Old Mass and the New: Explaining the motu proprio Summorum Pontificum of Pope Benedict XVI*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2010, 53-54.

¹³¹ The following exchange with the Sacred Congregation for Rites (Concilium) is an example: "Query: When the rubrics provide several options, may the competent territorial liturgical authority for the whole region or the bishop for his diocese direct all to observe a single way of doing things, for the sake of uniformity? Reply: Strictly speaking, this is lawful. But always to be kept in mind is the preservation of that freedom, envisioned by the new rubrics, to adapt the celebration in an intelligent way to the particular church and assembly of the faithful in such a way that the whole rite is a living reality for living people" (*Notitiae*, 1 [1965], 254, no. 76, English translation in *DOL*, 93, footnote R⁵). One might then question how one is able to adapt without first being allowed to interpret.

Two private rescripts from the Congregation for Sacraments demonstrate the Holy See's approach to liturgical interpretation:

Query: In Mass with a congregation, celebrated more solemnly, different ways of incensation are being used: one plain and simple; the other, the same as the rite for incensation prescribes in the former Roman Missal. Which usage should be followed?

Reply: It must never be forgotten that the Missal of Pope Paul VI has, since 1970, supplanted the one called improperly "the Missal of St. Pius V," and completely so, in both texts and rubrics. When the rubrics of the Missal of Paul VI say nothing or say little on particulars in some places, it is not to be inferred that the former rite should be observed. Therefore, the multiple and complex gestures for incensation as prescribed in the former Missal (see *Missale Romanum*, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1962: *Ritus servandus* VIII and *Ordo incensandi* pp. LXXX-LXXXIII) are not to be resumed.¹³²

And also: "[... W]hen the rubrics of the Missal of Paul VI say nothing, it is not to be thereby inferred that the former rubrics must be followed. The reformed Missal does not supplement but supplants the old Missal."¹³³

The Missal promulgated by Paul VI is described as having supplanted the prior Missal in both text and action; there is no provision for supplementation of one by the other. These private responses establish an impenetrable barrier of separation between the two Missals.¹³⁴ The conclusion logically drawn from this response is that the prior Missal

¹³² CONGREGATION FOR THE SACRAMENTS, private reply regarding use of older rubrics in *Notitiae*, 14 (1978), 301-302, no. 2, English translation in *DOL*, 481, footnote R¹¹. In fairness, the reply adds some guidance: "In incensation, the celebrant [...] proceeds as follows: a. toward the gifts: he incenses with three swings, as the deacon does toward the Book of the Gospels; b. toward the cross: he incenses with three swings when he comes in front of it; c. toward the altar: he incenses continuously from the side as he passes around the altar, making no distinction between the altar table and the base" (ibid.). Unfortunately, this does not provide a full answer. If the former usage is not permitted to inform the later, then a phrase like "he incenses continuously from the side as he passes around the altar" is of little help. However, there is reference to knowledge of the older use in the phrase, "making no distinction between the altar and the base," a distinction that is made in the *RSCM*.

¹³³ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, private reply regarding use of older rubrics, in *Notitiae*, 14 (1978), 534-535, no. 10.

¹³⁴ Worthy of note are two other negative allusions regarding use of the former Missal to inform decisions when encountering lack of clarity in the reordered rubrics. Both were likewise private responses issued in 1978: 1) "Query: During the recitation of certain formularies, for example, the *Confiteor*, *Agnus Dei*, *Domine, non sum dignus*, the accompanying gestures on the part of both priest and people are not always the same: some strike their breast three times; others, once during such formularies. What is the lawful practice to be followed? Reply: [...] Whereas in the Roman Missal promulgated by the Council of Trent meticulous gestures usually accompanied the words, the rubrics of the Roman Missal as reformed by the authority of Vatican Council II are marked by their restraint with regard to gestures. [...] As noted in the Reply no. 2 of the comments in *Notitiae*, 14 (1978), 301, when the rubrics of the Missal of Paul VI say nothing, it is not to be thereby inferred that the former rubrics must be followed. The reformed Missal does not supplement but

enjoys no juridic recognition and because of this there is no intermingling of the rites, no enrichment, no basic direction taken from the older Missal to the newer. Thus, the celebrant is not permitted to use his past experience to inform his celebration in the present¹³⁵ and celebration of the new ritual is removed from historical context.¹³⁶

One interpretation of the private replies is that a celebrant may interpret unclear directives as one sees fit, as long as the older ritual is not replicated. In a word, “Anything except what we used to do.”¹³⁷

Nonetheless, Glendinning accurately observes,

Abandoning such ritual elements and sacred gestures, then, was not merely a matter of disobedience to liturgical norms or a desire for innovation, but in accordance with practical directives provided by the Holy See itself. While the juridical import of these responses is not especially strong, they appear to serve as a source of legal interpretation (cf. c. 19), at least until the contrary is otherwise indicated.¹³⁸

supplants the old Missal. The old Missal at the *Agnus Dei* had the directive ‘striking his breast three times’ and the same for the *Domine, non sum dignus*. But because the new Missal says nothing on this point (*Ordo Missae*, nos. 131 and 133), there is no reason for requiring any gesture to be added to these invocations” (Response to a question regarding *GIRM*/1975, no. 87, in *Notitiae*, 14 [1978], 534-535, no. 10, English translation in *DOL*, 491, footnote R²²). 2) “Query: Some celebrants have the practice of raising then joining their hands during the dialogue before the preface and at the beginning of the final blessing. Others omit such gestures. What is right? Reply: As is often the case, at issue is a habit having its source in the rubrics of the former Roman Missal. The current directives of the Order of Mass are to be followed, which are clear on the two points raised. [...] Therefore, the former rite is not to be continued...” (Response to a question regarding *GIRM*/1975, no. 108, in *Notitiae*, 14 [1978], 536-537, no. 12, English translation in *DOL*, 491, footnote R²⁷).

¹³⁵ Finigan gives an amusing example of applying this directive in a *reductio ad absurdum*. Bearing in mind that the *Ritus servandus* indicated donning the alb first on the right arm and then on the left, Finigan states, “Therefore, if the answer from *Notitiae* quoted above is to be applied restrictively to all cases where the Missal of Paul VI is silent on a matter which is specified in the old *Ritus Servandus*, it would follow that priests celebrating the newer form of Mass ought to put their alb on back to front” (T. FINIGAN, “Mutual Enrichment in Theory and Practice,” in *Usus Antiquior*, vol. 2, no. 1 [January, 2011], 63).

¹³⁶ This ostensibly challenges the statement in the introduction to *GIRM*/1975, added particularly to declare that the reformed Mass witnesses to unchanged faith and to unbroken tradition (see *GIRM*/1975, nos. 1-15).

¹³⁷ Arguably, this position will be challenged in *GIRM* no. 42, first appearing in *GIRM*/2002, considered below.

¹³⁸ C.J. GLENDINNING, “The Old Mass and the New: Explaining the *Motu Proprio* by M. Aillet (Review) (=GLENDINNING, “Review of Aillet”),” in *Studia Canonica*, 45.2 (2011), 550-553 and 571, here, 551.

1.1.3 – The Influence of the Society of Saint Pius X

The influence of *Fraternitas Sacerdotalis Sancti Pii X* (SSPX) on the use of the older *Missale Romanum* is significant.¹³⁹ The SSPX was founded by French Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre as a pious union, primarily for the formation of priests in response to the perceived lack of formation taking place in French seminaries in the years following the Second Vatican Council.

Unlike the exceptions granted by the Holy See permitting the use of the emended post-Vatican II Missals, the SSPX eventually adopted *MR/1962* and other rituals that were in use immediately prior to those modified by the Conciliar and post-Conciliar revisions.¹⁴⁰ Additionally, they continued to use all of the liturgical books that were in use in 1962 with the corresponding GRC/1960: the *Pontificale Romanum*, *Breviarium Romanum*, *Graduale Romanum*, *Liber Usualis*, all the rituals, processions and blessings.

The SSPX was erected on 1 November 1970¹⁴¹ and suppressed in 1975 with the command that they disband.¹⁴² Since then, and on account of its suppression, the SSPX has had no canonical status. When ordered to do so, Lefebvre did not disband the organization but rather continued to use these rituals and continued to ordain deacons and priests, despite being instructed to the contrary.

¹³⁹ See J.G. LESSARD-THIBODEAU, *Arriving at the Juridic Status of the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Pius X*, JCL Thesis, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law Saint Paul University, 2018, 5.

¹⁴⁰ Use of *MR/1962* was not uniform in the SSPX. It is said that Lefebvre himself used the *MR/1962* amended version or versions until the mid-1970's, in an apparent desire to make a definitive liturgical separation from the Second Vatican Council. Clear documentation on the matter does not appear to exist.

¹⁴¹ M. DAVIES, *Apologia pro Marcel Lefebvre*, Part I 1905-1976, Kansas City, MO, Angelus Press, 1979, 12. For an English translation of Charrière's Decree of Erection, see B. CATHEY, "The Legal Background of the Erection and Alleged Suppression of the Society of St. Pius X," in DAVIES, *Apologia*, Part I, 443-444.

¹⁴² P. MAMIE, "Letter to Mgr. Lefebvre Communicating His Decision to Suppress the SSPX," in *La Documentation Catholique*, 72 (1975), 615, col. 1, English translation in DAVIES, *Apologia*, Part 1, 51 and 52.

Lefebvre incurred the penalty of *suspensio a divinis* on 22 July 1976, as a consequence of creating schism due to ongoing public contumacy and the ordination of priests while lacking dimissorial letters. From the Lefebvre's suspension onward, the penalty of suspension has extended to those ordained by him unless or until they are, *ad causam*, regularized. Such was the condition of the SSPX at the time of the death of Paul VI.

1.2 – Under the Pontificate of Pope John Paul II: 1978-2005

John Paul II inherited the conditions for use of the older rite as last expressed publicly by Paul VI on 24 May 1976. He similarly inherited the ongoing schism of Lefebvre and the SSPX, to which this Pontiff gave particular attention. Under his pontificate, John Paul would attempt to satisfy those who wished to adhere lawfully to the older rite through the grant of an indult to do so. This indult would differ from the exceptions granted by his predecessor. John Paul would grant permission for the use of *MR/1962 editio typica*, the last Missal promulgated before any changes to the Mass were enacted by the influence of the Second Vatican Council. The indult was difficult to apply.

John Paul II, together with Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Prefect of the CDF, would then engage in intense dialogue with Lefebvre in order to regularize the SSPX. These dialogues would collapse, and Lefebvre would consecrate four bishops without authorization to do so, incurring a publicly declared double excommunication upon himself and the co-consecrators.

John Paul responded swiftly to the crisis. In order to provide a structure in communion with the Church for those who wished to use the older rite but did not cling to the schism of Lefebvre, John Paul would establish a new priestly fraternity and call for greater

application of the indult issued earlier. Additionally, he would create a dicastery in order to oversee related matters and provide aid to the faithful who were affected.

1.2.1 – The “Indult Masses” of *Quattuor abhinc annos*

In 1980, at the direction of John Paul II, all the bishops of the Church were invited to submit a report on how the clergy and laity of their respective circumscriptions had received the revised *Ordo Missae* of MR/1969, what problems arose from its implementation and any opposition to it which may need to be addressed.¹⁴³ The results, published to all bishops,¹⁴⁴ indicated that “the problem” of some of the faithful, clergy and lay alike, remaining attached to the previous rite had been nearly resolved.¹⁴⁵

This “problem,” as well as the situation with the SSPX, must have been on the mind of the Legislator as the CDF prepared and issued Circular Letter *Quattuor abhinc annos*. While liberalizing the requirements by which clergy and laity could receive permission to use the older rites, it presents several conditions in order to do so:

Since, however, the same problem continues, the Supreme Pontiff, in a desire to meet the wishes of these groups grants to diocesan bishops the possibility of using an indult whereby priests and faithful, who shall be expressly indicated in the letter of request to be presented to their own bishop, may be able to celebrate Mass by using the Roman Missal according to the 1962 edition, but under the following conditions:

- a) That it be made publicly clear beyond all ambiguity that such priests and their respective faithful in no way share the positions of those who call in question the legitimacy and doctrinal exactitude of the Roman Missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970.
- b) Such celebration must be made only for the benefit of those groups that request it; in churches and oratories indicated by the bishop (not, however, in parish churches, unless the bishop permits it in extraordinary cases); and on the days and under the conditions fixed by the bishop either habitually or in individual cases.
- c) These celebrations must be according to the 1962 Missal and in Latin.
- d) There must be no interchanging of texts and rites of the two Missals.

¹⁴³ See CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Circular letter *Quattuor abhinc annos*, 3 October 1984, in *Communicationes*, 17 (1985), 3-4, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 7, 3-4.

¹⁴⁴ For the results, see *Notitiae*, 185 (1981), 589-611.

¹⁴⁵ *Quattuor abhinc annos*, §2.

e) Each bishop must inform this Congregation of the concessions granted by him, and at the end of a year from the granting of this indult, he must report on the result of its application.¹⁴⁶

The provisions of this Circular Letter depart from preceding exceptions granted for use of the older Missal. Herein, the Supreme Pontiff grants to diocesan bishops what is termed a “faculty” to, in turn, grant what is termed an “indult” to permit priests to celebrate and the faithful to attend the Mass offered according to the *MR/1962* without the 1965 and 1967 emendations.¹⁴⁷

The diocesan bishop grants the indult, regardless of the age or physical condition of the priest celebrant; there is no need for involvement by the Holy See. Under what circumstances and to whom the indult is to be granted is rather complex yet narrowly circumscribed. The bishop may grant the indult to priests, presumably to offer said Masses; he may grant it to persons, presumably to attend them.

For him to grant the favor, a diocesan bishop must receive the names of those who wish to celebrate and/or attend such a celebration of Mass. It must be unequivocally evident that the petitioners are not connected in any way to those who claim the new Missal somehow lacks solid doctrine or the right to be normative. If necessary, there must be public evidence of this.¹⁴⁸ Only those named in the petition may be allowed to offer or attend such an

¹⁴⁶ *Quattuor abhinc annos*, a)-e) and §4.

¹⁴⁷ Use of *MR/1962*, the Missal as it was prior to the Second Vatican Council, had not been mentioned in official documents up to this point. Exceptional allowances always indicated use of the 1965/1967 emended versions. This provision may have resulted from the influence of the SSPX.

¹⁴⁸ What is meant by “public evidence” is not defined. It seems reasonable that the petition submitted to the diocesan bishop would include motivation indicating unequivocal denial of connection between the petitioners and any schismatic group(s). Furthermore, assuming that the ordering reflects some type of priority, norm a) states that evidence may need to be presented demonstrating that the priests and persons petitioning have no connection with those who “call into doubt the lawful force and doctrinal soundness of the Roman Missal promulgated in 1970 by Pope Paul VI” [*Quattuor abhinc annos*, a)]. This potentially leaves at least a few categories of persons: 1) Those who by that time belonged to organized widespread groups in formal schism or at least organized protest, such as the SSPX. Dealing with these groups is the competence of the Holy See, not the diocesan bishop. Therefore, it seems clear that this indult does not apply in these cases. 2) Groups within dioceses not in schism but threatening to do so, claiming that the Church has

“indult” Mass; the celebration must take place exclusively for their benefit. The indult is not to be used in any way that would harm or hinder the liturgical reform as it has been received by the community in question.

The bishop must designate the location of the celebration which may be a church or an oratory but must not be a parish church. The bishop may permit its celebration in a parish church under extenuating circumstances; this exception is to be understood as extraordinary and not normative. The Mass must be offered according to *MR/1962* and must be offered in Latin. The days upon which and the circumstances under which such Masses may occur are to be approved by the bishop. The bishop may grant this indult as an individual instance or as a regular occurrence. The number of celebrations of the “indult” Mass, then, is determined by the diocesan bishop. There is to be no mixing of the rites between *MR/1962* and *MR/1975*, the Missal in use at the time of the issuance of this circular letter.¹⁴⁹

Furthermore, the Bishop must inform the Congregation for Divine Worship of each indult he grants. Finally, on or about 3 October 1985, the bishop must inform the Congregation for Divine Worship of the results of the indults he has granted. No mention

no right to limit use of the prior Missal or that the new Missal is doctrinally unsound. Norm a) does not permit the bishop to allow the favor to such groups. 3) Groups of the faithful who state that they are attracted to the Mass celebrated according to the former Missal for reasons stated in the comparative, for instance, nicer, prettier, more moving, more reverent, etc., than the new rite. Such groups would be identified as calling into question or at least being disrespectful to Mass offered according to the new Missal, eliminating them under norm a). 4) Groups of the faithful who placidly wish to retain the use of the former normative Missal for no divisive or untoward reason. This group would not be eliminated by norm a), but then again, they are not “the problem” to which the provisions of this document are stated to address. Because, if the group in question was not requesting the older Missal for particular reasons, then what need or desire would they have for it? On the other hand, likely those particular reasons could be interpreted or made clear that they are in some way due to displeasure with, disillusionment with or questions about the new Missal. If that is the case, then the group could be interpreted to fail the requirements of norm a).

¹⁴⁹ However, this liberalization of the use of *MR/1962* raised awareness of and broadened familiarity with the older rite among the faithful of the Latin Church.

is made of use of the *Breviarium Romanum* or other rites. There is no mention that this document has any juridic affect upon the previously offered and granted favors.¹⁵⁰

1.2.2 – *Ecclesia Dei* and the Excommunication of the Society of St. Pius X

On 30 June 1988, a twofold excommunication *latae sententiae* was incurred by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre as a more severe punishment of schism (*CIC/83*, c. 751) through persistent public contumacy (*CIC/83*, c. 1364) and for taking unto himself the authority to consecrate four priests as bishops without papal mandate to do so (*CIC/83*, c. 1382). The excommunications, applying as much to the illicitly consecrated bishops and the co-consecrator as to Lefebvre, were declared the next day, on 1 July 1988.¹⁵¹

Prepared for Lefebvre's actions, the Holy See did not only apply penal law to Lefebvre *et al.*, but concomitantly provided a safety net as it were to address the needs of the alienated faithful, lay and cleric alike, who did not wish to be part of this action. This care for the flock was manifested on 2 July 1988, the day after the excommunications were declared, in the form of Apostolic Letter *motu proprio Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, which, *inter alia*, encouraged broader use of the indult offered in *Quattuor abhinc annos*:

c) moreover, respect must everywhere be shown for the feelings of all those who are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition, by a wide and generous application of the directives already issued some time ago by the Apostolic See for the use of the Roman Missal according to the typical edition of 1962.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ This means effectively that there would have been those using the *MR/1967* exceptionally as provided by prior documents as well as those using *MR/1962*. As mentioned, and furthermore, the language, or lack thereof, within the Circular Letter makes it difficult to grant the indult it seeks to provide. The clergy and faithful who wish to retain the older rituals are identified as being a “problem.” The motivation for the indult is explained as “responsive to such groups....” There is no language expressing that this is a serious matter nor is there encouragement for bishops to make use of their faculty to grant the indult to such “problematic” groups. The receiving faithful found the conditions draconian and intrusive. Bishops were frustrated by the logical questions raised above and were reticent to make determinations on them. The indult went largely unused, but not unnoticed.

¹⁵¹ CONGREGATION FOR BISHOPS, Decree declaring the excommunication *latae sententiae* of Mgr. Lefebvre and those he consecrated bishop, 1 July 1988, in J. OCHOA, *Leges Ecclesiae*, vol. 8, col. 11326. no. 5285, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 12, 804-805, here, §1.

¹⁵² *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, art. 6, c).

The Apostolic Letter further created what would become the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* (PCED) specifically to study and address use of the older rites throughout the Church.¹⁵³

Just three months later, in October of 1988, the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter (FSSP) was erected to receive clergy who did not adhere to the schism of Lefebvre.¹⁵⁴ It allowed for this Priestly Fraternity to act as a clerical society of apostolic life of pontifical rite in every way, for example, by the competency to establish seminaries. The FSSP would use the liturgical books in force in 1962.

After promulgation of *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, the question was raised as to whether the indult described therein to offer Mass using the *MR/1962* included within it a provision for licit use of the other ritual books in use in 1962. John Huels draws his conclusion to the matter by identifying the species of the document *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*. He examines what juridic action it enacts by applying the canons relevant to it:

The favor granted to priests to celebrate Mass according to the 1962 edition of the Roman Missal is regulated by the common norms on individual administrative acts (cc. 35-47) and by the norms on rescripts (cc. 59-75). The answer to [the] question is found in canon 36, §2: “An administrative act must not be extended to cases other than those actually expressed in it.” The permission to celebrate Mass according to the Roman Missal of 1962 may not lawfully be extended to other liturgical rites.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Marcel Lefebvre died 25 March 1991. The SSPX has continued *de facto* under the leadership of its clergy.

¹⁵⁴ See PONTIFICAL COMMISSION ECCLESIA DEI, “Decree Erecting the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter as a Clerical Society of Apostolic Life of Pontifical Right,” 18 October 1988, English translation in CANON LAW SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, *Newsletter*, 11 (1989), 27-28.

¹⁵⁵ J.M. HUELS, “Canon 846: Presuming Permission for Use of Pre-Vatican II Rites, Opinion” in A. ESPELAGE, (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 1994-2000*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 231-232.

Huels admits that an exception to this granted by the PCED is found in the FSSP and guests of the Fraternity's houses.¹⁵⁶ From a strictly canonical perspective his explanation has all sagacity.

William Woestman employs a different juridical path to arrive at a similar conclusion. He identifies the indult as a dispensation from universal law which at the same time grants a faculty, in contrast to a permission, and thus is to be considered under the discipline provided by the canons pertaining to dispensations and faculties:

The indult to use the so-called Tridentine liturgical books is a dispensation from the universal law found in canon 846, §1. [...] Unlike a permission, i.e., the consent of a competent superior to do something according to the law, a dispensation can never be presumed; it always requires an act of one with the authority to dispense. [...] Since the indult – either directly from the Holy See or from the diocesan bishop – is a dispensation from the obligation to follow the post-Vatican II *Ordo Missae*, it must be interpreted strictly and not extended to other cases not expressed in the indult. The indult does not include the faculty to use the pre-Vatican II liturgical books for the celebration of the other sacraments unless it explicitly states so. In a word, the faculty to use the older rites is a dispensation from the current law and, as a dispensation, can never be presumed.¹⁵⁷

If one accepts Woestman's identification of the species of the indult provided in *Ecclesia Dei*, then his conclusion is plausible that use of the other liturgical books is not included in the indult.

Cardinal Dario Castrillón Hoyos, president of the PCED itself, however, approached the question from a more philosophical perspective resulting in a different conclusion:

My interpretation of the matter is that, if the Church has given permission for the greatest of all the sacraments, the Eucharist, to be celebrated according to the 1962 Roman Missal, then *a fortiori* it follows that all of the other sacraments may also be celebrated according to the liturgical books in force in 1962. The present practice is that for those institutes not of pontifical right an indult is to be requested from this Pontifical Commission for the conferral of sacred orders according to the *Pontificale Romanum*.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ As reported in the FEDERATION OF DIOCESAN LITURGICAL COMMISSIONS, *Newsletter*, 16 (March-April 1989), 1-4, (232). Cf. J.M. HUELS and W. WOESTMAN, "Canon 846: Presuming Permission for Use of Pre-Vatican II Rites, Opinion," in *Roman Replies, 1994-2000*, 231-232.

¹⁵⁷ W. WOESTMAN, "Canon 846: Presuming Permission for Use of Pre-Vatican II Rites, Another Opinion," in *Roman Replies, 1994-2000*, 234.

¹⁵⁸ PONTIFICAL COMMISSION ECCLESIA DEI, Letter of D. Castrillón Hoyos, 14 September 2000, prot. no. 799/89. Hoyos accomplishes several things in the first sentence in this brief quote. First, he classifies the sacraments in order to create a ranking in such a way that there is a superlative: "the greatest of all sacraments, the Eucharist." Consequently, he enters an *argumentum a fortiori*. In the same statement, the conclusion of

Hoyos recognizes that the *motu proprio* allows for much greater use of *MR/1962* by reducing the number of requirements to do so. It is his conclusion that the indult includes not only the *MR/1962* for celebration of Mass but for all the rituals in force at the time, save the conferral of Holy Orders. Nonetheless, the ongoing prohibition against mixture of the rites prevents the occasion of mutual enrichment.

In 1991, the PCED issued “Guidelines for Implementation of *Ecclesia Dei*”¹⁵⁹ as an aide in understanding how to apply the *motu proprio*. Notably, it is stated within: “The new lectionary in the vernacular could be used as a way of providing a richer fare for the faithful at the table of God’s word in Masses celebrated according to the 1962 missal.”¹⁶⁰

The document, from the competent dicastery, is addressed to bishops, particularly those who have been given the authority to grant the favors set forth in *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, i.e., diocesan bishops. Its purpose is to provide clarification rather than to establish law. However, presenting the possibility of admission of the revised *OLM*, the document appears to give approval to an action *contra legem*. Within itself, this somehow changes

his argument is based upon the ancient norms of law that the greater can assume the lesser, and the lesser is contained in the greater. In the second statement, he concludes that, since it has been indicated that permission is necessary from the PCED “for the conferral of sacred orders according to the *Pontificale Romanum*,” it can be deduced that the specificity of this order means that permission is required for this ritual only and that the others need no permission from the PCED. Because it is clear that one enjoying the favor of the indult must seek permission for one ritual only, it is deduced that one need not seek permission for other rituals. For a fascinating discussion of the notion of the lesser assumed into the great in secular law, see M. Herz, “Justice Byron White and the Argument that the Greater Includes the Lesser,” in *BYU Law Review*, (1994), Provo, UT, Brigham Young University Law School, 227-281. Also available at <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/217061809.pdf> (7 July 2022).

¹⁵⁹ PONTIFICAL COMMISSION ECCLESIA DEI, Letter of Cardinal Augustin Mayer, Prefect, to bishops, not dated, prot. no. 500/90, published in English as “Guidelines for Implementation of *Ecclesia Dei*,” in *Origins* 21:9, (18/19 July 1991), 144-145. Though not dated, the document was distributed as a memorandum dated 19 April 1991 to all bishops of the United States of America, from the Office of the General Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

¹⁶⁰ *Guidelines for Implementation of Ecclesia Dei*, 144-145. The possibility of introducing “the new lectionary in the vernacular” into “Masses celebrated according to the 1962 Missal” is a not a simple matter of rubrics but would require a radical alteration of the structure of the *GRC* governing *MR/1962* from which the *GRC* governing the OF diverges greatly. It is difficult to conceive how this would be accomplished practically. It could be argued that such a change would involve a substantive change and therefore is not congruous with mutual enrichment.

existing law, by at least mitigating the admonition that “there is to be no intermingling of the rites or texts of the 1962 Roman Missal with those of the Missal of Paul VI.”¹⁶¹

As explored above, it had been the apparent mindset of the Holy See that *MR/1962* was not to be used to inform celebration of *MR/1969* when lack of clarity in the *GIRM* is perceived. Then section 42 appeared in *GIRM/2002*:

The gestures and bodily posture of both the Priest, the Deacon, and the ministers, and also of the people, must be conducive to making the entire celebration resplendent with beauty and noble simplicity, to making clear the true and full meaning of its different parts, and to fostering the participation of all.¹⁶² Attention must therefore be paid to what is determined by this General Instruction and by the traditional practice of the Roman Rite and to what serves the common spiritual good of the People of God, rather than private inclination or arbitrary choice.¹⁶³

It may be interpreted that this article provides the celebrating priest with the ability to allow earlier liturgical practice to inform current liturgical practice. This would appear to provide the priest with a way to close a *lacuna* he perceives in the *GIRM* or to find direction he seeks without having to turn to “private inclination or arbitrary choice,” therefore without qualm of conscience. This could assure the priest that when his particular question or a similar one was raised in the past, the appropriate authority of the Church, and not the priest himself, had provided a viable and binding answer/solution which could be employed in the present.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ *Quattuor abhinc annos*, 4, d.

¹⁶² *SC*, nos. 30, 34. See also *SC*, no. 21.

¹⁶³ *GIRM/2002*, no. 42. This remains unchanged in *GIRM/2008usa* and retains the same article number.

¹⁶⁴ E. Foley, et al., in their scholarly and comprehensive commentary on the latest *GIRM*, come to a different conclusion. They provide the following observation regarding *GIRM/2002* no. 42: “[...] Because human sanctification takes place concretely within specific cultures, and cultural context affects the interpretation of symbols, there is no universal standard for a principle such as ‘noble simplicity,’ whose meaning changes not only across cultures but also within the diversity of a single culture (e.g., between Masses with adults, and those primarily attended by children of catechetical age). A parallel caution concerns the call for attentiveness to [*GIRM/2002*] and the traditional practice of the Roman Rite, where the use of the Latin singular (*tradita praxi*) gives the impression that there has been a uniform practice defining noble simplicity. This is an historically untenable position given the enormous pluriformity of the Eucharistic rite practiced in the Roman Church...” (E. FOLEY, N.D. MITCHELL and J.M. PIERCE [eds.], *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal: Developed under the Auspices of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy and Cosponsored by the Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Commissions*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2007, 128-129, no. 42). This commentary by Foley is both valid and valuable as the authors

If such an interpretation were accepted and embraced, the addition of no. 42 to the *GIRM* would indicate a significant shift in the mind of the Holy See from the time of the private replies, noted above in section 1.1.2, in which any use of past liturgical practice to inform present practice is proscribed. Regarding those responses, Glendinning had observed, “While the juridical import of these *responsa* is not especially strong, they appear to serve as a source of legal interpretation (cf. c. 19) at least until the contrary is otherwise indicated.”¹⁶⁵ *GIRM* no. 42 may replace the earlier responses as a source of legal interpretation. The weight of the *GIRM* as universally promulgated and binding is much greater than that of a private reply. Thus, not on the basis of arguably abrogated liturgical laws are these traditional practices relevant, but on the basis of the *ius vigens*.

1.3 – Under the Pontificate of Pope Benedict XVI: 2005-2013

The pontificate of Benedict XVI is undoubtedly the most significant regarding liberalization of the use of the older rite for Mass in the Latin Church. The actions of Benedict XVI appear to have been driven by the desire to regularize the SSPX and similar groups in schism or under the penalty of excommunication. As Prefect of the CDF, Ratzinger had worked very closely with Lefebvre and with John Paul II; he had a significant role in the most intense dialogue and moments of near reconciliation.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, he had witnessed the excommunications.

take a broad view of the history of the Mass “practiced in the Roman Church” with its many variations in time and place throughout much of history. The authors employ this broad and inclusive consideration of other sections of *GIRM*/2002 as well (e.g., *ibid.*, 128-129, regarding ritual embodiment). This would appear to indicate that their commentary on no. 42 is part of a consistent approach on their part. Given the nature of the *GIRM*, however, it seems that no. 42 is included in the text not for naught but intended to be of practical use. Therefore, it would require interpretation in a narrower sense.

¹⁶⁵ GLENDINNING, “Review of Aillet,” 551.

¹⁶⁶ For a comprehensive record of the communications between Lefebvre and the Holy See, see Michael Davies’ “Apologia pro Marcel Lefebvre” three-part series, especially, DAVIES, *Apologia, Part I*.

On the hopeful road to reconciliation, Benedict XVI issued *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* on 7 July 2007, granting a universal faculty throughout the Latin Church to use *MR/1962*. The accompanying letter, *Con grande fiducia*, provides details regarding the Pontiff's disposition and his further vision for liturgical reconciliation by means of mutual enrichment between the authorized Roman Missals.

By decree of 21 January 2009, in response to a request by the leadership of the SSPX, Benedict XVI saw to it that the excommunications imposed under John Paul II were remitted;¹⁶⁷ it was a social catastrophe. Most unfortunately and without any foreknowledge on the part of the Holy See, the announcement coincided with the delayed release of a televised interview with Richard Williamson, one of the bishops of the SSPX consecrated by Lefebvre, wherein he denied the existence of gas chambers in the Jewish Holocaust by the Germans.¹⁶⁸ Worldwide outrage ensued, the Pope was publicly excoriated by those who believed his actions were somehow intended to indicate accord with Williamson's position, relations between the Holy See and a number of countries and religions, particularly Judaism, became strained. Benedict XVI was completely blindsided by this and left very shaken, as he expressed in an explanatory and apologetic letter to bishops issued 10 March 2009.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁷ CONGREGATION FOR BISHOPS, Decree remitting the excommunication *latae sententiae* of the bishops of the Society of St. Pius X, 21 January 2009, prot. no. 126/2009, in *AAS*, 101 (2009), 150-151, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cbishops/documents/rc_con_cbishops_doc_20090121_remissione-scomunica_en.html (11 January 2022).

¹⁶⁸ The decree was dated 21 January 2009 and was pre-delivered to the SSPX on 20 January 2009. On 21 January, there was a Swedish television broadcast of an interview with Williamson that had been prerecorded in November 2008. In this interview, Williamson made statements akin to denial of the Jewish Holocaust or at least aspects of it. There was no way that anyone in the Vatican could have known of the planned broadcast, or of the statements contained in the interview (see BENEDICT XVI [emeritus] and P. SEEWALD, *Light of the World: The Pope, the Church and the Signs of the Times*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2010, 122, footnote I).

¹⁶⁹ BENEDICT XVI, Letter to the bishops of the Catholic Church Concerning the Remission of the Excommunication of the Four Bishops Consecrated by Archbishop Lefebvre 10 March 2009, http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/letters/2009/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20090310_remissione-

Nonetheless, with Benedict's passionate desire for reconciliation, negotiations continued. On 14 September 2011, an agreement between the Holy See and the SSPX was proposed. The SSPX leadership was given until 15 April 2012 to respond with a clarification of their disposition regarding the proposed agreement. Several attempts were made by the Holy See to encourage a response from the SSPX. On 12 December 2012, the PCED indicated that they had yet to receive a response from the SSPX leadership. In fact, a response was never received. Two months later, 11 February 2013, Benedict XVI announced his resignation effective 28 February 2013.

1.3.1 – *Summorum Pontificum* and Universal Allowance of the Older Rite

With the promulgation of *SP* on 7 July 2007, Benedict XVI manifested his will that celebration of the older rites be permitted generally:

The Roman Missal promulgated by Paul VI is the ordinary expression of the 'Lex orandi' (Law of prayer) of the Catholic Church of the Latin rite. Nonetheless, the Roman Missal promulgated by St. Pius V and reissued by Bl. John XXIII is to be considered as an extraordinary expression of that same 'Lex orandi,' and must be given due honor for its venerable and ancient usage. These two expressions of the Church's 'Lex orandi' will in not any way lead to a division in the Church's 'Lex credendi' (Law of belief). They are, in fact two usages of the one Roman rite.

It is, therefore, permissible to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass following the typical edition of the Roman Missal promulgated by Bl. John XXIII in 1962 and never abrogated,¹⁷⁰ as an Extraordinary Form of the Liturgy of the Church. The conditions for the use of this Missal as laid down by earlier documents "Quattuor abhinc annos" and "Ecclesia Dei," are substituted as follows: [... Articles 2-12].¹⁷¹

The purpose of this legislative document is to allow broad use of the former Missal and rituals, termed an "Extraordinary Form" of the one Latin Church, greatly freeing the clergy and faithful to do so. It substitutes the terms and conditions that had been required by the

[scomunica.html](#) (11 January 2022). For a more detailed treatment of the debacle, see SEEWALD, *Light of the World*, 120-130.

¹⁷⁰ For a comprehensive study dedicated strictly to this subject, see GLENDINNING, *Was the 1962 Missale Romanum Abrogated?* esp. 15-37.

¹⁷¹ *SP*, art. 1.

preceding documents, *Quattuor abhinc annos* and *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, in the following ways:

When the Mass is celebrated without a congregation, any priest of the Latin Church may use either *MR/1962* or the latest version of the Missal promulgated by Paul VI in 1970. At the time and place of this writing, that Missal is *MR/2008usa*.

Under the provisions of *SP*, Mass according to *MR/1962* could be offered publicly on any day, save the Paschal Triduum. No permission was necessary from the priest's ordinary or from the Apostolic See.¹⁷² The only requirement of the priest is that he be suitable (*idonei*) and not prevented by law from offering the Mass.¹⁷³ These EF Mass liturgies could be attended by the faithful spontaneously.¹⁷⁴ Any priest of the Latin Church may also use the *Breviarium Romanum* promulgated in 1962.¹⁷⁵

Institutes of consecrated life and societies of apostolic life, diocesan or pontifical, were permitted use the EF in their own oratories for the conventual or community Mass. An individual institute or an entire institute or society may use the EF frequently, habitually or permanently, as decided by their major superiors.¹⁷⁶

In churches that are not parochial or conventual, it is the rector who gives permission for use of the EF.¹⁷⁷ These celebrations may take place on Sundays, weekdays and feasts.¹⁷⁸ In the EF, the Sacred Scriptures may be proclaimed also in the vernacular from editions approved by the Apostolic See.¹⁷⁹ This list is not exhaustive.

¹⁷² See *SP*, art. 2.

¹⁷³ See *ibid.*, art. 5, §4.

¹⁷⁴ See *ibid.*, art. 4.

¹⁷⁵ See *ibid.*, art. 9, §3.

¹⁷⁶ See *ibid.*, art. 3.

¹⁷⁷ See *ibid.*, art. 5, §5.

¹⁷⁸ See *ibid.*, art. 5, §2.

¹⁷⁹ See *ibid.*, art. 6. This is a reference to the lectionary cycle as it appears in *MR/1962*; not to the post-Vatican II *OLM*.

The pastor may also permit use of the EF for administration of the Sacraments of Baptism, Marriage, Penance and Anointing of the Sick.¹⁸⁰ The ordinary may grant a faculty to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation using the EF as well.¹⁸¹

If a group of faithful attached to the EF exists in a stable way, the pastor should willingly grant their request and ensure that these faithful are harmonized with the ordinary pastoral care given in the parish.¹⁸² When requested by those faithful and by priests, the pastor should allow use of the EF for special circumstances and other celebrations, such as weddings, funerals and pilgrimages.¹⁸³ This list is not exhaustive.

If a pastor fails to grant the request of the aforementioned group of lay faithful, that group should inform the diocesan bishop who is requested earnestly to provide for their request. If he does not do so, the group could refer the matter to the PCED.¹⁸⁴ On the other hand, if a bishop wished to provide the EF for such groups but for whatever reason was unable to do so, he could seek counsel and assistance from the PCED.¹⁸⁵ In order to provide for the faithful, the local ordinary could appoint a rector or a chaplain for such a group or even erect a personal parish.¹⁸⁶

Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* would continue to possess its existing faculties and, additionally, whatever form, duties and regulations the Sovereign Pontiff would assign it.¹⁸⁷ The same dicastery was to possess the authority of the Holy See in ensuring the application and observance of the norms of *SP*.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁰ See *SP*, art. 9, §1.

¹⁸¹ See *ibid.*, art. 9, §2.

¹⁸² See *ibid.*, art. 5, §1.

¹⁸³ See *ibid.*, art. 5, §3.

¹⁸⁴ See *ibid.*, art. 7.

¹⁸⁵ See *ibid.*, art. 8.

¹⁸⁶ See *ibid.*, art. 10. Cf. c. 518.

¹⁸⁷ See *ibid.*, art. 11.

¹⁸⁸ See *ibid.*, art. 12.

1.3.2 – Con grande fiducia accompanying Summorum Pontificum

The sweeping changes enabled by *SP* do not include mention of the mixture of rites; the document is silent on the matter. That step in the history of mutual enrichment is found in the accompanying *CGF*:

[...]he two Forms of the usage of the Roman Rite can be mutually enriching: new Saints and some of the new Prefaces can and should be inserted in the old Missal. The “*Ecclesia Dei*” Commission, in contact with various bodies devoted to the *usus antiquior*, will study the practical possibilities in this regard. The celebration of the Mass according to the Missal of Paul VI will be able to demonstrate, more powerfully than has been the case hitherto, the sacrality which attracts many people to the former usage. The most sure guarantee that the Missal of Paul VI can unite parish communities and be loved by them consists in its being celebrated with great reverence in harmony with the liturgical directives. This will bring out the spiritual richness and the theological depth of this Missal.¹⁸⁹

Benedict XVI addressed this letter to bishops as his *ratio* for *SP*, to explain its significance and implementation. Here is the birth of mutual enrichment, partly substantial and partly conceptual. For substantial enrichment of the EF by the OF, Benedict XVI specifically cited the addition of new Saints and some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces to the *MR*/1962 system. Regarding enrichment of the OF by the EF, he offers conceptually that enrichment will grant the OF a “powerful sacrality.”¹⁹⁰ Further study was remanded to the PCED.

In 2011, as part of the ongoing responsibilities that belong to it, the PCED issued clarifications regarding *SP* and *CGF* by means of the instruction *Universae Ecclesiae*.¹⁹¹ Among the clarifications presented therein, it is stated that the PCED would be responsible for “looking after future editions of liturgical texts pertaining to the *Forma extraordinaria*

¹⁸⁹ *CGF*, §9.

¹⁹⁰ Of this, Kocik observes ponderously, “Note the qualitative difference between these two directions of mutual enrichment as suggested by Pope Benedict. The Extraordinary Form’s influence lies in its ethos or character (devotion, mystery, verticality), whereas the Ordinary Form’s influence involves new texts” (T. KOCIK, “The Reform of the Reform,” in A. REID, *Liturgy in the Twenty First Century*, 32).

¹⁹¹ PONTIFICAL COMMISSION ECCLESIA DEI, Instruction on the application of *Summorum Pontificum* *Universae Ecclesiae*, 30 April 2011, English translation in *Origins*, 41 (2011-2012), 45-47.

of the Roman Rite.”¹⁹² This leads to the presumption that there would, in fact, be future editions of the liturgical texts.

Con grande fiducia states that a priest must be *idoneus*, qualified or suitable, to offer the EF. *Universae Ecclesiae* clarifies this, stating: “Every Catholic priest who is not impeded by Canon Law is to be considered *idoneus* (“qualified”) for the celebration of the Holy Mass in the *Forma extraordinaria*.”¹⁹³ The document states that “The liturgical books are to be used as they are”¹⁹⁴ but later states that in Low Masses, the scripture readings may be proclaimed solely in the vernacular.¹⁹⁵ Ecclesiastical discipline as it appears in the *CIC/83* applies¹⁹⁶ but *SP* derogates from it insofar as it pertains to certain aspects of the sacred rites of the EF that are incompatible with the rubrics therein.¹⁹⁷ Of greatest interest herein, the Pontiff states that new Saints and some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces may and ought to be added to *MR/1962*.¹⁹⁸

1.4 – Under the Pontificate of Pope Francis: 2013-

Given the provisions of *SP*, dialogue with the SSPX became more concentrated on doctrinal matters. Consequently, in November of 2017, the CDF requested that they might themselves conduct dialogue directly with the SSPX.¹⁹⁹ In response, Francis suppressed the

¹⁹² *Universae Ecclesiae*, art. 11.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, art. 20, a.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, art. 24.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, art. 26.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, art. 27.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, art. 28.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, art. 25. Notably, under Francis, this statement will be referred to as a “mandate” by Benedict. See *Nota praevia*, *Quo magis*, §2.

¹⁹⁹ This was not surprising. In 2009, Benedict XVI presented such a reconfiguration of the PCED: “Precisely because the problems that must now be addressed with the [SSPX] are essentially doctrinal in nature, I have decided 21 years after the motu proprio *Ecclesia Dei* and in conformity with what I had proposed (see *SP*, art. 11) to rethink the structure of the Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, linking it closely to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. The Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* will therefore have the following configuration: a. The President of the Commission is the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith” (BENEDICT XVI, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Ecclesiae unitatem* concerning the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, 2 July 2009, in *AAS*, 101 [2009], 710-711, here, nos. 5-6a, English

PCED by means of *motu proprio* of 17 July 2019. The faculties of the PCED were transferred to a newly created specific “Section” within the CDF.²⁰⁰ The act was announced on 19 July 2019.

Seven months thereafter, 22 February 2020, the CDF as the competent dicastery, issued two decrees, each with accompanying *Nota praevia*. Decree *Cum sanctissima* provides the optional celebration of Saints and *Beati* more recently added to the GRC governing the EF. *Quo magis* presents seven additional Eucharistic Prefaces for optional use in *MR/1962*.

These decrees comprise the greatest and only substantial acts of mutual enrichment to the date of this writing, directly addressing Benedict XVI’s vision for it. They alter the liturgical calendar governing the celebration of *MR/1962*, the contents of the *MR/1962* and, by introducing these elements as options, alter the manner in which texts and celebrations are chosen for the given celebration of Mass according to *MR/1962*. These substantive and grand acts of mutual enrichment under the pontificate of Francis must be born in mind when reading later documents emanating from the same pontificate.

1.4.1 – *Cum Sanctissima*: Celebrating New Saints in the *Forma extraordinaria*²⁰¹

As the next Chapter will examine, the General Roman Calendar governing the *EF* was last updated on 26 July 1960. Thus, when one makes use of the EF of the Latin Rite, Saints and *Beati* subsequently added to the reformed General Roman Calendar and to particular calendars are not celebrated. *Cum sanctissima* seeks to address this. The accompanying *Nota praevia* presenting the decree states that the provisions contained in the decree serve

translation available at http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/apost_letters/documents/hf_ben-xvi_apl_20090702_ecclesiae-unitatem.html (11 January 2022).

²⁰⁰ FRANCIS, Apostolic Letter *motu proprio* on the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* (=FRANCIS, On Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*), 17 January 2019, English translation available at http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/motu_proprio/documents/papa-francesco-motu-proprio-20190117_ecclesia-dei.html (11 January 2022).

²⁰¹ See Appendix I for the texts of the Decree and *Nota praevia*.

to “fulfill the mandate given by Pope Benedict XVI to facilitate the celebration of more recently canonized Saints according to the *Forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite.”²⁰²

The Congregation determined that “it appeared that rather than dealing with this or that more recent Saint, it would be more appropriate to lay down a general principle that would enable [...] the celebration of any Saint canonized after the 1960’s, on the date of their proper feast.”²⁰³ Such celebrations would take their place within the rubrical structure of the EF.²⁰⁴

To make this possible, the decree widens the scope of the *Missae festivae latiore sensu*, to which the *Rubricae Generales Missalis Romani* makes reference.²⁰⁵ Article 1 of *Cum sanctissima*²⁰⁶ states that this *latiore sensu* consideration of certain celebrations, which

²⁰² See *Nota praevia, Cum sanctissima*, §1. The choice to describe the substantial recommendation by Benedict XVI presented in a non-legislative document, i.e., *CGF*, as a “mandate” is significant recognition of the importance of Benedict’s vision of mutual liturgical enrichment. Additionally, the very term was used again regarding the introduction of new Eucharistic Prefaces, as will be examined below. See *Nota praevia, Quo magis*, §2.

²⁰³ See *Nota praevia, Cum sanctissima*, §3.

²⁰⁴ Article 4 of the decree indicates that commemorations are to be made as the *ordo* may require: “Commemoratio ordinaria de festo aut vigilia omissa iuxta ea quae in nos. 1-3 statuuntur semper fit cum aliis commemorationibus occurrentibus iuxta rubricas, servata Rubricae generales 111 d)” (*Cum sanctissima*, no. 4).

²⁰⁵ These “festival Masses in a broad sense” are Masses that appear on a given day in the martyrology or in an appendix to it approved for particular Churches. In one sense, then, the provisions of *Cum sanctissima* allow for the celebration of new Saints and *Beati* assigned to a particular day in a way similar to those approved for particular Churches. This opens the door to the creation of actual particular calendars. *Rubricae generales missalis Romani* 302 reads as follows:

In a broader sense, however, the following are also called Masses of a feast:

- a) the Mass of a III Class feast impeded by another feast of the same rank;
- b) the Mass of a commemoration occurring in the Office of the day;
- c) the Mass of a Mystery, Saint or *Beatus* whose entry is given on that day in the martyrology or in an appendix to the martyrology approved for the respective churches.

Sensu autem latiore, dicuntur quoque Missae de festo:

- a) Missa de festo III classis ab alio festo eiusdem gradus impedito;
- b) Missa de commemoratione in Officio diei occurrente;
- c) Missa de Mysterio, Sancto vel Beato, cuius elogium eo die habetur in Martyrologio vel eius Appendice pro respectivis Ecclesiis approbata (*Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, sumorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio prima iuxta typicam*, Paris, Mame, 1962, xxi, right column).

²⁰⁶ “[1] Missa festiva latiore sensu (see *Rubricae generales Missalis Romani*, [RGMR] 302) celebrari potest iusta de causa omnibus diebus festis III classis (iis exceptis de quibus inferius sub no. 8) necnon in vigiliis de Sanctis III classis.”

formerly affected only IV Class feasts, has been broadened by this decree to include some III Class feasts and vigils.²⁰⁷ This expansion protects I and II Class feasts²⁰⁸ and, as mentioned, certain III Class feasts and vigils from the provisions of *Cum sanctissima*. Article 2²⁰⁹ states that these *missae festivae latiore sensu* “may be celebrated in honor of Saints canonized after 26 July 1960 [...] on their respective liturgical feast day.”²¹⁰

The provisions of *Cum sanctissima* and the questions they raise provide a framework for study into further mutual enrichment of GRC/1960. Likewise, while this decree makes no invitation to do so, it provides a means by which particular calendars may be created and inserted into the *Missale Romanum* and *Breviarium Romanum* of the EF. Prior to the promulgation of *Cum sanctissima*, the proposal of a particular calendar would have required significantly more juridic maneuvering. Now that the provisions of *Missae festivae latiore sensu* have been expanded, that work is greatly facilitated.

1.4.2 – *Quo Magis*: New Eucharistic Prefaces for the *Forma Extraordinaria*²¹¹

As will be examined in Chapter III, several historical influences and circumstances determined the number of Eucharistic Prefaces that would be canonized in MR/1570. A

²⁰⁷ There is only one such III Class vigil in the calendar of the EF, namely that of St. Lawrence on 9 August. On this subject, one may be reminded that from 1568 until the *Codex Rubricarum* of 1960, non-privileged vigils such as that of St. Lawrence were of the simplex rite and, accordingly, when they fell in occurrence with a semidouble or double feast of a Saint, that feast would prevail over the vigil. With the reform enacted under St. Pius X in 1911-1914, in non-conventual Masses the celebrant could, in certain cases, choose between the Mass of the occurring Saint and the Mass of the vigil. See also *Additiones et variationes in rubricis Missalis*, no. 1. (Cf. *Nota praevia*, *Cum sanctissima*, footnote 1).

²⁰⁸ Thereby protecting Sundays from an improper use of the provision of this decree.

²⁰⁹ “[2] Praeterea, quod attinet ad RGMR 302 c), permittitur etiam Missa cuiuslibet Sancti Catalogo Sanctorum post diem XXVI mensis Iulii a. D. MCMLX ascripti, eo nempe die quo memoriam liturgicam eiusdem ab Ecclesia Universa recoli statutum est. Missa autem votiva eiusdem item permittitur ad normam RGMR, 311, servatis aliis rubricis de Missis votivis” (*Cum sanctissima*, no. 2).

²¹⁰ See *Nota praevia*, *Cum sanctissima*, [§4]. It would seem that “their respective liturgical feast day” would be the day assigned to it in the latest GRC. At the same time, there is some confusion as to which Saints may be celebrated by provision of this Decree. Paragraph 3 mentions celebrating any Saint canonized “after the 1960’s” while this next paragraph refers to celebration of those Saints canonized after “26 July 1960.”

²¹¹ Please see Appendix III for the text of the Decree and *Nota praevia*.

small number were added over time and have been received in *MR/1962*. Compared to *MR/2008usa*, the number of Eucharistic Prefaces is quite small. As mentioned above, Benedict XVI called for the addition of “some” of the “new prefaces” into *MR/1962* as a means of enrichment of the older Missal by the newer. The CDF has accomplished an effort in this direction by means of decree *Quo magis*, introducing seven additional Eucharistic Prefaces for optional use in the EF.

Quo magis begins by recalling the request of Benedict XVI in *CGF* that some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces be inserted into *MR/1962*.²¹² The accompanying *Nota praevia* states that *Quo magis* completes the work²¹³ of carrying out this “mandate” of Benedict XVI,²¹⁴ formerly entrusted to the PCED and now within the competence of the CDF.²¹⁵

This is accomplished by the approval of seven texts of Eucharistic Prefaces for the Roman Canon, to be used *ad libitum*²¹⁶ wherever the EF is used.²¹⁷ The texts of these Eucharistic Prefaces, with musical notation according to the various tones in use in the EF, will become available at the *Libreria Editrice Vaticana*.²¹⁸

Quo magis grants generous provision for optional use of seven additional Eucharistic Prefaces to the Roman Canon for certain occasions in the Sanctoral cycle. While the Temporal Cycle receives no additional Eucharistic Prefaces, the provisions of this Decree do not preclude them. Thus, *Quo magis*, in addition to adding seven Eucharistic Prefaces, provides a framework for further study on the Eucharistic Prefaces and, by means of

²¹² “*Quo magis* altera Ritus Romani Forma alteram locupletaret, in Epistula ad universos Ecclesiae Latinae Episcopos die VII mensis Iulii a. D. MMVII data, censuit Benedictus PP. XVI aliquot ex novis praefationibus veteri Missali esse inserendas.”

²¹³ Decree *Quo magis* itself does not state this.

²¹⁴ See *Nota praevia*, *Quo magis*, §2.

²¹⁵ See FRANCIS, On Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, 17 January 2019.

²¹⁶ See *Nota praevia*, *Quo magis*, §1.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, §5.

²¹⁸ See *ibid.*, §1, footnote 5.

example, standards to guide further proposals regarding this material aspect of mutual enrichment.

1.4.3 – *Traditionis custodes*: Regulating Use of the Extraordinary Form

On 16 July 2021, Francis issued *motu proprio Traditionis custodes* on the use of the Roman Liturgy prior to the reform of 1970. It comprises four unnumbered introductory paragraphs, eight numbered articles and one concluding paragraph. The Pontiff describes the impetus behind his choice to legislate in this way:

In line with the initiative of my Venerable Predecessor Benedict XVI to invite the bishops to assess the application of the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* three years after its publication, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith carried out a detailed consultation of the bishops in 2020. The results have been carefully considered in the light of experience that has matured during these years.²¹⁹

In *TC*, Francis manifests his will that liturgical regulation of the EF be remanded to the diocesan bishop. In doing so, he states that it is the exclusive competence of the bishop “to authorize the use of the 1962 Roman Missal in his diocese, according to the guidelines of the Apostolic See.”²²⁰

In addition to this, Francis enumerates tasks and competencies for the bishop within the text of *TC*. These tasks and competencies include:

1. To determine that groups attached to the older form of worship “do not deny the validity and the legitimacy of the liturgical reform;”²²¹
2. To designate one or more locations where the EF may be celebrated;²²²
3. To establish the times for the EF to be celebrated at the designated locations;²²³
4. To use the vernacular for the Scripture lections in the EF Mass utilizing translations approved by the episcopal conference;²²⁴

²¹⁹ *TC*, §3.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, art. 2.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, art. 3, §1.

²²² *Ibid.*, art. 3, §2.

²²³ *Ibid.*, art. 3, §3.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, art. 3, §3.

5. To appoint a priest as his delegate to be entrusted with the EF celebrations and the pastoral care of the group or groups attached to the older form;²²⁵
6. To verify that personal parishes that have been erected for these groups “are effective for their spiritual growth;”²²⁶
7. To determine whether or not to retain such personal parishes.²²⁷

Further regulation is accomplished by means of restriction:

1. Priests who have been offering the EF should request authorization from the diocesan bishop to continue use of this faulty.²²⁸
2. Priests who are ordained after the effective date of *TC* who wish to celebrate the EF should make a formal request to the bishop to do so who will then “consult the Apostolic See before granting this authorization.”²²⁹
3. Parish churches are not to be used for celebration of the EF.²³⁰
4. New personal parishes for those attached to the *usus antiquior* are not to be erected.²³¹
5. The bishop is to take care not to authorize the establishment of new groups.²³²

Additionally, in order to identify competency in regard to the provisions of *TC*, the document states:

1. Institutes of Consecrated life and Societies of Apostolic Life that were erected by PCED fall under the competence of the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies for Apostolic Life.²³³
2. The Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life exercises the authority of the Holy See for matters particular to their competence with respect to the observance of the provisions of the *motu proprio*.²³⁴

²²⁵ *TC*, art. 3, §4.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, art. 3, §5.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, art. 3, §5.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, art. 5. Use of the general term, “priests who have been offering” the EF, eliminates a distinction between Masses *sine* and *cum populo* that occurs in *SP*. *Summorum Pontificum* stipulates that to celebrate Mass *sine populo*, any secular or regular Latin Catholic priest may use the Missal of either Form on any day, except the Easter Triduum, requiring no permission from the Apostolic See or his ordinary (see *SP*, art. 2). *Summorum Pontificum* also stipulates that the celebrant of the EF Mass *cum populo* “be suitable (*idonei*) and not prevented by law from offering the Mass” (*SP*, art. 5, §4).

²²⁹ *TC*, art. 4. Based upon its wording, this tenet appears to be a restriction set upon the bishop. Such a requirement seems incongruent with the Pontiff’s focus in *TC* upon returning the matter of regulating the exercise of the right to offer the EF to the diocesan bishop.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, art. 3, §2.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, art. 3, §2.

²³² *Ibid.*, art. 3, §6. Exceptionally, the language used here is that of an appeal rather than a mandate.

²³³ *Ibid.*, art. 6.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, art. 7.

3. The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments exercises the authority of the Holy See for matters particular to their competence with respect to the observance of the provisions of the *motu proprio*.²³⁵

Articles of the *motu proprio* conclude with the explicit revocation formulary: “Previous norms, instructions, permissions, and customs that do not conform to the provisions of the present *Motu Proprio* are abrogated.”²³⁶ The document in whole concludes with a general formula of revocation: “anything else to the contrary notwithstanding, even if worthy of particular mention....”²³⁷

In like manner to Benedict XVI when he issued *SP*, Francis issued a letter accompanying *TC*, to which we shall refer as *Come già*.²³⁸ This letter consists of thirteen unnumbered paragraphs.

After describing his motivation in *Come già* to issue *TC*, Francis states, “I am constrained to revoke the faculty granted by my Predecessors.”²³⁹ He states further that those who celebrate the EF should return eventually to a single form²⁴⁰ and that the diocesan bishop should lead such persons in that direction.²⁴¹

²³⁵ *TC*, art. 7. In Apostolic constitution *Praedicate evangelium*, the competence of the retitled Dicastery for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments, is retained, in the document’s only mention of the Extraordinary Form. There is no mention of the competence of the Dicastery for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life. See FRANCIS, Apostolic Constitution *Praedicate evangelium*, on the Roman Curia and its service to the Church and to the world, 19 March 2022, art. 93, available in Italian at <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2022/03/19/0189/00404.html> (19 March 2022).

²³⁶ *TC*, art. 8.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, concluding paragraph.

²³⁸ FRANCIS, *Come già*, Letter of the Holy Father Francis to the bishops of the whole world that accompanies the Apostolic Letter *motu proprio Traditionis custodes*, official English translation available at: <https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/letters/2021/documents/20210716-lettera-vescovi-liturgia.html> (11 January 2022). For the full text in the official English translation, see Appendix VII.

²³⁹ See *Come già*, §8.

²⁴⁰ See *ibid.*, §11.

²⁴¹ See *ibid.*, §13.

In this letter, Francis charges bishops with providing for the good of those groups using the EF. At the same time, the bishop is to determine their fate²⁴² and is to discontinue the erection of new personal parishes “tied more to the desire and wishes of individual priests than to the real need of the ‘holy People of God.’”²⁴³

In *Come già*, Francis reiterates and partially restates the terms of abrogation:

I take the firm decision to abrogate all the norms, instructions, permissions and customs that precede the present *Motu proprio*, and declare that the liturgical books promulgated by the saintly Pontiffs Paul VI and John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of Vatican Council II, constitute the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite.²⁴⁴

The explicit revocation formulary of *TC* includes “all that do not conform,” while *Come già* indicates “all that precede.” These are not identical; the latter is a broader inclusion than the former and thus more restrictive. In order to narrow the study, two matters have been considered:

1. The *Motu proprio*, as a legislative document from the Supreme Pontiff, bears greater weight than the Pontiff’s letter to the bishops;
2. Canon 18 indicates that restrictive laws are to be interpreted strictly. The verbiage used in *TC* itself is less restrictive than that used in the accompanying Letter.

Herein, consequently, greater weight is attributed to the restrictive terminology in *TC* as an expression of revocation.²⁴⁵

²⁴² See *Come già*, §11.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, §12.

²⁴⁴ *Come già*, §10. Cf. *TC*, art. 1. It may be argued that the language Benedict used to describe “two Forms” of the one Latin Rite has been made obsolete by Francis’ expression that the post-Conciliar Missal is the “unique expression” of the Church’s *lex orandi*; these words appear *prima facie* to indicate that there is no other expression and thus there are no longer “two Forms.” Yet Francis neither abrogated *MR/1962* nor prohibited its use. Therefore, two Forms of the Mass liturgy still retain universal recognition for use within the Latin Church albeit with closer regulation than in the recent past. Thus, the expression “Extraordinary Form” for the *usus antiquior* remains apt or assumes more significance. See section 4.4.4 below for an examination of *TC* as well as of the phrase “unique expression.”

²⁴⁵ This is an unusual juridical situation and clearly the argument presented is not flawless. Remaining lack of clarity from the Holy See contributes to the argument’s speculative nature. One might argue, for instance, that two statements on the same day from the same author, who is also the Roman Pontiff, are of equal weight since the Roman Pontiff does not need to utilize any particular kind of document to express his will and/or to act legislatively, making an evaluation of the weight of each document moot. Likewise, both documents are declarations of the sovereign will of the Pope. With this in mind, one may argue that the broader, more encompassing of the statements is the one that bears more gravity. Similarly, c. 18 refers to

Traditionis custodes imposes and *Come già* describes restrictions upon whom, when and where the EF may be celebrated; it does not express interest in the celebration of the EF apart from the one mention of the ritual, appearing in art. 3, §3, presenting the requirement for the Sacred Scripture texts to be proclaimed in the vernacular in EF celebrations. Thus, *TC* does not appear to impede mutual liturgical enrichment. Nonetheless, a brief examination of the juridic nature of *TC* and its bearing upon mutual enrichment will be undertaken below, in Chapter IV.

1.4.4 – CDWDS: *Responsa ad dubia*, 4 December 2021

On 4 December 2021, the CDWDS issued *Responsa ad dubia*,²⁴⁶ describing itself as a response to a number of questions posed from bishops of the Latin Church regarding interpretation of motu proprio *Traditionis Custodes*.²⁴⁷ The document was made available in English, German, Spanish, French and Italian and later appeared in Latin. The published text contains an introductory address of nine paragraphs and eleven queries and responses, eight of which are followed by an explanatory note.²⁴⁸

Consistent with *TC*, these *Responsa* do not concern themselves with matters of celebration of the Mass according to *MR/1962*, apart from the language of the Scripture readings. Rather, it clarifies and further narrows the circumstances under which the EF may

laws; the Pope's declaration of his will is a singular administrative act, not a law. These and other arguments and positions exist and are worthy of genuine discussion. Nonetheless, the argument presented above is partly informed retrospectively by the clarification issued by the Holy See, as will be considered below. Discussing both documents concomitantly can be cumbersome and so herein they are treated separately. As well, aware that c. 18 does not strictly apply, it is cited as a canonical principle that the juridically restrictive is interpreted narrowly.

²⁴⁶ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, *Responsa ad dubia*, On certain provisions of the Apostolic Letter *Traditionis Custodes*, 4 December 2021. English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_2021_1204_responsa-ad-dubia-traditionis-custodes_en.html (11 January 2022).

²⁴⁷ *Responsa ad dubia*, §1.

²⁴⁸ For the complete document in English, please see Appendix VIII. The document is not presented with denoted divisions. For ease of citation, the text in Appendix VIII provides paragraph numbers and query/response numbers.

be celebrated. Nonetheless, a brief examination of the juridic nature of *TC* and its bearing upon mutual enrichment will be undertaken below, in Chapter IV.

Traditions Custodes and the *Responsa* that followed it are neither to be dismissed nor have their value minimized. The new norms, restrictions and interpretations set forth in these documents are significant and affect a broad number of persons and circumstances; examination of them in their entirety will make fascinating study. However, such examinations exceed the scope of the instant work. For the sake of managing that scope, the influence these documents have placed upon mutual liturgical enrichment remains the focus of concentration in order to maintain that the relevance of mutual liturgical enrichment remains even in light of the way the EF appears to have been treated in these most recent documents and is not merely speculative, at the time of this writing. Some speculation of the future will be included in the General Conclusion, below.²⁴⁹

Conclusion

The passage of time, changes in pontifical administrations and the need to address contemporary circumstances have had tremendous effect on the allowance for use of the older rites while respecting the primacy of the newer rites. From the vision of the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council manifested in *SC* and the promulgation of a redesigned Roman Missal and rubrics, to the liberalizing provisions of *SP* and *CGF*, to the substantial enactment of mutual enrichment by the CDF decrees, to the disciplinary provisions of *TC*,

²⁴⁹ On 29 June 2022, Francis promulgated apostolic letter *Desiderio Desideravi*, (FRANCIS, Apostolic Letter *Desiderio Desideravi*, on the liturgical formation of the People of God, 29 June 2022, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_letters/documents/20220629-lettera-ap-desiderio-desideravi.html [7 July 2022]). The letter comprises some 65 articles and is addressed to all persons of the Church. Francis expressed his will that this letter address the subject of the Mass liturgy to all members of the Church, following upon *TC*, which was addressed to bishops (see art. 1). Though this is not a legislative document, it is noteworthy in the timeline and development of mutual liturgical enrichment, particularly as it intimates some degree of reproach to those who use the EF as a mean for divisive ends.

oscillating exceptions for use of the older rites have created a pathway to mutual enrichment that brings us to an ever-new point in liturgical history in the Latin Church.

In *SP*, Benedict XVI authorized both Forms throughout the Latin Church and permitted use of the EF by providing a general faculty to do so. What once had been known as “former rites” became “present rites.” This general faculty was revoked and permission to use *MR/1962* was remanded to the authority of the diocesan bishop by Francis in *TC*, but use of *MR/1962* remains. Both Forms remain living Mass liturgies of the Latin Church. As such, the ritual of *MR/1962* has become familiar to many more of the faithful than it had been between 1965 and 2007. These faithful comprise new generations of persons who were too young to have had experienced the older rites when they were normative yet find themselves attracted to it, without the nostalgic attachment or schismatic connection of prior generations.

From a juridic perspective, this development did not occur by means of organic development. Nothing regarding the Mass takes effect unless competent juridic authority so decrees, no matter how organic the origin of the desire for any given change. At the same time, however, documents such as *Summorum Pontificum*, *Cum sanctissima* and *Quo magis* may be said to be responses to organic development or even its manifestation, by competent juridic authority.

Because of what has taken place along this pathway, we have arrived at an opportunity for further study and proposal regarding mutual enrichment in both directions, that is, between both Missals currently in licit use in the Latin Church, even if use of the EF has become more restricted. The opportunities are exciting and the possibilities so extensive that consideration of them all greatly exceeds the boundaries of this work.

CHAPTER II

ENRICHMENT OF THE LITURGICAL YEAR

Introduction

In *CGF*, Benedict XVI states, “[N]ew Saints and some [or “certain”] of the new Prefaces can and should be inserted in the old Missal.”²⁵⁰ As the dicastery entrusted with this task, the PCED, in its 30 April 2011 instruction *Universae Ecclesiae*, reiterated the same.²⁵¹ Following transfer of competencies to the CDF, their 25 March 2020 decree *Cum sanctissima* provides a generous framework within which one is allowed to celebrate feasts of Saints canonized since GRC/1960 as it is used in the EF. This chapter seeks to continue the work requested by Benedict XVI, begun by the PCED, recognized under Francis as a “mandate” of Benedict XVI and at least partially fulfilled in a substantial way by the CDF under Francis.

An unfortunate condition of *MR/1962* is that the proceedings of the post-Tridentine reforms resulting in its mother Missal, *MR/1570*, have been lost to time. To ascertain how it came into existence and to be informed of and respectful to the Missals of both Forms, exploration of how they came into existence must be undertaken. A degree of historical study is necessary to achieve this end.

Little is known of the Western rites in the earliest centuries. Nonetheless, there are a number of extant sources for consideration that were used by the Reformers in both the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. Because worship in the West was not unified by law until 1568-1570, universal legislative documents regulating the liturgy

²⁵⁰ *CGF*, §9. “In antiquo Missali recentiores sancti et aliquae ex novis praefationibus inseri possunt immo debent secundum quod quam primum statutum erit.”

²⁵¹ “New Saints and some [certain] of the new prefaces can and ought to be inserted into the 1962 Missal, according to provisions which will be indicated subsequently” (*Universae Ecclesiae*, art. 25).

emanating from this level of authority do not exist prior to that time. Therefore, the sources used by Reformers will be considered juridically authoritative within their respective contexts, for these sources were governed by custom and the authority of the diocesan bishop. Their use as authoritative sources by the most respected scholars both in the sixteenth and twentieth centuries expresses recognition of their juridic importance. These sources will figure prominently into what becomes canonized in *MR/1570* as a matter of explicit ecclesiastical law. Fortunately, there is no lack of fine scholarship to provide guidance.

By examining the development of liturgical celebrations that become the practice of GRC/1960 governing the EF, we can then compare them to GRC/1970 governing the OF. Fortunately, the proceedings of the post-Vatican II liturgical reforms are well-documented. The sources, and scholars who discuss them, will reveal the origins, practices and adaptations of the Latin Church regarding celebration of seasons of the year in the Temporal Cycle of the mysteries of the Lord and the Sanctoral Cycle in the celebration of Saints and *Beati*, as well as devotional observances. This expedition into the past will afford the possibility to examine by what means the calendar that accompanies *MR/1570* and its granddaughter, *MR/1962*.

The historical survey is not intended to vulgarize the subject matter. Rather, it seeks to contextualize it and to arrive at historical consistency that may be respected when proposing mutual enrichment in the present. This study is not exhaustive because this is not *per se* a work of liturgiology so much as it is a study of how liturgical practice comes into juridic existence, so that proposals for mutual enrichment in the present will operate within the juridic framework of the *ius vigens*.

Because so many elements comprise any version of the General Roman Calendar, the study necessarily cannot be brief. This is true as well because some elements treated in the instant Chapter, such as the liturgical sources, will be useful for the next as well and need not be repeated there. Nonetheless, it becomes clear that, when taken as a whole, the General Roman Calendar itself and its development are perhaps not quite so complex or unclear as they may appear *prima facie*.²⁵² In fact, with some exceptions, its development to the time of *MR/1962* shows a great deal of consistency.

Finally, after examination of the development of the *GRC/1960* governing the EF and the *GRC/1970* governing the OF, informed observations and proposals may be made. The fruit of these observations will take specific form by the proposal of particular calendars for dioceses of Canada and the United States of America that would directly but respectfully enrich the EF liturgical calendar with elements of the OF. The proposal is necessarily informed by the history of the Latin Church and the provisions granted in and limitations imposed by decree *Cum sanctissima*.

2.1 – Historical Source Texts

Given the persecutions suffered by Roman Christians and the secrecy with which many had to conduct their worship, it is possible that the practices of Western liturgical pre-history were not recorded. Nonetheless, we can commence study of recorded history by means of extant sources that emerge from a period of time after more freedom was granted to Christians.

In the earliest Mass liturgies, the various prayers were created *ad libitum*. Over time, some were found worthy of repetition and were memorized. Some were written on a special

²⁵² The practical use of the Calendar in either liturgical Form is, however, admittedly complex.

tablet, which may have been akin to what we recognize as “altar cards” today.²⁵³ The presence and use of liturgical texts in this way represents a time of transition between *ad libitum* constructions and what would later become the Sacramentary.²⁵⁴ For a variety of reasons,²⁵⁵ written collections of Western liturgical texts developed according to the needs of the individual celebrant and/or those of the local Church. Rather soon, they began to coalesce into more uniform books for various ministries. Most of them have continued in forms that bear a good degree of similarity to the liturgical books used in our day.

For the role of the priest- or bishop-celebrant, many small collections of Mass formularies have survived from ancient times in the form of booklets collectively called *libelli*. From these grew the *liber sacramentorum* or simply *sacramentarium*, containing the *Orationes* and *Praefationes* varying with the time of the year or Saint celebrated at the given time. As these books developed, texts for the *Ordo Missae* and the Canon were added. Today, we recognize this book as the Sacramentary.²⁵⁶ Later, the *Antiphonale* came into existence containing the entrance, offertory and communion antiphons for the choir.²⁵⁷

²⁵³ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 61.

²⁵⁴ C. FOLSOM, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” in A. CHUPUNGO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997, 245-314, here, 246. Folsom will call this period one of “structured improvisation.”

²⁵⁵ Such reasons appear to be that many celebrants lacked the gift of poetic prayer composition. Notable compositions were found worthy of repeating and sharing, motivated by a desire for uniformity, to honor one’s episcopal predecessor, for ease of celebration and the like.

²⁵⁶ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 61.

²⁵⁷ See *ibid.* Once various schedules and paradigms coalesced for the Scripture used in the Mass, two books developed for the persons proclaiming them: the *Apostolus* or *Epistolarium* for the one who proclaimed the Epistle and the *Evangelarium* for the Deacon who proclaimed the Holy Gospel. These continue to exist similarly in the form of the Lectionary and the Book of the Gospels. There was also the *cantatorium* for the individual who led and sang the responsorial chants between the Scripture readings. These chants were severely truncated by the time *MR/1570* was promulgated. It would appear that the former *antiphonale* and what was necessary of the *cantatorium* together form the *Graduale Romanum* (see *ibid.*). It is, in fact, a fusion of the sacramentary, lectionary and antiphonal into one book that creates the Missal books that we have known for the last many centuries (see FOLSOM, “Liturgical Books,” 262). Of how this came to be, Folsom remarks, “Among the most common theories are these: (1) the development of the private Mass, (2) the obligation on the part of the priest to recite all the parts of the Mass, even if these parts were sung by the schola or read by the lectors, (3) pastoral usefulness and the development of the care of souls in small parishes

Books of liturgical instruction emerged called *Ordines*. These contained directions for the Master of Ceremonies for ordinary celebrations as well as the more infrequently used rites.²⁵⁸ The way in which the *Ordines* existed to give instruction is paralleled today in the *praenotanda* of the Missals in use today as the *Ritus Servandus*, *Rubricis generales*, the *GIRM*, the local *ordo* and other such instructional documents.²⁵⁹

Fundamental to this study are the four major collections of euchological texts which have survived from antiquity: The Veronese/Leonine, the *Gelasianum Vetus*, the Eighth Century Gelasian and the Gregorian Sacramentaries. None of these is purely Roman; all contain Gallican influence.²⁶⁰

The Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary²⁶¹ is not one organized book, but rather a collection of *libelli* compiled in the early seventh century and likely composed between 561 and 574;²⁶² it is considered the oldest extant source for the Mass of the Latin Church.²⁶³

away from large diocesan or monastic centers, (4) the influence of priestly piety and the concern to omit nothing" (FOLSOM, "Liturgical Books," 245-314, here, 263-264).

²⁵⁸ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 61-62.

²⁵⁹ Of the *Ordines*, *Ordo Romanus I* is one of the most important for an understanding of the Roman Mass. Though existing in numerous manuscripts, the oldest *Ordines* can be dated to at least the seventh century. They contain descriptions of the preparation for and the rite of the papal stational services. The broad travels and many adaptations of these *Ordines* demonstrate how strong the influence of the ritual for the pope's stational liturgies were upon the Mass, even in the northern lands, at least through the eleventh century with the later *Ordo Romanus III* (see JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 66). *Ordines I* will bear tremendous significance upon the post-Vatican II reforms to the Mass and will be treated below, in Chapter IV. For a thorough historical treatment of the custom of papal stational Masses, see M. METZGER, "The History of the Eucharistic Liturgy in Rome," in A. CHUPUNGCO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume III: The Eucharist*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1999, 103-131, especially 109-114.

²⁶⁰ JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 61.

²⁶¹ See L.C. MOHLBERG, L. EIZENHÖFER and P. SIFRIN, *Sacramentarium Veronese*, RED Series Maior, Fontes I, Rome, Herder, 1978. This is also known as the *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, "Leonine Sacramentary," *Sacramentarium Veronese* and the "Verona Sacramentary." Marx observes, for example, "that although Vagaggini, Jungmann and Bouyer still refer to this book as the 'Leonine' Sacramentary, Bouyer, at least, points out the mistaken attribution" (N. MARX, "The Revision of the Prefaces in the Missal of Paul VI," in M. JOHNSON [ed.], *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 358, footnote 42). Cf. L. BOUYER, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. C. U. QUINN, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1968, 360. For the sake of clarity and uniformity, the term "Veronese/Leonine" is used herein.

²⁶² See FOLSOM, "Liturgical Books," 246.

²⁶³ The Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary plays a key role in the history of Latin liturgy: sixteenth century reformers took at least 174 texts from it when preparing what would become *MR/1570* and thus are in use

This large but incomplete collection contains full euchological formularies for the Mass.²⁶⁴ The calendar of Temporal and Sanctoral Cycles as well as prayers for other rites are arranged in an ostensibly disorganized mix.²⁶⁵ Though the flavor of the texts is decidedly Roman in many cases, it is a hybrid; the editor appears to have used every available source.²⁶⁶ Authorship of these texts has been traced to, among others, Popes Leo the Great (440-461), Gelasius (492-496) and Vigilius (537-555).²⁶⁷

The *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, frequently referred to as the *Gelasianum Vetus*,²⁶⁸ is preserved entirely as a single book of Mass formularies that we would recognize readily as a Roman-style sacramentary. The single extant manuscript is dated to ca. 750, copied at a monastery in Chelles, near Paris. The texts themselves were composed over time from 628-715;²⁶⁹ it is considered the second oldest extant liturgical source for the Mass of the Latin Church.

The *Gelasianum Vetus* contains the full year of Mass formularies divided into three recognizable sections: the Christmas and Easter cycles; the Saints' feasts for the full year with a supplement for Advent and Ember week of Advent; a list of Sunday Masses along

today in the EF. Three of these texts, the *Aufer a nobis* prayer said when ascending the altar, the *Deus qui humanae substantiae* prayer said when adding water to the wine at the offertory and the *Quod ore sumpsimus* prayer said at the ablutions are used at every Mass celebrated in the EF.

²⁶⁴ The formularies for Christmas to mid-April are missing.

²⁶⁵ See FOLSOM, "Liturgical Books," 246.

²⁶⁶ For instance, there are twenty-eight Masses for the celebration of the feast of Saints Peter and Paul and fourteen for St. Lawrence. It is evident that some of the formularies contained therein were assembled quite casually; some texts are exceedingly personal. In fact, certain Eucharistic Prefaces contained therein are metamorphosed into controversial speeches against personal enemies of the author(s), chiefly false monks. These conditions indicate the situation in the fourth and fifth centuries (see JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 61, footnote 7). Because of its characteristics, this manuscript is considered to have been a private effort (see *ibid.*, 61).

²⁶⁷ See FOLSOM, "Liturgical Books," 246.

²⁶⁸ See L.C. MOHLBERG, *Liber sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae ordinis anni circuli* (=MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*), RED Series Maior, Fontes IV, Rome, Herder, 1981. The *Gelasianum Vetus* is also referred to as the "Gelasian" or "Old Gelasian Sacramentary." All three titles appear to be used quite commonly. The most technical works more frequently use the term *Gelasianum Vetus*. For the sake of clarity and uniformity, the term *Gelasianum Vetus* is used herein.

²⁶⁹ See FOLSOM, "Liturgical Books," 248.

with Votive Masses for an extensive diversity of occasions and possibilities.²⁷⁰ In every essential way, this is indeed a Roman Mass book mingling aspects of both the papal and presbyteral customs.²⁷¹ Gallican elements in it are easily identifiable, in some case by the wording and in other cases by the names of the Saints included in the calendar.²⁷²

A Mass book of more Gregorian origin had developed in Gaul somewhat overlapping the time of the development of the *Gelasianum Vetus*. When the texts of the *Gelasianum Vetus* and other sources predominantly imported from Rome were introduced in Gaul, the Church there found herself with two Mass books.

Rather than decide which to use, they combined the two.²⁷³ The many resulting amalgamated manuscripts have come to be known as the “Eighth Century Gelasian Sacramentaries.”²⁷⁴ A characteristic of this collection is that it contains a considerable number of episcopal blessings and thus appears to have been intended for use by bishops.²⁷⁵ Notably, extant manuscripts contain a cycle for the liturgical year and Saints.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁰ See FOLSOM, “Liturgical Books,” 248.

²⁷¹ See *ibid.*, 249.

²⁷² An example of Gallican influence appears in the Good Friday prayer for the emperor: “Respice propitius ad Romanum sive Francorum benignus imperium.” Furthermore, a section devoted to the minor orders is entirely Gallican. The Roman elements made their way to France in some form in the first half of the seventh century at the very latest. Ergo, it can be deduced that these same texts must have been in use at Rome prior to that. By virtue of mutual enrichment, Gallican materials from *Gelasianum Vetus*, such as the rites for the minor orders, were assumed into the Roman Pontifical and into *MR/1570* and were received into *MR/1962*. They remain normative in the EF (see FOLSOM, “Liturgical Books,” 249).

²⁷³ See *ibid.*

²⁷⁴ Also known as the “Later Gelasian” or “Frankish Gelasian.” For the sake of clarity and uniformity, the term “Eighth Century Gelasian” is used herein.

²⁷⁵ See FOLSOM, “Liturgical Books,” 250.

²⁷⁶ JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 62-63, 118, and BOUYER, *Eucharist*, 362.

The many extant manuscripts of these eighth century texts are divided into Groups I and II. The best known of Group I is “Gellone,” dated ca. 790-800, having been composed ca. 760-770.²⁷⁷ The best known of Group II is “St. Gall,” written there, ca. 800.²⁷⁸

Finally, the Gregorian Sacramentary²⁷⁹ emerges from a complex but fascinating historical exchange that brings the Roman Mass through much of the West and then back to Rome again.²⁸⁰ Emperor Charlemagne (742-814) desired that the various Mass liturgies celebrated in his realm would come into uniformity. As the prestige of the papacy had increased, it seemed to him fitting to use the Roman ceremonies to accomplish his desired end. Charlemagne requested a copy of the Roman sacramentary from Pope Hadrian I (772-795) who sent him a prototype ca. 785 based upon what appears to have been the Papal sacramentary, called the *Hadrianum*, or *Sacramentarium Hadrianum*. Because it was intended to be used for the Papal stational and festival liturgies rather than parochial Masses, many basic elements, such as ordinary Sunday Mass formularies, were not included.

At the invitation of Charlemagne, the priest and scholar Alcuin of York (735-804) created the supplement to fill the gaps in the *Hadrianum*.²⁸¹ In doing so, he mixed both

²⁷⁷ See A. DUMAS and J. DESHUSSES, *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis*, CCL, 159-159A, Turnhout, 1980.

²⁷⁸ See L.C. MOHLBERG, *Das fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum in alemanischer Überlieferung* (=MOHLBERG, *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*), LQF Quellen I-II, Münster, 1918.

²⁷⁹ See J. DESHUSSES, (ed.), *Le sacramentaire Grégorien: Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, 3 vols., Spicilegium Friburgense, no. 16, Editions Universitaires, Fribourg, 1971-1979.

²⁸⁰ For a concise treatment of the complex history of the Gregorian Sacramentary, see FOLSOM, “Liturgical Books,” 252-254.

²⁸¹ There is a relatively new argument that it was Benedict of Aniane and not Alcuin who wrote the “Hadrianum Supplement.” This does not appear to be supported by primary scholars in the field but would make for fascinating further investigation. See M.R. REED, *Into the Vault of the Saints: The Exterior Crypts of Saint-Denis in Paris and Saint-Germain in Auxerre*, Master’s Thesis, Baton Rouge, LA, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, May 2011, 65, footnote 16. Cf. F. PAXTON, *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 1990, 136;

Gallican and Roman material. This book became disseminated throughout the realm, picking up some local elements wherever it went. This enriched edition eventually made its way back to Rome. Thus, a new type of Roman Sacramentary came into being, one with many more formularies, heavily influenced by the Gallican usages, practical for presbyteral and not only Papal use and from which the plethora of later editions developed.²⁸² This was a truly Western Missal, recognized and used in Rome.

Presumably, by removing clearly Gallican additions, *inter alia*, scholars have been able to reconstruct what they believe is close to the original prototype sent by Hadrian to Charlemagne. The additions inserted by Alcuin became termed the “supplement.” With the sources separated, then, into a Gregorian “Hadrianum” Sacramentary and a Gallican “Hadrianum Supplement,” these texts became sources of prime importance.²⁸³

Multiple later sources exist from the tenth and eleventh centuries. These are called the “Mixed Gregorians” or “Gelasianized Gregorians.” These synthesize a number of texts and are highly Gallican in their content.²⁸⁴ But it is the Veronese/Leonine, *Gelasianum Vetus*, Eighth Century Gelasian, the Gregorian “Hadrianum” along with the “Hadrianum Supplement” that comprise the primary, though not exclusive, sources of reference for the post-Vatican II reforms. These appear to have been the main sources used by scholars at the time of the post-Tridentine reforms as well.²⁸⁵

²⁸² See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 63.

²⁸³ Scholars have been able to delve even deeper and reconstruct from among all these elements the sacramentary as believed to have existed in the time of Honorius I (625-638) or slightly later. This becomes termed the “pre-Hadrian” Sacramentary. Incidentally, scholars are coming more to believe that Gregory the Great did in fact author many of the texts contained in the eponymous sacramentary. Therefore, many texts in *MR/1570* and received into *MR/1962* are now believed to have been composed by Pope Gregory (see JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 63).

²⁸⁴ See FOLSOM, “Liturgical Books,” 255.

²⁸⁵ For instance, the ninth century Ambrosian Sacramentary or *Sacramentarium Bergomense* was also used by reformers as a later source for some texts. For further reference, see *Sacramentarium Bergomense: manoscritto del secolo IX della Biblioteca di S. Alessandro in Colonna in Bergamo*, trans. A. PAREDI,

2.2 – Overview of the Liturgical Year and General Roman Calendar

The liturgical year in both Forms has two distinct rotations or cycles: “the Temporal cycle, the commemoration of the life of our Lord (*proprium de tempore*), and the Sanctoral cycle (*proprium de sanctis*), beginning at the end of November and dated according to the secular calendar, but running concurrently with the temporal cycle.”²⁸⁶ These partly independent sequences of celebrations last twelve calendar months after which they begin anew.

The Temporal is the first of these cycles to develop, beginning with the local celebration of Sunday. This soon grew into the celebration of Easter and soon thereafter into the Easter-related mysteries. This was followed in the Gallican communities by the celebration of the Epiphany of the Lord with a Lent-like forty-day preparatory period of fasting. In Rome, celebration of the Nativity of the Lord came into being and a preparatory season of Advent developed. Eventually, an Octave of Christmas and a season of Christmastide came into being.

Amid this, from the earliest recorded times, the Church in Rome celebrated changes of the natural seasons and other special feasts of prayer, petition and thanksgiving. These became known as Rogation Days and Ember Days.

For the past many centuries, the cycle of the liturgical year has begun on the First Sunday of Advent and ends the day prior to the First Sunday of the following Advent. The dates beginning the various seasons are dependent upon the timing of certain major feasts of the Lord.

Bergamo, Edizioni Monumenta Bergomensia, 1962. Additionally, French diocesan Missals of the seventeenth-nineteenth centuries were at times consulted, among them principally the 1738 Paris Missal (see WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” in *Notitiae*, 23 (1987), 413-937, here, 424).

²⁸⁶ R. PEIL, *A Handbook of the Liturgy*, New York, NY, Herder and Herder, 1960, 48.

The remainder of the year is connected neither to Easter nor to Christmas and thus developed into the Sanctoral Cycle, first with memorials of martyrs then of other Saints and *Beati*. The Sanctoral Cycle eventually includes other mysteries of salvation history and devotion.²⁸⁷ Most, but not all, occur on fixed dates according to the secular calendar and the natural seasons.²⁸⁸

2.3 – Development of the Temporal Cycle of the Liturgical Year

The Temporal Cycle took some time to coalesce.²⁸⁹ The earliest celebrations in the Church focused on Sunday, stemming from the Jewish reckoning of the week. The seventh day of the week, the Sabbath, was replaced by the first day of the week, Sunday. On Sunday, the Lord began creating; on Sunday, the Lord rose from the dead; on Sunday, the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles.²⁹⁰ Other days soon began to assume significance as well. Peil observes:

²⁸⁷ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship: A Survey*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, ca. 1957, 178.

²⁸⁸ In the nineteenth century, the term “liturgical year” was coined by Prosper Guéranger (see P. GUÉRANGER, *L’année liturgique*, Paris, Oudin, 1911, available as an electronic book at <https://archive.org/details/lanneliturgiqu06gu/page/n7/mode/2up> [11 January 2022]). It appears that the term “Liturgical Year” is more often, though not exclusively, used in reference to the Temporal Cycle and the term “Roman Calendar” is more often, though not exclusively, used in reference to the Sanctoral Cycle. The official name of the whole is the “General Roman Calendar.” All three terms appear to be used interchangeably. “General Roman Calendar” or “GRC” are used herein to denote the actual governing document, while “Roman Calendar” is used for general reference.

²⁸⁹ Sheppard dates the coalescence of the Church’s year quite early, stating that the liturgical calendar “was practically speaking completed with the adoption of the octave of Pentecost in the seventh century” (L. SHEPPARD, [ed.], *The New Liturgy: A Comprehensive Introduction to the New Liturgy as a Whole and to Its Calendar, Order of Mass, Eucharistic Prayers, the Roman Canon, Prefaces and the New Sunday Lectionary*, Glasgow, Robert MacLehose and Company, Ltd., 1970, 10). Jungmann posits that a genuine inner cohesiveness of the feasts, Temporal and Sanctoral, is not achieved until the twelfth century (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 178-179). Augé places the evolution of the calendar yet later, stating that the system of yearly liturgical events and celebrations began to be organized in the thirteenth century, but that it was not until the sixteenth century that these initial sketches became known as a unity. Nonetheless, he will posit that the structure itself of the liturgical year as we know it “was fixed in the sixth century and is the fruit of a process which began in apostolic times with the celebration of Sunday and which was followed by the annual celebration of Easter” (M. AUGÉ, “The Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” in A. CHUPUNGCO [ed.], *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Vol. V, Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 135). In any event, by the time of the Ecumenical Council of Trent (1545-1563), the liturgical year in the Latin Church was highly structured and organized into a GRC.

²⁹⁰ See PEIL, *Handbook of the Liturgy*, 48.

Wednesday, the day of our Lord's betrayal, and Friday, the day of his death, early in the Church's history became days of fasting. To these was added Saturday, the day our Lord's body rested in the tomb, following a literal interpretation of Mark 2:20. It is for this reason that these days receive special notice in Ember weeks, the quarterly fasts at the beginning of the four seasons. With this exception, the ecclesiastical year has no special connection with the months or seasons of the calendar year.²⁹¹

Over time, the Temporal Cycle became dependent upon moveable days and dates. The timing of much of the cycle is determined by the date of Easter²⁹² after which certain other celebrations, such as the beginning of Lent, the timing of the Sacred Triduum and the feasts of the Ascension and of Pentecost, are reckoned. Similarly, the season of Advent is dependent upon the day of the celebration of the Nativity of the Lord. While the feast has a fixed date in the of 25 December in the West, the day of the week upon which it falls in any particular year determines the reckoning of the First Sunday of Advent, the Christian "New Year's Day."²⁹³

The celebrations occurring on fixed dates are principally those of martyrs, Saints and *Beati*²⁹⁴ and belong to the Sanctoral Cycle. These dates initially had no relation to the celebration of the liturgical seasons. In the West, however, some of these developed into seasons themselves, such as the seasons of Advent, Christmastide and Epiphany.²⁹⁵

The Temporal Cycle of the liturgical year is dependent upon the temporal cycle of the solar calendar. That is, celebration of the mysteries of Catholic Divine Worship depends upon the solar calendar for the designation of Sunday and thus upon the seven-day week.

²⁹¹ PEIL, *Handbook of the Liturgy*, 48. For further notes on the ecclesiastical year, see Chapter 12 of same.

²⁹² See SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 10.

²⁹³ Prior to the twelfth century, a question of at what time the liturgical year would begin was not apparently raised. Advent, Easter and *Septuagesima* had all been used as its beginning in various places. Ultimately, Advent was adopted as the start of the liturgical year, likely for practical purposes: liturgical books had to determine a specific beginning, i.e., what goes on page 1 (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 178-179).

²⁹⁴ See SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 10.

²⁹⁵ See AUGÉ, "The Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," in A. CHUPUNGCO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 177-210, here, 194.

It depends upon the four natural seasons as experienced in most of the West, particularly for Rogation and Ember Days. It depends on the twelve-month solar year for the celebration of one complete cycle.

2.3.1 – The Prominence of Sunday

The observance of Sunday as a day of worship almost certainly began with the Apostles, when considering New Testament references to Sundays along with the first patristic texts on the matter. For instance, in 1 Corinthians 16:1-2, Paul requests a collection to be taken “on the first day of every week,” which is necessarily the day after the seventh day, or Sunday.²⁹⁶ This demonstrates that the Corinthian Church used the Jewish reckoning of a seven-day week and that the first day of the week, Sunday, was of particular importance.²⁹⁷

The reasons that brought about the institution of Sunday as the preeminent day of Christian worship are not entirely obvious. One theory resides in the notion that Sunday

²⁹⁶ As well, in the Acts of the Apostles 20:7-11, St. Paul visits Troas as a guest to the Church he had founded there. The final day of his visit is “the first day of the week.” He joined with the community who had congregated for “the breaking of the bread,” a turn of phrase used to indicate celebration of the Christian Eucharistic Liturgy as it was then (see Luke 24:35; Acts 2:46; 1 Cor. 10:16). Reference is made to a “large room upstairs” (see also Mark 14:15) lighted by “many lamps.” This sounds very much like a particular gathering of the local Church on a particular day for a particular worship event, i.e., the Holy Eucharist. This is a regularly scheduled event and not one held uniquely for the departure of Paul. Rather, he is given time to speak at an event that was going to occur and apparently occurred every Sunday (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 136). There exists a difference of opinion on which day of the week is being identified in this text from Acts. Some contend that the author of Acts faithfully observed the Jewish system of reckoning days, which would place the meeting on Saturday evening, since the Jewish day begins with sunset. Others contend that he would have used the Greek or Roman system, which would make Sunday evening the evening of the first day of the week (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 136). By either reckoning, the worshippers understood it to be Sunday. For various opinions, see W. RORDORF, “Origine et signification de la célébration du dimanche dans le christianisme primitif: État actuel de la recherche,” in *La Maison-Dieu*, 148 (1981), 103-122, and T.I. TALLEY, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, Second Edition, Collegeville, MN, 1991, 13-17.

²⁹⁷ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 135-136.

achieved preeminence because it is the day of the resurrection itself.²⁹⁸ For many, the most evident cause is that it is the day post-resurrection appearances.²⁹⁹

Of this, Augé observes:

In sum, we can argue that Sunday was born in the Eucharistic and spiritual climate (pneumatological and eschatological) of the appearances of the Risen One in the vicinity of Jerusalem. Even if the only New Testament witness that explicitly mentions a Sunday celebration³⁰⁰ refers to a Pauline community, outside of Palestine, the available data lead to a fundamental agreement with those who connect Sunday worship with the appearances of the Risen One.³⁰¹

The explanation given by Justin, Martyr, presented c. 155-157 to Roman Emperor

Antoninus Pius, combines both elements:

But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things....³⁰²

Sunday as the primary day of worship became a fixed matter from the fourth century onward, Justin's description of observance local to him notwithstanding. Along with it developed an Office for Sunday.

²⁹⁸ In support of this, see C. S. MOSNA, "Storia della domenica dalle origini fino agli inizi del V secolo: Problema delle origini e sviluppo, culto e riposo, aspetti pastorali e liturgici," in *Analecta gregoriana*, 170, Rome, Gregorian University, 1969, 42-60.

²⁹⁹ See AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries," 137. This thesis is treated in W. RORDORF, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*, Philadelphia, PA, Westminster Press, 1968, 177-237, and in S. MARSILI, "I segni del mistero di Cristo: Teologia liturgica dei sacramenti," in *Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae: Subsidia*, 42, Rome, Edizioni Liturgiche, 1987, 377.

³⁰⁰ Acts 20:7-12.

³⁰¹ AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries," 138. He continues, "Hypotheses that connect Sunday to a non-Christian origin, whether in the worship of the sun, in practices of the Mandeans, or in those of the Qumran community are considered inconsistent by the majority of scholars" (ibid., 138, footnote 8). Cf. C. S. MOSNA, "Storia della domenica dalle origini fino agli inizi del V secolo," 30-42; W. RORDORF, "Origine et signification de la célébration du dimanche dans le christianisme primitif: État actuel de la recherche," in *La Maison-Dieu*, 148 (1981), 111-113; JULIÁN LÓPEZ-MARTÍN, "El origen del domingo: Estado actual de la cuestión," in *Salmanticensis*, 38, 3^o (1991), 285-293. For a concise treatment of the early Christian observance of the Jewish Sabbath, see AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries," 140.

³⁰² JUSTIN, *Apologia I*, in J. KAYNE, *The First Apology of Justin Martyr Addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius*, Edinburgh, John Grant, 1912, LXXXIX, (94)-(95). The section in which this quote appears is frequently designated also as Chapter LXVII.

By the end of the fourth century, it is evident that the Churches in the East as well as Jerusalem observed a night vigil to Sunday, celebrated by all.³⁰³ Evidence of this is found in the writing of the pilgrim [Aetheria].³⁰⁴ “She describes an Office with psalms and prayers, the climax of which was the reading of the resurrection account from the Gospels, which only the bishop could do. This was done as though by the angel before the empty tomb. It was an extremely solemn popular Office, which exalted Sunday as a weekly memorial of the mystery of Easter.”³⁰⁵

Over time, the Easter theme of Sunday’s observance began to be obscured. Certain feasts from the Temporal Cycle were allowed to encroach as additions to the Sunday Mass or even replacements thereof. The Council of Trent would remedy the situation by greatly reducing the number of Saints in the Sanctoral Cycle and restoring primacy to Sunday. This deteriorated over the following centuries until Pius X attempted to ameliorate the situation by giving Sundays a position of privilege. Additionally, he reduced the number

³⁰³ Augé observes, “At the end of the fourth century, due especially to the influence of the community at Jerusalem, the process began by which the events of Easter were historicized, with the various events of the paschal mystery distributed to separate celebrations. This process was not uniform in the various Churches and was slower in the West than in the East. The process of the expansion of Easter took place in concentric circles that grew ever larger” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 153).

³⁰⁴ The pilgrim is also referred to as “Egeria” or “Etheria.” Because “Aetheria” appears to be the most frequent usage, it is adopted herein. Like Aetheria, many from the Gallican lands made pilgrimage to the Holy Land. They recorded what they witnessed and how they participated in the sacred commemorations. Not unlike what took place at Pentecost, these witness-pilgrims returned to the West where they shared what they had recorded of the events and their experiences attached thereunto. For further understanding of this influence on the Mass in the West, see “Aetheria: Peregrinatio ad loca sancta,” in W. RORDORF (ed.), *Sabbat und Sonntag in der Alten Kirche Traditio Christiana*, ii, Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 1972, no. 110. See also R. CANTALAMESSA (ed.), *Easter in the Early Church: An Anthology of Jewish and Early Christian Texts*, trans. J.M. QUIGLEY and J.T. LIENHARD, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1993, nos. 116-116b.

³⁰⁵ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 145. See also R. TAFT, *The Liturgy of the Hours: The Origins of the Divine Office in East and West and Its Meaning for Today*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1986, 28-29, ff. During approximately the same period, disciplinary norms regarding participation in Sunday worship were being issued by several provincial synods, though they were quite permissive. The Council of Elvira led the way by declaring in canon 21: “If someone stays for some time in a certain place and does not go to church on three Sundays, he should be excluded for a brief time so that he might know that he is being punished” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 145). See “Concilium Illiberritanum, can. 21” in W. RORDORF (ed.), *Sabbat und Sonntag*, no. 110.

observances in the Sanctoral Cycle marginally. His successors added more celebrations of Saints, however, until 1955 when the rubrics, touching upon the liturgical calendar, were simplified.³⁰⁶ In 1960, a revised Code of Rubrics³⁰⁷ furthered simplification by elevating Sundays and reducing several feasts to the rank of a simple commemoration. The structure of the liturgical calendar, however, was not modified.³⁰⁸

2.3.2 – Marking the Natural Seasons: Ember Days and Rogation Days

Ember Days are observances of fast and abstinence roughly at the beginning of each of the four natural seasons of the year as experienced in the Northern Hemisphere.³⁰⁹ It is conjectured reasonably that the practice originated with the Roman pagan observances marking three significant agricultural periods with supplications to their gods. These took place:

1. in December, the *feriae sementivae* for the planting;
2. in June, observing the *feriae messis* for the reaping;
3. in September, the *feriae vindimiales* for the vintage.

Seeking to Christianize even pagan practices that could be rehabilitated for good ends, the Roman Church held corresponding observances in those same months. The dates were not fixed but rather announced yearly by the priests of the Church.³¹⁰ Though the date of

³⁰⁶ All feasts of the “Semidouble” Class along with the class itself were eliminated by John XXIII. The rank would be somewhat akin to a “Lesser Memorial” if such a category existed. That is to say, an obligatory observance below what the OF would rank as a Memorial and above a mere Commemoration. By means of the same reform, all but three octaves were eliminated: Christmas, Easter and Pentecost.

³⁰⁷ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, *Novum rubricarum decretum generale quo novus rubricarum breviarii ac missalis Romani codex promulgatur*, 26 July 1960, in *AAS*, 52 (1960), decree, 596; rubrics, 597-740, English translation in P. MURPHY, *The New Rubrics of the Roman Missal and Breviary: Translation and Commentary*, Surry Hills, New South Wales, The Catholic Press Newspaper Company, Ltd., 1960, decree, xv; rubrics, 1-142. These documents govern the rubrics of the Extraordinary Form. In cases that retro-lacunae or conflicts are created with/in the 1983 Code, the CDF has the authority previously held by the PCED to provide clarification, as will be explored below.

³⁰⁸ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 11-12.

³⁰⁹ Ember Days are known also as *Quarter-tense* or *Quarter tense*, a corruption of the Latin *Quatuor Tempora*, or “four times.”

³¹⁰ It was also the case with the pagan feasts that the pagan priests or the pagan pontiff would announce the dates of their three celebrations annually; they were not fixed. For a brief description of these feasts, see

origin of these observances is lost to history, Pope Leo the Great (440-461) expressed his belief that Ember Days were of Apostolic origin.³¹¹

It is unclear when a fourth observance was added to the original three. However, Gelasius (492-496) already spoke of all four in his day. The observance of Ember Days had been confined to Roman practice but began to spread widely after the era of Gelasius.³¹² Gelasius permitted the conferral of the Sacrament of Holy Orders to take place on the Saturdays of Ember Week celebrations, which hitherto had been limited to Easter.³¹³

Approximately six centuries later, Gregory VII (1073-1085) definitively arranged the Ember Day celebrations and prescribed them to be observed throughout the Latin Church on fixed days. In his arrangement, the Ember Days are the Wednesday, Friday and Saturday:

1. after 13 December (Saint Lucy);
2. after Ash Wednesday (the first day of Lent);
3. after White Sunday³¹⁴ (the Sunday after Easter);
4. after 14 September (the Exaltation of the Holy Cross).³¹⁵

MARCUS TERENTIUS VARRO, *On the Latin Language in Twenty-five Books*, London, William Heineman, 1938, Book VI, 197-199, nos. 25-26.

³¹¹ Pope Callistus (217-222) is credited with creating a law ordering the fast, but this likely predates the Ember Day celebrations. See C. HERBERMAN, E. PACE, C. PALLAN, et al. (eds.), *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine and History of the Catholic Church in Fifteen Volumes, Volume Five, Diocese-Fathers* (=HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 5), New York, NY, Robert Appleton Company, 1909, 399, col. 2.

³¹² “They were brought into England by St. Augustine and into Gaul and the German lands by the Carolingians. Spain adopted them with the Roman liturgy in the eleventh century. They were introduced by St. Charles Borromeo into Milan” (HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 5, 399, col. 2). Due to their exclusively Roman nature and their spread with the Roman Liturgy and Western missionaries, the Ember Days are unknown in the East.

³¹³ See HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 5, 399, col. 2.

³¹⁴ *Dominica in albis*, as goes the official name, is referred to as Low Sunday, White Sunday, Whitsun, and Whitsunday. For the sake of consistency, the terms used herein are “White Sunday,” and the corresponding “White Saturday,” for *Sabbato in albis*.

³¹⁵ See HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 5, 399, col. 2. Each day of the Ember Day observance has a complete Mass formulary in both *MR/1570* and *MR/1962*.

In addition to the general promotion of prayer and fasting, the purpose for Ember Day celebrations “was to thank God for the gifts of nature, to teach men to make use of them in moderation, and to assist the needy.”³¹⁶

Ember Week Wednesday Masses have three additional Scripture readings, Saturdays, six and the Saturday in December’s observance, seven. This practice of inserting additional scripture readings into some Ember Day Mass formularies dates to at least the fifth century.

MR/1570 codified the Ember Days in the aforementioned schedule and included the additional scripture readings in the Mass formularies. This observance of Ember Days remains unchanged in *MR/1962* and the EF.

Rogation Days³¹⁷ are four days of prayer, celebrated over two periods. These were introduced by the Roman Church to appease God’s anger at the sins perpetrated by humanity, to ask for protection from catastrophe and misfortune and to reap a good and plentiful harvest.³¹⁸

The Major Rogation, with its accompanying Major Litany, is a single day observed on 25 April.³¹⁹ This celebration dates to antiquity and is speculated to have been implemented in order to thwart the ancient celebration of *Robigalia*, a day upon which the pagans held

³¹⁶ See HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 5, 399, col. 2.

³¹⁷ The term is likely taken from the Latin *rogatio*, meaning a prayer, entreaty or request.

³¹⁸ HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 13, 110, col. 2 to 111, col. 1, here, 111, col. 1. In Germany, Rogation Days are known as *Bittage*, *Bittwoche* and *Kreuzwoche*. In England, where they were observed with great devotion, they are known as “Gang Days” and “Cross Week.”

³¹⁹ 25 April is also the feast of St. Mark the Evangelist. The Feast of St. Mark, however, was added at a much later date than the celebration of the Rogations. As such, the two observances are merely coincidental (see Charles B. HERBERMAN, Edward A. PACE, Condé B. Pallen, et al. [eds.], *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine and History of the Catholic Church in Fifteen Volumes, Volume Thirteen, Revelation-Simon Stock* [=HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 13], New York, NY, Robert Appleton Company, 1909, 110, col. 2 to 111, col. 1).

processions and besought their gods. Gregory the Great (590-604) regulated the custom that was already in existence in his time.³²⁰

The Minor Rogations with accompanying Minor Litany comprise the three consecutive days prior to the feast of the Ascension. However, these celebrations were in existence long before the feast of the Ascension of the Lord was designated and celebrated. Each of the three days is celebrated with a procession, the prescribed proper Mass and the assigned Litany of the Saints. The Minor Rogations were initiated by St. Mamertus (+475), Bishop of Vienne, France. They were soon after enjoined by the Fifth Council of Orléans (511) and later approved by Leo III (795-816).³²¹

MR/1570 codified the Rogation Days in the aforementioned schedule and includes the assigned processions and Litanies. This observance of Rogation Days remains unchanged in *MR/1962* and the EF.³²²

2.3.3 – *Tempus Adventus*

For the first half-millennium of Christianity in Rome, “there is a complete absence of ancient witnesses for an Advent season.”³²³ In Spain and Gaul, however, its origins are quite early and complex. What was celebrated in those areas during the time of year that

³²⁰ See HERBERMAN, et. al., *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 13, New York, NY, Robert Appleton Company, 1909, 110, col. 2 to 111, col. 1.

³²¹ See *ibid.* *MR/1962* notes in a rubric that if the celebration of the feast of St. Mark is transferred, the Rogation procession is not transferred. If, albeit rare, 25 April falls on Easter Sunday, the procession is moved to the following Tuesday.

³²² The only ostensible legislation for the United States of America regarding Rogation and Ember Days appears in a Pastoral Letter issued from the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore, dated 27 October 1833. In article 19, it is reported that a request was sent to the Pope, presumably Gregory XVI (1831-1846), to dispense persons from observing the prescribed abstinence from meat on the Saturdays of Lent and Ember Days, on the Feast of St. Mark and the Rogation Days. These were two distinct requests (see SECOND PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Pastoral Letter, 27 October 1833, in H. NOLAN (ed.), *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Volume I 1792-1940*, Washington, DC, United States Catholic Conference, 1984, 67-81, here, 79). This is the last mention of Rogation Days to be found in documents issued by the Bishops of the United States of America. The Quarter-tenses, or Ember Days, will be mentioned a second and last time in 1966, as will be seen below.

³²³ KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413.

would become known as Advent has no correlation to Advent as it is known in either liturgical Form in current use. Rather, this entirely different season was almost identical to Lent.

Likely due to strong Oriental influences, these regions were introduced to the feast of Epiphany long before there was a feast celebrating the Nativity of the Lord. Epiphany was considered a baptismal feast, requiring a forty-day fast prior to its observance. Because the Church in Gaul considered both Saturday and Sunday to be non-fast days, eight full calendar weeks were necessary to accomplish the forty days of fast, bringing the beginning date to 11 November, the feast of St. Martin. The season was thus called the *Quadragesima sancti Martini*. As such, these regions observed a season remarkably similar to what we know as Lent prior to the baptismal feast of the Epiphany, even sharing its name of *Quadragesima*.³²⁴

The euchological texts of that time and region significantly paralleled the *Quadragesima* that preceded Easter.³²⁵ It was not primarily a season of rejoicing, but rather one of a penitential preparation for a forthcoming feast of rejoicing.³²⁶

Meanwhile, back in Rome, a pre-Christmas liturgical mood did not begin to emerge until the mid-sixth century.³²⁷ The euchological formularies of two Sundays prior to Christmas and the intervening Ember Week observance “introduced the subject of the coming (*adventus*) of Christ into this world, and the preparation for it by the message of

³²⁴ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 208-209.

³²⁵ See KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413.

³²⁶ In Spain and Gaul, a sense of what would become Advent further developed its focus as a consequence of the influence of Irish missionaries. These preached Christ as the eschatological judge who was to return; thus, the need for penitential prayer and fasting, which fit well with the *Quadragesima* prior to Epiphany. The celebration of Christmas, then, was not focused upon memorializing the Lord's historical birth but of his return as judge at the end of time (see KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413).

³²⁷ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 209.

the Angel and the preaching of St. John the Baptist.”³²⁸ There is an absence of a fast, indicating that this Roman observance had no parallels to the pre-Epiphany *Quadragesima* of Gallican practice nor of the pre-Easter *Quadragesima* of Roman practice.³²⁹ This was a development distinct from that of Spain and Gaul; the timing of their occurrence in the differing calendars is merely coincidental.

It was not until the eleventh century that a four-week, or rather, a four-Sunday, Advent is found in the Roman liturgical books, by which time it had taken on a timbre of its own.³³⁰ In Roman lectionaries from the high Middle Ages, the Gospel indicated for the First Sunday of Advent is that of the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem,³³¹ just as used at the beginning of Holy Week. This creates an episode as it were spanning from the first of Advent to the first of Holy Week, “presented by the liturgy as an image of the whole mystery of the Advent of the Lord from his first coming, in which he fulfilled the messianic

³²⁸ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 209.

³²⁹ KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413.

³³⁰ See KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413, and JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 209. Augé places this occurrence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 202). The observance in Rome appears to have been tepid. For some time, the season, such as it was, included overlap of these different lengths of observance (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 202). In the *Gelasianum Vetus* are five formularies and in the *Hadrianum* are two entitled *Orationes de Adventu Domini*, placed near the end of the book. These prayers mentioning the advent of the Lord seem to have no connection to the Christmas texts that appear at the beginning of the book. Because the season that these prayers celebrated was later to include Christmas on 25 December, the two became united. The scripture readings prescribed for Advent in the first lectionaries of Rome express both the notion of Christ's arrival in the flesh and his arrival at the consummation of the ages. The older observance of Roman Advent found in the *Gelasianum Vetus* comprised six weeks prior to Christmas while the later observance of Roman Advent, according to the Papal Liturgy of Gregory the Great in the *Hadrianum*, comprised four weeks (see *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 169-173, marg. nos. 1120-1156, *Orationes de aduentum Domini*, and D. LIETZMANN, *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem aachener ur-exemplar*, Münster, Aschendorff, 1967, 103-104, marg. nos. 185-186, “*Orationes de aduentu domini* Domonica Prima; Domonica Secunda, respectively). Marginal numbers in the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* do not correspond to those cited by AUGÉ. The documents are presented with history and commentary in A. CHAVASSE, *Le sacramentaire gélasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316) sacramentaire presbytéral en usage dans les titres romains au VIIIe siècle*, Tournai, Desclée and Co., 1958, 412-426.

³³¹ Matthew 21:1-9.

hopes of the ancient Chosen People, until his return in glory, when he will fulfill the hope of the Church.”³³²

When the Roman observance of the feast of the Nativity on 25 December reached the Churches of Spain and Gaul, they adopted the practice of a four-Sunday Advent, interrupting the pre-Epiphany *Quadragesima*. Consequently, the length of the pre-Epiphany fast had to be re-reckoned, the calculations of which took place in varied ways.³³³ Consequently, the pre-Epiphany *Quadragesima* observance became diluted and diminished in significance.

As Roman practices strongly influenced those of her northern neighboring Churches, so in time a converse exchange took place as well. For the following half millennium, the hybridized pre-Christmas/pre-Epiphany Gallican practice was maintained in what became the Frankish Empire, even though the Roman Mass had been adopted there. That enriched observance made its way back to Rome “to become the norm for all of Western Christendom.” It has been influenced by Gallican and, to some degree, German influence, resulting in a sort of Romano-Gallico-Teutonic hybrid.³³⁴

As the Gallicans had adopted the Roman Advent season, the Romans eventually adopted the Gallican practice of penance and fasting during Advent.³³⁵ Under this

³³² AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 203. This choice of Gospel for the First Sunday of Advent was not taken up in *MR/1570*. Luke 21: 25-33 was chosen (see *MR/1570, Editio Princeps*, 58-59). As received from *MR/1570*, not every day in Advent has a proper Mass formulary in *MR/1962*. Complete formularies are given for the Ember Days of Wednesday, Friday and Saturday of the Third Week of Advent. Two versions are presented for that Saturday: a longer form with more Scripture readings for conventual Masses and Masses in which the sacrament of Holy Orders is conferred, and a shorter version with fewer scripture readings for all other circumstances.

³³³ In some areas of Spain, the fast began on 16 November, forty days before Christmas. Some areas of Gaul retained the beginning on 11 November, the Feast of St. Martin (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 208). Within these regions, however, the period of fast began as late as 15 November or as early as some time in September (see KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413).

³³⁴ KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413.

³³⁵ See *ibid.*, and JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 209.

influence, the Roman liturgy took on the corresponding external signs of penance and fasting as well.³³⁶ By the end of the first millennium, the *Gloria* and *Te Deum* had been eliminated from the Advent Mass and Divine Office, respectively, while use of musical instruments and of floral décor became limited.³³⁷ The use of violet and sometimes black vestments, as per the practice in the Spanish/Gallican pre-Easter *Quadragesima*, was adopted. Despite these more penitential signs and practices from the north, the attitude of the Roman Advent maintained an aspect of a hopeful expectation and not entirely that of the final judgment.³³⁸ Remnants of the Gallican-style Advent survived primarily in the parousial scripture readings for the concluding Sundays after Pentecost,³³⁹ which immediately precede Advent.

These mixed influences resulted in a Roman Advent with strong Gallican elements. The focus of the Gallican practice shifted from celebration of the Epiphany of the Lord on 6 January to that of the Nativity of the Lord on 25 December. This feast of the Nativity was celebrated with neither the anxiety of the final judgment nor the triumph of Easter but uniquely *in dulci iubilo*.

This hybrid season was codified in *MR/1570*. Some Gallican elements remained in appearance as well as in the Mass formularies that immediately precede the seasons.³⁴⁰

This produces in the Roman Mass what Jungmann will term “a sort of pre-Advent.”³⁴¹

³³⁶ See KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413, and JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 209. Augé will remark, “After the Roman liturgy came into contact with that of Gaul, during the Carolingian era or even later, ascetical and penitential elements proper to the Gallican tradition were introduced into the Roman Advent. However, this did not change the structure of the Roman Advent” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 202). Observance of the Advent fast, however, did not last long in Roman practice (see JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 209).

³³⁷ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 209.

³³⁸ See KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 413.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, 414.

³⁴⁰ See *ibid.*

³⁴¹ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 210.

The Mass formula of the 18th Sunday after Pentecost expresses Advent-thoughts in its *Introit* and Epistle. For in olden times, it was the Sunday of the autumn Ember week, and occurred between the 19 and 25 September, that is, as near as possible to 24 September mentioned above. The processional chants for the final Sundays after Pentecost (beginning from the 23rd Sunday which may fall in the second half of October) are always the same; and of these the *Introit* especially makes clear reference to the end of time, to the ultimate liberation of the redeemed. And so, the note of the Second Coming of Christ is here already powerfully struck and continues to echo throughout Advent.³⁴²

The reforms of *Cum nostra hac aetate* of 23 March 1955³⁴³ elevated the rank of the Sundays of Advent to Doubles of the I Class,³⁴⁴ outranking any other Sundays in concurrence³⁴⁵ and occurrence.³⁴⁶ In the further reform declared in motu proprio *Rubricarum instructum* of 25 July 1960,³⁴⁷ followed immediately by the new code of rubrics in *Novum Rubricarum* of 26 July 1960,³⁴⁸ the Sundays of Advent were retained as privileged Sundays with the simplified rank of Sundays I Class.³⁴⁹

The Season of Advent begins with First Vespers for the First Sunday of Advent to the

³⁴² JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 210.

³⁴³ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, *Cum nostra hac aetate*, Decretum generale de rubricis ad simpliciorum formam redigendis, 23 March 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), decree, 218-219; rubrics 219-224.

³⁴⁴ *Cum nostra hac aetate*, Title II, a) 3. Incidentally, the term “Double” (or “Duplex”) comes from a time when major feasts required the celebration of two nighttime hours of the Divine Office: that of the vigil at night and that of the feast after midnight. Even after this practice ended, the term remained ascribed as a rank to those feasts traditionally celebrated with a double nighttime celebration of the Divine Office and later ascribed additionally to those feasts given the same degree of privilege as those historically older celebrations (see KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 376 and 376, footnote 7. See also L. EISENHOFER and J. LECHNER, *The Liturgy of the Roman Rite*, New York, NY, Herder and Herder, 1961, I, 589).

³⁴⁵ “Concurrence means the coinciding of vespers of the current liturgical day with I Vespers of the following liturgical day. In concurrence, vespers of the liturgical day of higher Class take priority, and the others are commemorated or not, according to the rubrics. But when liturgical days of the same Class concur at vespers, the complete II vespers of the current Office are said, and the following Office is commemorated, according to the rubrics” (*Novum rubricarum*, nos. 103-105).

³⁴⁶ “Occurrence is the coinciding of two or more Offices on the same day. Occurrence is accidental when a movable liturgical day and a fixed liturgical day coincide only at given intervals of years; but it is permanent when two liturgical days coincide each year. The effect of occurrence is that the Office of the liturgical day of lower rank gives place to the Office of higher rank. This may be done by omitting, or commemorating, or transferring, or reassigning the less important Office.... [...] A commemoration fixed for a given day is not transferred or reassigned with the transfer or reassignment of the feast, but is made on its proper day or omitted, according to the rubrics” (*Novum rubricarum*, nos. 92-94).

³⁴⁷ JOHN XXIII, 25 July 1960, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Rubricarum Instructum*, novum rubricarum breviarii et missalis Romani corpus approbator, in *AAS*, 52 (1960), 593-595, English translation in MURPHY, *The New Rubrics*, xii-xiv.

³⁴⁸ See *Novum rubricarum*, decree, xv; rubrics, 1-142.

³⁴⁹ See *ibid.*, 2-4, nos. 9-20.

observance of the Divine Office hour *None* of the Christmas Vigil, inclusive.³⁵⁰ This arrangement of the season of Advent appears in *MR/1962* and the EF.

2.3.4 – *Tempus Nativitatis* and *Tempus Epiphaniae*

The Birth of Christ and the Epiphany originate in historical complexity and mystery.³⁵¹ Nonetheless, the Church has celebrated the birth of Christ on 25 December³⁵² beginning at least within a generation or two after the Emperor Constantine's Edict of Milan in 313.³⁵³

³⁵⁰ See *Novum rubricarum*, 12, no. 71.

³⁵¹ The ancient Church made several attempts to determine the actual date of the birth of Christ; not all results concurred. "Some have argued that the celebration of Christmas may be dated to around the year 300 or even earlier and that the feast originated in North Africa, not Rome" (TALLEY, *Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 85).

³⁵² The date developed most likely from Greek/Hellenistic influence. Jungmann observes, "Among Greeks and Romans, it was customary to celebrate the birthdays both of rulers (see Matt. 14:6) and of other notable men. Such birthdays were often celebrated even after the death of the person concerned. For this purpose, they did not always select the actual calendar date of his birth, even when this was known; sometimes they chose another date that had some symbolic importance. For example, the birthday of Plato was celebrated by schools of philosophy on a feast of Apollo. The Christians, therefore, felt a desire to celebrate such a feast for their *Kyrios*. Because the actual date of his birth was not known, they chose a day that had symbolic significance. In Rome, this was the 25th of December, the day of the Winter Solstice. It is quite certain that this day was selected because of its reference to the sun, as the Christians were wont to regard Christ as the True Sun, the *Oriens ex alto* [...] the *Sol iustitiae*. His birth was a dawn, a rising of the Sun for the earthly world, just as his resurrection was a rising of the Sun for the heavenly world of the new creation he had brought into being by his death" (JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 205-206). It seems plausible that the 25 December Roman celebration of the *Dies natalis Solis Invicti* introduced by emperor Aurelius in 274 was significant in selection for the date of celebrating the birth of Christ. Aurelius was attempting to regularize religion throughout his empire; he wanted "the unconquerable Sun" to be the primary god. The opportunity to bear witness to Christ, the true "unconquerable Sun," would not have been lost on Christians, recently emerged from State-sponsored persecutions (see JUNGMAN, *The Church's Year*, 206-207). Regarding the hypothesis that the Roman Church established the celebration of the birth of Christ on 25 December in opposition to the *Natalis Solis Invicti*, see B. BOTTE, "Les origines de la noel et de l'Épiphanie: Étude historique," in *Textes et études: liturgiques sous la direction de D. B. Capelle*, Louvain, Abbaye du Mont César, 1932, 61-67. See also the later study: S. ROLL, "Botte Revisited: A Turning Point in the Research of the Origins of Christmas and Epiphany," in *Questions liturgique*, 74, no. 3-4 (1993), 153-170. The popular notion that the date was chosen strictly as the Christianization of a pagan festival overlooks the possibility that both Christian and pagan alike could have chosen the same date for the same reason: the symbolism of the sun at that time of the year. That theory also overlooks the possibility that Christians could have chosen the date for this reason in addition to the attempt to Christianize or supplant a pagan festival. There is no reason there must be a binary limitation placed retrospectively upon the practice of fourth century Roman Christians. Because Christians understand that the Lord continues to be born into the world until the consummation of the ages, the date for the observance could have been chosen for its significance without any concern that the date chosen had little chance that it was the actual day of earthly birth "but focuses far more on the fact that the eternal *Logos* of the Father has assumed our flesh" (KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 415).

³⁵³ Kunzler observes, "The earliest evidence we have that in Rome 25 December was kept as the feast of Christ's birth occurs in the so-called 'Chronograph' of 354. Among the Christian remembrance days listed in this remarkable calendar we find *VIII. Kal. Ian. natus Christus in Betleem Iudaeae* - that is, our Christmas Day on 25 December. From certain characteristics of the 'Chronograph,' it is possible to deduce that the

The Roman observance of the 25 December as the celebration of the Nativity broadened rapidly. According to one theory, this spread occurred due to the conflict with the Arian heresy, causing emphasis to be placed on the two natures of the God-Man. “A feast for the birth of Christ would give a convenient liturgical expression to the profession of faith from Nicea that condemned Arianism in 325.”³⁵⁴

Three distinct Masses developed for Christmas, apparently all of Roman origin. According to Gregory the Great (590-604) these Masses occurred *in nocte*, *in aurora*, and *in die*. It appears that the first of the three to develop was celebrated by the Pontiff *in die*

assignment of this date was derived from a yet older text of the year 336. Therefore, Christmas must have been celebrated in Rome as early as that time. The feast rapidly spread to other places. Even before the end of the fourth century it had been adopted in the East, though the East already had its own feast to celebrate this mystery - the Epiphany” (KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 416). “VIII. Kal. Ian.” is a reference to the Roman calendar indicating a date of 8 days before the Kalends (or Calends), or first day, of January. The Roman system of counting days is inclusive of the days being counted and thus subtracting eight days from 1 January brings one to 25 December. This system of reckoning days is still present in the liturgical calendar printed in *MR*/1962. An assumption is held by some that the Eastern/Byzantine Churches did not celebrate Christmas or set it at a different date from that of the West. In fact, the East had adopted the date of Christmas as 25 December in the latter part of the fourth century. The change in dates is due to the change from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar: 25 December in the old Julian calendar corresponded to 7 January in the new Gregorian calendar. Due to necessary changes in the calendars, the Julian 25 December fell on the Gregorian 6 January throughout the entirety of the nineteenth century. Thus, while it may appear to those following the Gregorian calendar that some of the East celebrates Christmas on 6 January or somehow lacks a feast of Christmas, these Churches are celebrating Christmas on 25 December, albeit reckoned according to the older Julian calendar (see KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 416).

³⁵⁴ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 196. Cf. P. SIFFRIN (ed.), *Sacramentarium Veronese* (Leonianum), Cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. LXXXXV [80], Rome, Casa Editrice Herder, 1958. Augé continues, “Later, in the middle of the fifth century, this was confirmed by the ten Christmas sermons of St. Leo the Great, the best witness for the original meaning of Christmas in the Roman liturgy as well as author of some of the Christmas texts from [the Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary]” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 196). To the early Christian mind in Rome, the time of celebration of a martyr was not focused on the day of earthly birth or death so much as it was on the act of Christians gathering to celebrate the victory in Christ, understood to be something in the present and not confined to any earthly date (see KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 415). This is reflected by the language used to describe the feast being celebrated. The earliest language used is *natale Domini*, which can be used simply to mean “anniversary” or even “birth” in a broader philosophical context. Lack of the term *nativitate*, with its closer connotation to actual birthday or earthly birth, provides insight into the mind of the early Roman Christians and their theology already so clearly exhibited. We know from the sermons of Pope Leo I (440-461) that the celebration of the feast focused on the Incarnation of Christ, a theology that recognized and included at the same time the events occurring from the Annunciation to the birth. Recognition of the slaughter of the Holy Innocents as well as celebration of the arrival and adoration of the Magi were understood as incorporated into the Epiphany (see KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 415).

on Christmas, the exclusively papal Mass for Christmas day.³⁵⁵ This particularly Roman Mass formulary used the Johannine Overture as the Gospel, mystically expressing the incarnational mystery.³⁵⁶

The second Mass to be introduced, *in nocte*, likely came as a consequence of the pilgrimages to Jerusalem, one of several historically based observances having their origins in the places where the historical events took place.³⁵⁷ This had a marked influence on the Temporal observances in Gaul and, thanks to liturgical exchange, came to influence the Roman Rite as well.³⁵⁸

The third Mass that came into custom, *in aurora*, seems to have originated in the sixth century due to circumstances arising in connection to a specific church in the city of Rome. On the Palatine Hill in the City stood the stational church of St. Anastasia, dedicated to a widely venerated Byzantine martyr whose feast was celebrated 25 December prior to the observance of the Nativity on that same date and bearing no connection to it. This church in Rome had become the court church of the Byzantine Governor during this period of Byzantine supremacy. “As a consequence, the Mass on its traditional feast-day began to be celebrated with very great splendor and, moreover, in honor of the Martyr St. Anastasia to

³⁵⁵ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 210, and KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 415.

³⁵⁶ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 210.

³⁵⁷ See *Novum rubricarum*, 191. Jungmann states, “We have some very detailed information in the account given by the pilgrim Aetheria.” (ibid.). He does not cite a source here. Aetheria describes that, in Jerusalem, celebration *in nocte* was held in Bethlehem following a procession from Jerusalem followed by a procession returning to Jerusalem from Bethlehem for a celebration *in aurora*. By the fourth or fifth century, a Mass *in nocte* was offered in Rome at Santa Maria Maggiore where there had been built a replica of the birth grotto or *praesepe* (see ibid., 210-211, and KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 415). The Gospel at the nighttime Mass was that of the historical account of the birth of Christ.

³⁵⁸ JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 191.

whom there was a special devotion in Byzantium. Thus, it came about that the Pope himself had to celebrate this Mass too....”³⁵⁹

Euchological texts for all three of these Masses made their way into the Roman books and thereby spread through the West. Consequently, it became customary for priests, not only the Pope, to celebrate all three Masses for Christmas.³⁶⁰ The three Masses are found in the *Gelasian Vetus*³⁶¹ but without stational designation.³⁶²

Christmas is followed by an octave but not of a rank so high as to preclude other celebrations during it. It would appear that Christmas was celebrated for only one day initially and that the unrelated feasts occurring within what would become the octave preexisted either the expansion of Christmas into an octave or the introduction of the 25 December celebration of Christmas.³⁶³

In the Gregorian *Hadrianum*³⁶⁴ the station for the Mass for the octave day is the church of *Sanctam Mariam ad Martyres*. The Collect for the Mass contains Marian references.³⁶⁵

³⁵⁹ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 211. Apparently, the Pope’s involvement had something to do with the fact that the church of St. Anastasia was along his way to the stational church of his daytime Mass. It is unclear exactly what took place in the church, since they were not observing Christmas therein (see KUNZLER, *The Church’s Liturgy*, 416). Mention of St. Anastasia remains in the Roman Canon.

³⁶⁰ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 211, and KUNZLER, *The Church’s Liturgy*, 416.

³⁶¹ *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 7-10, marg. nos. 5-23, “Item de uigilia domini in nocte.”

³⁶² AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 197.

³⁶³ AUGÉ states there is a unity here but neither describes nor explains it: “Between Christmas Day and the celebration of its octave, we find a series of feasts of Saints, which are connected with the celebrations of Christmas in such a way as to form a sort of unity with them. As early as the [Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary] there are, immediately after the Christmas Masses, two formulas for *In Natale Sancti Iohannis Evangelistae* (nos. 1273-1283) and an additional two *In Natale Innocentium* (nos. 1284-1293)” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 198). An example of the dates of the feasts celebrated in the Octave of the Nativity is found in the feast of St. Stephen Protomartyr. This feast was celebrated by the Armenians and the Grecophone East on 26 December already in the fourth century, approximately the same time as, or even slightly earlier than, the 25 December date for Christmas was developing in Rome (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 212).

³⁶⁴ LIETZMANN, *Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, 16, marg. no. 14, “Mense ianuario in octabas Domini ad Sanctam Mariam ad Martyres.” (Marginal numbers for the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* do not correspond with those cited by Augé.)

³⁶⁵ “Deus qui salutis aeternae beatae Mariae uirginitate fecunda humano generi praemia praestitisti: tribuae quaesumus ut ipsam pro nobis intercedere sentiamus, per quam meruimus auctorem uitae suscipere: qui tecum uiuit, etc.” (LIETZMANN, *Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, 16, marg. no. 14).

“Here we find the traces of the first Marian feast of the Roman liturgy on 1 January or the *Natale sanctae Mariae*, which later disappeared with the emergence of other Marian feasts.³⁶⁶ In any case, there was a Marian stamp on the feast of the [secular] New Year’s Day during the Middle Ages.”³⁶⁷

Because scripture records that, on the eighth day after his birth, Christ was circumcised, the octave day also assumed recognition of this historical event in the Gallico-Frankish liturgy. The name given to the feast was *Circumcisio Domini* and was later adopted by Rome.³⁶⁸ At the time of the promulgation of *MR/1570*, the feast had become universally known as *In circumcissione Domini et octava Nativitatis*. This is the feast that remains as the octave day of Christmas in *MR/1962*.

Additionally, at the time of his circumcision, the Lord was given his name. Therefore, association with the Holy Name of Jesus likewise developed on the Octave Day. The devotion was particularly fostered and successfully spread by St. Bernardine of Siena (+1444). In 1721, a specific feast celebrating the Holy Name of Jesus was instituted and, since the time of Pius X (1903-1914), is celebrated on a day between 1 and 6 January.³⁶⁹

Devotion to the Holy Family of Jesus, Mary and Joseph was widespread by the seventeenth century when it was perceived that the Christian family was particularly

³⁶⁶ See B. BOTTE, “La première fête mariale de la liturgie romaine,” in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 47 (1933), 425-430, and A. CHAVESSE, *Le Sacramentaire gelasien* (Vaticanus Reginensis 316) *Sacramentaire presbyteral en usage dans les titres romains au VIIe siècle, Bibliothèque de théologie I, Serie IV: Histoire de la théologie I*, Tournai, Desclée, 1958, 381-388, 651-656.

³⁶⁷ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 197-198. Jungmann observes similarly, “In the oldest books of the Roman liturgy there is provision only for the Octave Day of Christmas, on 1 January; and this had the title of the *Octava Domini*, and also the *Natale sanctae Mariae*” (JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 212). This celebration is undeniably a recapitulation of the mystery of the incarnation from a Marian perspective. At the same time, this makes 1 January the oldest date of Marian celebration in Rome, a probable devotion emerging from reflection upon the Incarnation (see *ibid.*).

³⁶⁸ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 212.

³⁶⁹ See *ibid.* The obligatory observance takes place on the Sunday after the Octave of the Nativity, that is, the first Sunday of the New Year. If that Sunday is 1, 6 or 7 January, it is celebrated on 2 January.

threatened. The devotion was spread regionally and was promoted by Leo XIII. The feast to celebrate the Holy Family was inserted into the GRC under Benedict XV on 26 October 1921.³⁷⁰ The celebration is assigned to the First Sunday after Epiphany. This arrangement of the feasts of the Holy Name of Jesus and of the Holy Family were assumed into the Roman Missal and remain in *MR/1962* and are observed as such in the EF.

During these feasts occurs the ancient feast of the Epiphany, laden with tremendous symbolism and custom. Celebration of the Epiphany originates in the East, the most ancient vestiges of which are found in Alexandria.³⁷¹ By the late fourth century, in various Churches both East and West, 6 January is the date upon which the feast is observed. The subjects celebrated were varied: some celebrated the birth or the baptism of Jesus, some the miracle at Cana or the adoration of the Magi and some, other mysteries.

The first record of the feast being celebrated in Rome appears in the mid-fifth century in the form of a series of sermons by Leo the Great for the Epiphany. The theme of these homilies is the adoration by the Magi. This would become the typical focus of the celebration of the feast of Epiphany in most of the Churches of the West.³⁷² As mentioned

³⁷⁰ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR RITES, Decree *Urbis et orbis*, nonnulla festa cum officiis et missis propriis ad universam ecclesiam extenduntur, 26 October 1921, in *AAS*, 13 (1921), 543-544.

³⁷¹ It was the practice of the gnostic sects of Alexandria already in the second century to mark the day as the feast of the Baptism of the Lord. Bearing in mind Gnostic doctrine, this event also celebrated Jesus' "birth" as the Son of God, so it is understandable that this was a feast of tremendous significance there. How this feast became the Epiphany in the Egyptian Church, however, is not completely clear. Of this, Augé will state, "In Egypt there was a pagan celebration of the light in honor of the birth of the sun god Aion from the virgin Kore. This happened at the time of the winter solstice, about two weeks after 25 December, on the night of 5 or 6 January. On this occasion, water was drawn from the Nile and reserved. This is probably the origin of the Eastern feast of the Epiphany, which focused, as has been said above, on the Baptism of Jesus" (AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," 199). Cf. JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 213.

³⁷² See AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," 199. Bearing in mind that in Rome, where celebrating baptisms on the feast of the Epiphany was not customary, there was no accompanying period of preparation. Without the accompanying customs, therefore, the Epiphany, as celebrated in Rome, "was a specifically liturgical institution from its beginning. The oldest documents in this regard are the liturgical texts of the [*Gelasianum Vetus*] and, later, those of the [*Gregorianum 'Hadrianum'*]" (AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," 202).

above, this feast had never developed as a baptismal feast in Rome as it had elsewhere in the West. The feast has an octave of its own, of higher rank than that of Christmas; feasts of Saints may not be celebrated within it.³⁷³

When a synopsis is made of the scripture texts proclaimed on the feast of the Epiphany,³⁷⁴ it becomes evident that the chosen pericopes have been consistent over the ages, including both current Forms of the Mass of the Latin Church. “We may conclude, therefore, that both the euchological texts and the biblical texts for the feast of the Epiphany have remained practically unchanged in the Roman liturgy.”³⁷⁵

The Christmas Season (*tempus natalicium*) begins with First Vespers for Christmas and runs through 13 January, inclusive. This season comprises Christmastide (*tempus Nativitatis*), running from First Vespers for Christmas to None of 5 January, inclusive, and Epiphanytide (*tempus Epiphaniae*), beginning with First Vespers for the Epiphany to 13 January, inclusive.³⁷⁶ With the simplified ranking system established in *Novum rubricarum*, Christmas is ranked as a I Class feast, the same as Easter, White Sunday, Pentecost and the Sacred Triduum.³⁷⁷

However, the Christmas-Epiphany season extends, in a somewhat muted way, beyond the feast of the Epiphany. The euchological texts themselves from the celebration of Epiphany through the Sundays *post Epiphaniam*, *ante Septuagesima* are Epiphany-

³⁷³ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 213.

³⁷⁴ A. NOCENT, “Il Tempo della Manifestazione,” in M. AUGÉ, et al. (eds.), *Anamnesis, VI: L’anno liturgico*, Genoa, Marietti, 1988, no. 6, 187.

³⁷⁵ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 200. These readings and euchological texts include the Gospels of the adoration of the Magi on the feast proper (Matthew 2: 1-12), the episode of the Baptism of the Lord on the eponymous feast 13 January with its corresponding Gospel pericope (John 1:29-34), followed by the Wedding at Cana on the Second Sunday after Epiphany (John 2: 1-11). These are read every year in the EF. They correspond to *MR/1570*, apart from a Vigil of the Epiphany that was suppressed by Pius XII in 1955 by means of *Cum nostra hac aetate*, title II, 8-10.

³⁷⁶ *Novum rubricarum*, 12, no. 72, a) and b).

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 15, no. 91, 1-2.

minded.³⁷⁸ These eponymous Sundays continue in such a way as to elongate Epiphany, bearing Christmas with it, of which season it is a part,³⁷⁹ until it reaches to *Septuagesima* at the edge of Lent which itself leads to Easter. Considering this, it could be said that Christmas “is not distinct from and independent of Easter but is its beginning, the dawn of salvation. In the annual celebration of the mystery of salvation, the fullness and height of which is Easter, the celebration of Christmas demonstrates the aspect of new birth of which redemption consists.”³⁸⁰

Nonetheless, the period between the end of the Octave Day of Epiphany and *Septuagesima* Sunday is a semi-unique season of the *tempus per annum ante Septuagesimam*,³⁸¹ which will be treated below. This is the arrangement existing in *MR/1962* and observed in the EF.

2.3.5 – *Tempus Septuagesimae*

The three Sundays prior to the First Sunday of Lent and their intervening weeks constitute the pre-Lenten season of *Septuagesima*.³⁸² The Sundays are named, in order, *Septuagesima*, *Sexagesima* and *Quinquagesima*, meaning literally seventy, sixty and fifty, respectively. “The first Sunday of Lent is *Quadragesima*, or forty. Ashes are distributed on

³⁷⁸ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 213.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 214.

³⁸⁰ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 197.

³⁸¹ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 213.

³⁸² For a concise treatment of the season of *Septuagesima*, its development and deletion from the *GRC*, see L. PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent: The Suppression of *Septuagesima*,” in *Usus Antiquior*, vol. 1 no. 2 (July 2010), 95-109. See also *ibid.*, 103-108, for a presentation of the poetry and genius of the Mass Collects from *MR/1962* that are assigned to the Sundays and each ferial of intervening weeks of the season of *Septuagesima*. Pristas bases the historical data largely upon the work of C. CALLEWAERT, “L’oeuvre liturgique de s. Grégoire: La Septuagésime et l’Alléluia,” in *Sacris Erudiri, Fragmenta Liturgica Collecta a Monachis Sancti Petri de Aldenbrugge in Steenbrugge ne Pereant*, The Hague, Steenbrugis, 1962, 635–653, and, following Callewaert, H. LECLERQ, “Septuagésime” in *Dictionnaire d’archéologie Chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 15.1 (1950), cols. 1262–1266.

Wednesday of *Quinquagesima* week. *Septuagesima* Sunday, then, begins a not very literal countdown to the Pasch.”³⁸³

The season of *Septuagesima* came about organically by the observances of both the faithful and the monks. When nascent, bishops received it in differing ways.³⁸⁴ “From about the middle of the fifth century a period of pre-Lenten preparation began to be observed in the West. By the year 590 or 591, all three weeks of *Septuagesima* were an established part of the Roman Church’s annual preparation for the Pasch.”³⁸⁵

Jungmann indicates that the Mass formularies for the season assume “a penitential character and, particularly in their Gospel readings, announced the advent of the fast (the Laborers in the Vineyard, the Seed on Good Ground, the Suffering of Christ).” He continues “The spirit of the season is particularly evident in the *Introits* for the Masses of these Sundays.”³⁸⁶

³⁸³ The origin of the naming these days is unclear (see PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 96, footnote 4).

³⁸⁴ See CALLEWAERT, “L’oeuvre liturgique,” 647–648, and PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 96, footnote 7. Somewhat alternatively, Jungmann attributes the development of *Septuagesima* primarily to customs arising in the East that had their influence on practices in the West. By the end of the fourth century in the East, the desire to fast for forty days prior to Easter had become a concern as it would later in the West, as described above. The lack of forty days was augmented by the fact that the East generally observed Saturday as an exceptional day to fasting together with Sunday. Leaving only five fast days per week, it took a full eight calendar weeks to achieve forty fast days. These weeks were counted back from Palm Sunday, making the Eastern observance beginning a full nine weeks prior to Easter. Similarly, *Septuagesima* begins nine weeks prior to Easter. Jungmann posits that this Western period of pre-Lent was introduced in imitation of the practice of the East (see JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 182–183). Mohlberg observes, “In the sixth and seventh centuries, [Lent] is lengthened with the introduction of *Septuagesima*, *Sexagesima* and *Quinquagesima* Sundays. The formulas present in the *Gelasianum Vetus* are more recent interpolations” (MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*, 16, marg. nos. 69–72, “*In Septuagesima*,” 16–17, marg. nos. 73–77, “*In Sexagesima*,” 18–19, marg. nos. 84–88, “*Orationes et praeces a Quinquagesima usque Quadragesima*). Augé will remark similarly, “This lengthening was probably done to stress the penitential nature of Lent and Easter during a time when repeated Gothic and Lombard invasions caused people to be predisposed to supplementary practices of prayer and penance” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 184). Cf. JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 183. It is not difficult to imagine that extending the time of prayer and supplication to God during those particularly trying times was attractive.

³⁸⁵ PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 96. This is possibly verified in the text of a homily preached by Gregory I on *Septuagesima* Sunday at the station church of Saint Laurence outside the Walls in 590 or 591 (see PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 96, footnote 5, and CALLEWAERT, “L’oeuvre liturgique,” 648 and 648, no. 46).

³⁸⁶ JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 183.

What sets this season apart is that it is truly preparatory; the penitence encouraged during this time is not obligatory but rather a voluntary act of devotion.³⁸⁷ It does not appear that fasting was ever a matter of requirement during *Septuagesima*; the Great Fast begins with Ash Wednesday.³⁸⁸ “The intuition of faith that gave rise to the season of *Septuagesima*, then, is a recognition of the goodness, or even the necessity, of preparing oneself mentally, physically and spiritually for the ascesis of Lent.”³⁸⁹ The season possesses an external penitential character similar to that of the preparatory season of Advent: the color of vesture for the Mass is violet, the Alleluia, *Gloria* and *Te Deum* are dropped from the Mass and Divine Office, respectively.³⁹⁰

According to *Novum rubricarum*, the season begins with First Vespers of *Septuagesima* Sunday and ends with Compline of the Tuesday after *Quinquagesima* Sunday,³⁹¹ that is, the eve of Ash Wednesday.³⁹² This arrangement was codified in *MR/1570*, received in *MR/1962* and remains the observance of the season of *Septuagesima* in the EF.

³⁸⁷ See CALLEWAERT, “L’oeuvre liturgique,” 647–648, and PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 96, footnote 8.

³⁸⁸ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 183.

³⁸⁹ PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 96. She continues, revealing another possible connection to the Eastern Church: “The same recognition expresses itself in the Eastern practice of observing the Sundays of Meatfare and Cheesefare on the second and first Sundays, respectively, which precede the last Sunday before Lent. From Meatfare Sunday, the faithful lay aside all flesh foods until the Pasch. From Cheesefare Sunday the faithful abstain from animal products such as eggs, milk, yogurt, butter and cheese” (ibid.). Notably, when Easter is celebrated on the same day in both the East and the West, Meatfare coincides with *Septuagesima* and Cheesefare with *Sexagesima*. Therefore, in those years, the pre-Lenten period of preparation coincides in East and West (see ibid., and 96, footnote 9).

³⁹⁰ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 183.

³⁹¹ *Novum rubricarum*, 12, no. 72.

³⁹² Therefore, the number of post-Epiphany Sundays is determined by the date of *Septuagesima* Sunday, which in turn is determined by the date of Easter. Ancient sacramentaries, for instance *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 19–20, make a distinction not found in modern Missals, namely that the Wednesday of *Quinquagesima*, Ash Wednesday, marks the beginning of the fast, and the following Sunday, the first Sunday of *Quadragesima*, marks the beginning of Lent. In *MR/1962*, Ash Wednesday is designated *Feria Quarta Cinerum*, literally, Wednesday of Ashes, and the ferial days following, Thursday after Ashes, Friday after Ashes, Saturday after Ashes, until the First Sunday in Lent, *Dominica Prima in Quadragesima*. The post-Vatican II books use the same names for the ferial days from Ash Wednesday to that Saturday. Sunday is designated *Dominica I in Quadragesima* (see PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 95–96, footnote 3). *MR/1570* continues to refer to the *Quadragesimale initium* in the *secreta* at the Offertory for that day. Therein is also

2.3.6 – *Tempus Quadragesimae* and *Tempus Passionis*

A period of preparation for the Easter observance was accepted already in the West in the fourth century.³⁹³ Jungmann observes:

The forty days of Lent were intended to serve as a preparation for Easter. This preparation should consist essentially in a more diligent cultivation of the Christian life. It was not meant to be only a time of fasting (though fasting was included). Even before the introduction of Lent it had been customary to fast before Easter: one day, two days, even a week. Especially on Holy Saturday there were many who abstained from all food.³⁹⁴

A time of forty days was favored due to the number's connection to scriptural events.³⁹⁵

The number of days was counted in reverse from Holy Thursday, bringing its start to a Sunday, what is now our First Sunday of Lent.

This reckoning, however, did not remain entirely stable. In Antioch, for instance, the end of the fast was observed as the Sunday prior to Easter. In the sixth century, this same system of reckoning was adopted in Rome causing a rearrangement of liturgical services in order for them to begin a week earlier than had been the practice. This further developed into an understanding that the celebration of Easter comprised the entire week prior to it

the first reference to the number forty, which is repeated at times in the Mass formularies of the week following (see JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 181). This phenomenon continues in the Prayer over the Offerings for the First Sunday of Lent in *MR/2008*, using *exórdium* in place of *initium*, to similar effect: *Super oblata fac nos, quaesumus, Dómine, his munéribus offeréndis conveniénter aptári, quibus ipsíus venerábilis sacraménti celebrámus exórdium.*” *MR/2008usa*, renders it: “Give us the right dispositions, O Lord, we pray, to make these offerings, for with them we celebrate the beginning of this venerable and sacred time.”

³⁹³ “Even though its origins are not clear, Lent appears as a time of preparation prior to the paschal fast of the Friday and Saturday before Easter. In a letter to Marcella from around 384, St. Jerome is the first witness in Rome to the existence of Lent (*Quadragesima*), which was characterized by fasting. The Lenten sermons of Leo the Great also have a clear ascetical and moral content, with a focus on fasting and the practice of virtue. Lent became the framework for the final preparation of catechumens, the *illuminandi*, for baptism on Easter eve. It is clear, then, that the Lenten liturgy witnessed to by the *Gelasianum Vetus* is strongly influenced by baptismal themes. This will gradually lessen as the Church lacked a real catechumenate” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183-184).

³⁹⁴ JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 182.

³⁹⁵ Not only does this parallel the length of Christ's fasting in the wilderness but as well, the forty days' time Moses spent on the mountains and the forty-day journey of Elias.

and the week after it.³⁹⁶ Therefore, the date of the start of the pre-Easter fast and the total number of days it comprised, varied.

At the same time, even though the period of forty days was accepted broadly, it was not regarded as a strict fasting period in all places. In the late fourth century, Rome observed a three-week fast. Even when the practice of fasting extended more deeply into the season, Sundays were always excepted; fasting and penance were never observed or permitted on Sundays.

When fasting eventually extended throughout Lent, Sundays excepted, there arose a problem: when the six Sundays of Lent are subtracted from the total number of days, there remain only thirty-four fast days leading to the Triduum as it was then celebrated. Considering Good Friday and Holy Saturday as fast days as well this brings the number of fast days to thirty-six.

By the seventh century, this situation was considered untenable: it was desired for forty days of fast to be exactly that and no less. The additional four days needed to bring the total number of fast days from thirty-six to forty were taken from the week prior to the Sunday on which the season customarily began. The addition of that Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday brought the days of fasting exactly to the forty sought. In this way, the start of the fast began to be observed on the Wednesday prior, known to us now as Ash Wednesday.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁶ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 181. This created a fourteen-day post-Lenten period comprising Holy Week and Easter Week. This reckoning of the celebration existed until the promulgation of *CIC/83*. In *CIC/17* c. 859, §2, the time for fulfilling the precept to receive Holy Communion at Easter is described as precisely this period, that is, from Palm Sunday to White Sunday (see *ibid.*, 181-182).

³⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 182.

The fast itself began voluntarily; penitential exercises were generally accepted and expected in preparation for any great feast, but particularly for the great feast of Easter. “It was regarded as a matter of course that a Christian should fast for various motives: to reinforce prayer, to do penance for sins, to save something for the poor, or even to prepare for a feast. Therefore, one fasted to prepare for Easter.”³⁹⁸ In the earliest times, there were no laws regarding these practices. Laws concerning fasting emerged in the fourth century in some places and became enforced in the Middle Ages.³⁹⁹ Once fasting became obligatory, “it became constantly necessary to define clearly the exact limits of the duty so that everyone might observe them; and also to take into account the excusing circumstances which have become very numerous in our own day.”⁴⁰⁰

As Lent and penitential practices continued to develop in form, a challenge regarding public worship arose. On the one hand, the Mass is connected with the mystery of the resurrection and post-resurrection apparitions of the Lord and belonged properly to Sundays. On the other hand, the Holy Eucharist is understood as the Daily Bread to which our Lord refers in the Christian prayer. Two alternative solutions to the conundrum of weekday celebrations during Lent arose: 1. the faithful could gather with Scripture readings, perhaps with distribution of previously consecrated Holy Eucharist or, 2. the Mass itself could be celebrated daily. The former was adopted in the East and the latter in Rome.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁸ JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 184.

³⁹⁹ See *ibid.*

⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰¹ See *ibid.*, 185. Celebration of the Mass in Rome during Lent did not immediately extend to all weekdays. It seems that Wednesdays and Fridays were first included, as mentioned above, due to their connection to the betrayal and crucifixion of the Lord, respectively. Pope Hilary I (461-468) added Mondays. Tuesdays and Saturdays were later added. Pope Gregory the Great (715-731) gave Thursdays a Mass, making daily Mass during *Quadragesima* in the West a reality from the early eighth century (see *ibid.*, 186, and AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 184).

From the fifth and sixth centuries onward, feasts of the Saints that occurred during Lent were either not celebrated or delayed until after Lent. When, in the seventh century, the feast of the Annunciation was inserted on 25 March, Spain refused to celebrate it because of its occurrence during Lent. The later custom of veiling of statues and images during at least part of Lent likely had some connection to this notion of focus upon the season of Lent and away from the sanctoral celebrations.⁴⁰²

In addition to the fast, another theme shaping the observance of Lent hinged upon the fact that Easter was and remains a baptismal day. Accordingly, Lent assumed the timbre of preparation for the baptism of catechumens. In fifth century Rome, the practice was for these catechumens to give their names at the beginning of Lent. From that point, they were numbered among the Elect; they received instruction and carried out community service. Though details on these matters from the era are not entirely clear, it can be stated with certainty that there were solemn public events called *traditiones* during which those texts that were the privilege of Christians, i.e., the Gospels, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, were revealed to these persons,⁴⁰³ on the Third, Fourth and Fifth Sundays of Lent.⁴⁰⁴

⁴⁰² JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 185. Therefore, the *GRC* governing *MR/1570* has comparatively fewer celebrations of Saints in this period (see *ibid.*). The earliest possible date for Ash Wednesday is 4 February and the latest possible date for Easter is 25 April. This is roughly the window during which the number of celebrations or their rank were reduced, even since ancient times. This practice was preserved in the *GRC/1568*. In the much fuller *GRC/1960* governing the EF, the 19 March Feast of St. Joseph and the 25 March Feast of the Annunciation are the only two I Class Feasts to occur during Lent. The 22 February and 24 February feasts of the Chair of St. Peter and St. Matthew, Apostle, respectively, are the only two II Class feasts that may possibly fall during Lent. The remainder of the days comprise III Class feasts, Commemorations or even days with no designated celebration.

⁴⁰³ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 187.

⁴⁰⁴ See *ibid.* In *MR/1570*, the *traditiones*, the custom of giving those sacred texts to the Elect, is not exactly preserved. Nonetheless, the baptism theme is still present in the Scripture pericopes of those three Sundays and the two weeks between them, particularly on the traditional liturgical days of Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday (see *ibid.*, 187-188). Jungsmann explains: "Baptism is there indicated in its types; we find the washing from leprosy of Naaman the Syrian, the water that gushed forth from the rock, the Samaritan Woman by Jacob's well, the teaching about the new dispensation which should supersede the old, about the heart of flesh contrasted with the heart of stone, about light contrasted with darkness (Baptism was called *illuminationi*), about the healing of the man born blind and the miracles wherein our Lord raised the dead to life" (*ibid.*, 188).

Though they held unique status in the Church, the Elect were not baptized and thus not Christians. Consequently, the degree of participation in public worship they enjoyed was limited. In the practice of Rome, the elect were present throughout the Mass, wearing their hairshirts. They were restricted from participating in the Offertory procession and, of course, could not receive the Holy Eucharist. They remained in the celebration, however, and received a blessing unique to them after the faithful had received the Holy Eucharist.⁴⁰⁵

Approximately the same era in which the date for beginning Lenten penitential practices was drawn back to Ash Wednesday, Rome began to treat the unbaptized Elect somewhat similar to baptized Penitents. At that time, the Roman ceremony adopted the practice of expelling the Elect together with the Penitents at the end of what would become known as the Mass of the Catechumens. This practice had been in place in the East from much earlier times; it was seen allegorically parallel to the act of the Father expelling Adam and Eve from the Garden. The words used for the dismissal of the Penitents and Elect are familiar to us: “Remember, man, that thou art dust and unto dust thou shalt return.”⁴⁰⁶ Nonetheless, even with the rite changed, the Elect received a blessing before they were expelled, imparted by the imposition of hands. Later, the imposition of ashes would be joined with this gesture.⁴⁰⁷

By the tenth century, the faithful were joining the catechumens and identifying themselves in spirit with the Penitents by having ashes imposed upon them as well.⁴⁰⁸ This movement by baptized and non-Penitent laity prompted more prayer, more intensity in that prayer, more attention to Holy Scripture and more engagement in penitential acts,

⁴⁰⁵ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 188-189.

⁴⁰⁶ See *ibid.*, 189.

⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰⁸ See *ibid.* Cf. M. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 184.

particularly fasting, within a season that was coalescing in a more definitive way.⁴⁰⁹ This was a recognition of one's own need for repentance through the exercises of Lent as well as a gesture of accompaniment with these catechumens and Penitents in their pilgrimage toward the celebration of the Paschal Mystery.⁴¹⁰ In addition to the fast and the preparation of the Elect, another theme shaping the Mass of Lent during the tenth century was the Lord's Passion. References to this during the first weeks of Lent were occasional; the broader consideration of the battle between God and the powers of darkness took precedence.⁴¹¹ Recollection of the events of the Passion began deep into the season, in the Passiontide period of Lent.⁴¹²

Passiontide is the period within Lent comprising *Dominica I Passionis*, the days of the week following it, *Dominica II Passionis seu in palmas*,⁴¹³ and the Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week following it. The same was true in those areas and eras wherein Lent was reckoned as ending on Palm Sunday.

On the First Sunday of the Passion, the Sunday prior to Palm Sunday, the theme changed from the broader concept of their existence to how the battle between good and evil, light and darkness was undertaken by the Lord Jesus.⁴¹⁴ Externally, the uniqueness of Passiontide became emphasized by the veiling of statues and crucifixes, "by the omission

⁴⁰⁹ See AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," 184.

⁴¹⁰ Within the same era, an intercession for Penitents was introduced into the Mass in the form of the Tract, with an accompanying genuflection, which became codified in the Masses of Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays during Lent in *MR/1570*. Cf. JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 189.

⁴¹¹ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 189-190.

⁴¹² The laws of fast and abstinence for the Latin Church are codified in *CIC/1917*, cc. 1250-1254, and in *CIC/1983*, cc. 1249-1253.

⁴¹³ In the *Gelasianum Vetus*, the Sunday prior to Easter is entitled, *Dominica in palmas de passione Domini* (see *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 53-54, marg. nos. 329-333). However, none of *Epistolari* or *Evangeluari* of Rome from the seventh and eighth centuries refer to palms. This is likely because it was not until the end of the tenth century when the rite that makes use of the palms entered Roman liturgical practice (see AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," 181).

⁴¹⁴ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 189-190.

from the prayers at the foot of the altar of Psalm 42 (which is used as an *Introit* on Passion Sunday), and of the *Gloria Patri* from other places.”⁴¹⁵ These practices were assumed into *MR/1570* and remain in the observance of the EF.

In *MR/1570*, and as received in *MR/1962*, the Lenten season (*tempus Quadragesimale*) comprises the whole of Lent (*tempus Quadragesimae*) beginning with Matins of Ash Wednesday and ending with *None* of the Saturday before the First Sunday of Passiontide, inclusive, and Passiontide (*tempus Passionis*), which begins with the First Vespers of the First Sunday of Passiontide to the Mass of the Easter Vigil, exclusive.⁴¹⁶ This is the practice that remains in the EF.

2.4 – *Hebdomada Sancta*

The historically based observances of Holy Week have their origins in Jerusalem where the events took place.⁴¹⁷ As with the celebration of Christmas in the Holy Land, Jungmann states as well, “We have some very detailed information in the account given by the pilgrim Aetheria⁴¹⁸ concerning the liturgy of Holy Week as it was carried out in Jerusalem about the year 400.”⁴¹⁹ Jungmann recalls Aetheria’s experience of the general arrangement of activities observed on Palm Sunday in Jerusalem in 400:

On the eve of Palm Sunday there was held in Bethany a commemoration of the supper in the house of Simon the Leper. Then on Palm Sunday afternoon the people assembled in the church on the Mount of Olives for longer devotions. Towards evening, at the top of the Mount, there was read the Gospel passage concerning the triumphal entry of our Lord into the Holy City. The procession then moved off towards the city, with the people singing psalms and hymns, the bishop in their midst. All, both old and young, carried palms or olive branches in their hands, and made answer to the singing with the cry, ‘Blessed is he

⁴¹⁵ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 190.

⁴¹⁶ *Novum rubricarum*, 13, no. 74, a) and b).

⁴¹⁷ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 191.

⁴¹⁸ Jungmann does not cite a source here.

⁴¹⁹ JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 191. Similar to the way in which they had shared their experiences surrounding the Nativity in the Holy Land, these pilgrims recorded their experiences of the sacred commemorations of the holy days of Easter in the Holy Land. Doing so had a marked influence on the Holy Week observances in the non-Roman West and, thanks to liturgical exchange, in Rome as well (see *ibid.*).

who comes in the name of the Lord.’ Then followed Vespers in the Church of the Resurrection.⁴²⁰

This account will seem familiar today. In similar form, these celebrations began taking place in the West from the tenth century. Typically, the celebration took place in the morning and began in a church building that was outside of town, as Bethany was outside of Jerusalem. In the north, willow-branches were used and blessed, as were palms in warmer climates.⁴²¹

The procession with palm branches on the Second Sunday in Passiontide became typical practice in Rome after the *Ordo de die palmarum*⁴²² made its appearance in the thirteenth century. This influenced the Roman liturgical books to the point that, from then on, the Roman Mass would combine its pre-existing reading of an entire passion narrative along with a commemoration of the Lord’s triumphal entrance into Jerusalem. This and other such rituals “encountered in the week prior to Easter show that what we now call Holy Week already had a distinctive personality in the sixth and seventh centuries, the nucleus of which was the passion of the Lord.”⁴²³ This dramatic ritual with palms remains an obvious addition; the Roman Mass itself, following the procession, focuses simply on the Passion of the Lord.⁴²⁴

These rites became prescribed in *MR/1570* in such a way as to continue the Roman adaptation of the Holy Land observance. The ritual of Palm Sunday begins with

⁴²⁰ JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 191.

⁴²¹ Ibid.

⁴²² Found in the *Pontificale Romano-Germanicum*, in C. VOGEL and R. ELZE (eds.), *Le Pontificale romano-germanique du Xe siècle*, Vatican City, 1963, ch. XCIX, 162-206.

⁴²³ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 181-182.

⁴²⁴ JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 192. The same is true for all of Holy Week in the West, wherein “the celebration both of Palm Sunday and of the *Triduum Sacrum* is ordered less in reference to the chronological sequence of events than to the total theological significance of the redemptive Passion. For this reason, the Passion is ever viewed in connection with the Resurrection” (ibid., 194).

recollection of the triumphal entry by means of the appropriate Gospel pericope followed by a procession with palms. The Mass formulary then continues to focus on the Passion; the entirety of St. Matthew's version is proclaimed.⁴²⁵ On the Tuesday and Wednesday after Palm Sunday, the entirety of the passion narratives of St. Mark and St. Luke are read, respectively. St. John's version is read on Good Friday.⁴²⁶

2.4.1 – *Triduum Sacrum*

In 1955, the Sacred Congregation of Rites (SCR) summarized the holiest time in the Christian calendar, stating:

At first, the supreme moments of these mysteries, those of “the crucified, buried, and risen” Christ (St. Augustine, EP. 55, 14), were recalled in a special three-day period. Soon a solemn commemoration of the institution of the most Holy Eucharist was added. Finally, on the Sunday immediately preceding the passion, a liturgical celebration of the triumphant messianic entry of Our Lord and King into the holy city was added. Thus, there arose a special liturgical week which, by reason of the greatness of the mysteries celebrated, was designated as “Holy” and was enriched with exceptionally complete and sacred ceremonies.⁴²⁷

The three last days of Holy Week are named the *Triduum Sacrum*.⁴²⁸ In practice, two consecutive triduum celebrations are observed. First, the *Triduum Sacrum* of Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday, followed by a *Triduum resurrectionis* of Easter Sunday, Monday and Tuesday,⁴²⁹ all sharing the rank Double I Class. In the edition of

⁴²⁵ JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 192.

⁴²⁶ In some places, a composite text created from all four Passion narratives was used (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 193). In the mid-fifth century, Leo the Great refers to reading the Passion Narratives from the Gospels on the Sunday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday of Holy Week (see *ibid.*, 190).

⁴²⁷ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, General decree *Maxima redemptionis nostrae mysteria* on the restoration of the order of the Holy Week liturgies, 16 November 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), 838-847, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 4, 49-61, here, 838, §1.

⁴²⁸ *Novum rubricarum*, 13, no. 75.

⁴²⁹ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 180, footnote 2. To this point, Augé observes, “In the course of the second part of the seventh century and the first half of the eighth, a fusion of the Roman liturgy with the customs of Frankish Gaul took place. Then, with the definitive influence of the PRG [*Pontificale Romano-Germanico Romanum*] in the tenth century, the now transformed Roman liturgical books returned to Rome, where they became the standards. The Roman Curia codified these books in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in such fashion that they eventually became the books of the Tridentine reform of the sixteenth century. During the course of this lengthy period, the celebration of the Easter cycle underwent new and definitive developments. Among the principal ones are Holy Thursday (originally the last day of Lent) becoming part of the sacred Triduum and the Easter Vigil being anticipated on Holy Saturday. In this way,

Urban VIII, *MR/1570* ranks the days of the Easter Octave higher on Monday and Tuesday than the days that follow them,⁴³⁰ thus emphasizing the prominence of the Easter Triduum of Sunday, Monday and Tuesday.

2.4.2 – *Missa Chrismatis and Missa Solemni Vespertina in Cena Domini*

The celebrations of Holy Thursday and Good Friday in the West are likewise influenced by the historical events in Jerusalem. The overriding concern, however, is the theological and eschatological meaning and consequences of the events. As such there are moments that connect the participants, celebrating outside of the Holy Land, with Jerusalem, retaining the primary objective of connecting all participants to the Paschal Mystery. We have seen an example of this above.

The first Mass of Holy Thursday to develop is the evening Mass of the Lord's Supper. The general arrangement of activities observed on Holy Thursday in Jerusalem in 400 is recalled by Aetheria via Jungmann:

The Mass on Maundy Thursday was at seven o'clock in the evening. All received Holy Communion at this Mass. Then they all went home to strengthen themselves with a meal, after which they assembled again on the Mount of Olives, to commemorate the Agony of our Lord with hymns and readings and prayers (a primitive form of our "Holy Hour"). After midnight they went to the place where our Lord was taken prisoner, and the Gospel account of that event was read to them, whereupon the whole crowd broke out into loud sobbing and cries of lamentation. (It was thus a kind of "ritual" crying.)⁴³¹

À propos to the mindset of the Latin Church as it adapted the celebration, the Holy Thursday Mass of Rome centered on the *Cena Domini* and the institution of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist therein while including some degree of historical commemoration.

the sacred Triduum no longer referred to the passion, death and resurrection of Christ but became the Triduum of the passion and death. The detachment of the passion and death of Christ from his resurrection is evident, in that there developed, after the 'Triduum of the death' a second 'Triduum of the resurrection' on the Sunday, Monday and Tuesday of Easter" (AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," 177-178).

⁴³⁰ See AUGÉ, "Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," 183.

⁴³¹ JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 193.

The *mandatum* of the feet takes place quite some time after the Mass. Additionally, Holy Thursday was a day of preparation for the forthcoming celebration of Easter.

The Mass of Chrism celebrated on Holy Thursday morning by the bishop arose as a logical solution to two logistical challenges. One regards the Penitents and the other, the Catechumens.

Penitents were required to participate in the ceremonies of Easter; therefore, they had to have been reconciled prior to receiving the Holy Eucharist. Considering there was no Mass celebrated on Good Friday or Holy Saturday, Holy Thursday was the last day Mass was offered until then. Holy Thursday morning had no assigned ritual celebrations and was, therefore, an ideal time for this preparatory reconciliation.⁴³²

Catechumens were to be baptized at the Holy Saturday nighttime Easter Vigil and then immediately confirmed. Both acts require holy oils. The blessing of oils did not fit into the evening celebration of the *Cena Domini*. Again, Holy Thursday morning was an ideal time for anticipating the needs of the Catechumens by blessing and consecrating the Holy Oils.⁴³³

The sixth century Gelasian Sacramentary includes three different euchological texts for Holy Thursday: one each for the commemoration of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, the reconciliation of the Penitents and finally the blessing and consecration of the Holy Oils. It appears that the three coalesced into a single Mass formulary soon thereafter and used on Holy Thursday morning.⁴³⁴ We readily recognize these themes at work in Holy Thursday in both Forms today.

⁴³² See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 196.

⁴³³ See *ibid.*

⁴³⁴ See *ibid.*

2.4.3 – *Feria Sexta in Passione et Morte Domini and Sabbato*

Good Friday observance in the Holy Land in the year 400 is recalled, again by Aetheria via Jungmann:

It was not until the morning [following the lamentations of Holy Thursday] that they returned to the city, to Calvary, where the Passion of our Lord, from the agony to the trial before Pilate, was read to them. Here also, before mid-day, the relic of the True Cross was exhibited for veneration on a table covered with a linen cloth; behind it sat the bishop, surrounded by his deacons. Each and every one of the faithful could then approach the table and kiss the wood of the Cross. From noon until about three o'clock in the afternoon all the people assembled again on Calvary, to honor the Lord during the three hours of his sufferings by listening to readings from both Old and New Testaments, and by singing hymns and saying prayers. [...] With this the liturgy itself was ended. But those who felt they had the strength to do so would come back during the following night to the Church of the Resurrection. There they passed the entire night singing psalms and praying without intermission.⁴³⁵

Elements of these ceremonies from the fourth century found their way into the corresponding liturgies as they developed in the West. The prayers, reading of the Sacred Scriptures recounting the historical events and related parts, exhibition of a relic of the cross and subsequent veneration thereof and the very timing of the ceremony are all elements with which the contemporary faithful are familiar.

The Good Friday liturgies of the West did not incorporate historical matters in the earlier days. Rather, they comprised simple rituals of prayers and scripture readings. These liturgies were marked by austerity and “the desire to symbolize the ever-growing darkness in honor of the Savior who entered into the darkness of his tomb.... [...] It was an ancient custom also to leave the altar bare, covering it with a cloth only as each function began, and removing the cloth immediately afterwards.”⁴³⁶

The ceremony of veneration of the Holy Cross was added to the simple Roman Good Friday rituals when the Byzantines particularly influenced Rome. “The Cross was unveiled by the priest, held aloft and finally offered to the people for veneration. [...] The fact that

⁴³⁵ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 193.

⁴³⁶ See *ibid.*, 195.

Rome took it over from the East is discernible also from the accompanying chant: the *Hagios o Theos, Lumen Christi*.... [...] Also, the Reproaches, which she hears as from the mouth of her Savior, come from the Greek, perhaps ultimately from the Syrian liturgy.”⁴³⁷

In Rome, by the seventh century, the custom of the faithful receiving the pre-consecrated Holy Eucharist at the Good Friday service was similarly established as a result of Byzantine influence. It was introduced simply by the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer by all present.⁴³⁸

2.5 – *Tempus Paschatis*

Due to persecutions and other troubles experienced by the early Roman Christians, little information pertaining to the Roman celebration of the feast of Easter remains from the first four centuries after Christ. What is extant from the second and third centuries reveals that Easter included a rigorous fast, the length of which varied by a day or more in the different Churches.⁴³⁹ This was followed by a nocturnal gathering of the faithful in which prayers were offered and scriptures read, ending with the offering of the Mass of the

⁴³⁷ JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 198.

⁴³⁸ See *ibid.* This is the most recent development in the Good Friday service. Prior to its introduction, the prevailing mentality was to abstain from the Holy Eucharist from after Holy Thursday evening Mass of the Lord’s Supper until the following Saturday night in order to receive it with greater enthusiasm at the Easter Vigil. It was a later change that brought about the practice of receiving the Holy Eucharist every day in Lent. In the non-Roman West, the faithful joined the penitents in reconciling on Holy Thursday. Thus, they were in the best spiritual condition to receive Holy Communion on Good Friday (see *ibid.*, 198-199). This custom in the West generally ended with the promulgation of *MR/1570*. The post-Tridentine ritual provides only for the priest celebrant to receive the Holy Eucharist, which had been consecrated the day prior. On Holy Thursday, a particle of what had been consecrated at that Mass was placed into a chalice containing unconsecrated wine. This was followed by a sober ritual of wrapping and binding the chalice and setting it aside in reservation. These were then consumed by the priest during the Good Friday ritual. With the reordering of Holy Week in 1955 by means of *Maxima redemptionis*, the practice of the faithful receiving the Holy Eucharist was re-introduced to Good Friday and the highly symbolic ritual performed by the celebrant was abandoned.

⁴³⁹ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” footnote 33. On the question of this paschal fast, see P. JOUNEL, “Le jeûne pascal,” in *Le Maison-Dieu*, 45 (1956), 87-92, and M. AUGÉ, “La revalorización del *ieiunium paschale*,” in *Ecclesia Orans*, 9 (1992), 277-286.

Faithful, roughly equivalent to the Liturgy of the Holy Eucharist in the OF. In the second century, the celebration of Easter had expanded into a season of fifty days.

Sources from the fifth to the seventh centuries are rich in Easter content. Of exceptional value are the sermons of Leo the Great (440-461), the emergence of the first sacramentaries with their accompanying *Ordines* and the various books containing the scripture readings. “From them we learn that by means of a process that we might refer to as increasing ‘historicization,’ one’s attention is focused on the individual events of the redemption, while at the same time the global vision of the whole mystery seems to become obscured. This process, which began in the course of the fourth century, takes definite shape between the fifth and seventh centuries.”⁴⁴⁰

Easter’s placement in the Church’s calendar, that is, the reckoning of the time of its celebration, is an interesting examination. Some authors assume that Easter was celebrated annually in Apostolic times.⁴⁴¹ However, Augé states that “there are no direct witnesses in favor of such a celebration.”⁴⁴²

Jungmann observes that the Paschal celebration originates in the Jewish, and therefore Old Testament, celebration of the Pasch or Passover commemoration. Christians simply

⁴⁴⁰ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 177.

⁴⁴¹ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 146, footnote 29. See also H. AUF DER MAUR, *Feiertage im Rhythmus der Zeit I: Herrerlfeste in Wuche umi jahr, Gottesdienst der Kirche: Handbuch der Liturgiewissenschaft*, Teil 5, Regensburg, 1983, 65-66, and TALLEY, *Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 4.

⁴⁴² AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 146. Augé continues, explaining: “Christians celebrated a Passover ‘in spirit and in truth’ in the hearts of the disciples of Jesus, before there was even a rite or a festival as such” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 146 and 146, footnote 31). See also R. CANTALAMESSA, *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza: Le tradizioni pasquali della Bibbia e della primitiva Chiesa*, Turin, 1971, 109-115, and S. MARSILI, *I segni del mistero di Cristo: Teologia liturgica dei sacramenti*, Rome, Edizioni Liturgiche, 1987, 382-383.

continued to celebrate the feast but within the context of the saving events of the passion, death and resurrection of the true Lamb of God.⁴⁴³

As for the time of day of the celebration, Jungmann observes:

Originally it was celebrated during the night between Saturday and Sunday, and the next seven weeks were regarded as a festal season. From the fourth century, the one feast-day became expanded into a triduum, beginning with Friday, so that now the Death, the Rest in the Tomb, and the Resurrection of Christ were successively brought to mind.⁴⁴⁴

The early Church Fathers had a profound influence on what would become the practical focus of the celebration of Easter.⁴⁴⁵ After exchanges of thought and some debate between

⁴⁴³ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 180. The first extant explicit documentation on the matter portrays its roots in present-day Turkey in the second half of the second century. The local Churches celebrated the feast on 14 Nisan, the day of the full moon in a spring month of the Hebrew lunar calendar, (see Sirach/Ecclesiasticus 43: 6-8) the day the Jewish people were to sacrifice lambs for Passover or Pesach. The faithful of these Churches, called *Quartodecimans*, or “Fourteeners,” believed the sacrifice of Christ was a direct substitution for the sacrifice of the Pesach. For them, as with the Hebrews, the day of the week upon which this date fell was unimportant and was celebrated on the date itself. Those who adhered to this custom fasted that day and broke the fast with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist at the end of a vigil that took place in the night between 14 and 15 Nisan. Other Churches observed the feast on the Sunday following 14 Nisan, following the pattern as practiced in Rome (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 146). Augé relates further on the matter: “Around the year 190 the climax of this controversy was reached, and Pope Victor threatened to excommunicate the Christian communities that accepted the *Quartodeciman* formula. Eusebius tells us that Irenaeus of Lyons tried to bring peace between the two sides. The bishop of Lyons recalled for the Pope that forty years earlier St. Polycarp of Smyrna was in Rome in order to deal with the same question with Pope Anicetus. At that time, the two arrived at an agreement that respected the respective traditions. The vast majority of contemporary scholars assign priority to the *Quartodeciman* Easter formula” (ibid., 147). It should be recalled that the controversy did not involve a point of dogma, “but rather whether Easter should be celebrated on the day of Christ’s death or on the day of his resurrection. The former would stress the continuity between the Christian Easter and the Jewish Passover, while the latter would stress its novelty. Tradition has connected the *Quartodeciman* Easter tradition rightly to John. The tradition from Peter and Paul that connects Easter with Sunday is considered doubtful” (ibid.). The celebration of the Resurrection became fixed when Pope Victor (189-199) declared that it would be celebrated on the Sunday following the spring full moon. The climax celebration of the Triduum and the day of the Resurrection itself are bumped to the Sunday following the date as reckoned in any given year. There ends up being a sort of dual-layered historicism: the calculation and determination of the historical dates upon which the events took place and then the transference of its celebrations to the historical days upon which the events took place, i.e., Thursday through Sunday. If the annual celebration of Easter is celebrated on Sunday, then necessarily the Ascension of the Lord takes place on a Thursday forty days after Easter and likewise necessarily Pentecost takes place on a Sunday, fifty days after Easter, as recorded in Holy Scripture.

⁴⁴⁴ JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 180.

⁴⁴⁵ In the early third century, both Clement of Alexandria and Origen maintained that Easter commemorated the suffering of Christ while at the same time acknowledged that the term *Pascha* is rooted in the Hebrew *Phas*, which means passage or transmission. From this, Clement concludes that Easter is “the passage from all trouble and from all objects of sense” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 151, footnote 42). See also R. CANTALAMESSA (ed.), *Easter in the Early Church: An Anthology of Jewish and Early Christian Texts*, trans. J.M. QUIGLEY and J.T. LIENHARD, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1993, no. 33. Origen, in his typical way, attached both spiritual and universal features to Easter. He states

them, it was Ambrose (c. 340-397) who saw the most perfect Easter sacraments as Baptism and Holy Eucharist, describing them in such a way as to make these two sacraments inseparable. These are, he states, “a passing from sin to life, from guilt to grace, from defilement to sanctification.”⁴⁴⁶ This development changed the typological moment of Easter from the sacrifice of the lamb as described in Exodus 12 to the passage into freedom through the Red Sea as described in the next two chapters of Exodus 13-14. This resulted in the sacrament of Baptism coming into focus as the sacrament proper to the annual celebration of Easter.⁴⁴⁷

2.5.1 – *Sabbato Sancto, de Vigiliae Paschalis*

In early times, the daytime of Holy Saturday was one of somber silence with no proper liturgy until the evening celebration of the Easter Vigil, what Augustine would call, the “Mother of all Vigils.”⁴⁴⁸ The rigorous fast continued.

that the entire Church and with her, all believers, continually celebrate the sacraments of baptism and the Holy Eucharist because the Lord “is always passing over in thought and in every word and every deed from the affairs of this life to God and hastening toward his city” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 151, footnote 43, and CANTALAMESSA, *Easter in the Early Church*, nos. 43 and 39). Source of the Origen quotation is not cited. Jerome and others also identified Easter as a *transitus* but underscored that this passage celebrated is the Lord’s passage. This notion connects allegorically to the Exodus event (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 151, footnote 44, and CANTALAMESSA, *Easter in the Early Church*, no. 114). Augustine accepts this approach held by Jerome and thus fuses Easter as a commemoration of both the passion and of passage: “For by suffering the Lord made the passage from death to life and opened a way for us who believe in his resurrection by which we too might pass from death to life” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 151, footnote 46, and CANTALAMESSA, *Easter in the Early Church*, no. 130). Source of the Augustine quotation not cited. For him, the Church’s celebration of Easter is realized in essence in the daily celebration of the Mass, without, however, diminishing the importance of the annual observance of Easter.

⁴⁴⁶ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 151, footnote 47, and CANTALAMESSA, *Easter in the Early Church*, no. 109.

⁴⁴⁷ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 151-152.

⁴⁴⁸ JUNGSMANN, *Public Ministry*, 199. The celebration took place at night based upon the scriptural description that the tomb was found to be empty in the early morning of Sunday (see Matthew 25:6). There was also reminiscence of the Old Testament mysteries that were traditionally held to have taken place during the night, such as the liberation from Egypt and the passage through the Red Sea. Likewise, there was an emphasis placed upon the Parousia with the expectation that it would take place during night, perhaps even Easter night (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Ministry*, 199).

The Easter Vigil came to be the culmination of the sacred days and week preceding it, the celebration of the *totum paschale sacramentum*. The Ambrosian understanding of Easter as a baptismal feast was adopted by the highest authorities in the Roman Church. Pope Siricius (384-399), a contemporary of Ambrose, states in 385 that the Easter Vigil is the night for baptism.⁴⁴⁹ Leo the Great refers to the candidates having been prepared for baptism during Lent.⁴⁵⁰

The *Didascalia*, dated to the first half of the third century, describes the Easter Vigil with some detail.⁴⁵¹ A total fast was mandated for the Friday and throughout the Saturday preceding the Vigil. The text states, in part: “You shall come together and watch and keep vigil all the night with prayers and intercessions, and with reading of the prophets, and with

⁴⁴⁹ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 180, footnote 6, and SIRICIUS, *Epistle 1*, 2, in J.P. MIGNE (ed.), *Patrologia cursus completus: Series Latina*, 217 vols., Paris, Garnier and J.P. Migne, 1844-1864, vol. 13, 1134-1135. Siricius speaks not only of Easter but as well of Pentecost as traditional days for baptism, which will develop into some parallel observances on the Vigil of Pentecost, as we shall see below. See also LEO THE GREAT, “Epistle 16, 6,” in *PL*, vol. 54, Paris, 701; “Epistle 168,” in *op. cit.*, 1210. Additionally, “during the first part of the third century, Tertullian, in a text (which is not clear) from his work *De baptismo* and Hippolytus, in the commentary *In Daniele*, present Easter as a day that is appropriate for baptism. Witnesses to this practice became more numerous after the beginning of the fourth century” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 149). See also TERTULLIAN, “De baptismo adversus Quintillan” in J.P. MIGNE (ed.), *Quinti septima florentis Tertulliani, opera omnia*, tomus prior, Paris, J.P. Migne, 1866, XIX, 1331, col. 1, and HIPPOLYTUS, *Commentaire sur Daniel*, trans. M. LEFÈVRE, Paris, Éditions du cerf, 1947, 1:16, 101-103.

⁴⁵⁰ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 180, footnote 7, and LEO THE GREAT, “Tractatus 40, De ieiunio Quadragesimae 2,” in *Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina*, 226 vols., Turnhout, vol. 138, 225.

⁴⁵¹ “Therefore, you shall fast in the days of the Pascha from the tenth, which is the second day of the week; and you shall sustain yourselves with bread and salt and water only, at the ninth hour, until the fifth day of the week. But on the Friday and on the Sabbath, fast wholly, and taste nothing. You shall come together and watch and keep vigil all the night with prayers and intercessions, and with reading of the Prophets, and with the Gospel and with Psalms, with fear and trembling and with earnest supplication, until the third hour in the night after the Sabbath; and then break your fasts. For this did we also fast, when our Lord suffered, for a testimony of the three days, and we were keeping vigil and praying and interceding for the destruction of the people because that they erred and confessed not our Savior. So do you also pray that the Lord may not remember their guilt against them unto the end of guile which they used against the Lord but may grant them a place of repentance and conversion, and forgiveness of their wickedness” (*Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments, with Introduction and Notes by R. Hugh Connolly*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1929, XXI, 189, verses 18 – 19).

the gospel and with psalms, with fear and trembling and with earnest supplication, until the third hour of the night....”⁴⁵²

The vigil ceremonies included lengthy rituals of prayers and readings, concluded with the Mass. During the pre-Mass rituals, baptisms were celebrated for those Elect who had been undergoing the lengthy and arduous period of preparation, heightened during the pre-Easter season.⁴⁵³ Because baptism was such a focus of the pre-Mass vigil, it influenced the other rituals as well. Fire was kindled and blessed by a deacon as a symbol of the enlightenment the Elect would soon receive. The deacon then sang a hymn, such as the *Exsultet*.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁵² See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 149, footnote 37, and CANTALAMESSA, *Easter in the Early Church*, no. 86. Augustine regarded the Easter Vigil as a type of what should be the Christian soul’s ever-expectation of the return of the Lord in triumph. He assimilates remembrance and presence together with the waiting that characterize the Easter Vigil, stating, “And so, in this vigil of ours, we do not await the Lord as if he were still about to rise; rather, our yearly feast renews the memory of his resurrection. Still, when we celebrate this feast, we recall past events in such a way that, by this same vigil, we create a sign of something we do by living in faith. For this whole time, in which this world flies past as if in one night, the Church keeps vigil, gazing with the eyes of faith upon the holy Scriptures as if they were lamps in the night, until the Lord comes” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 152-153, and 153, footnote 51). Cf. CANTALAMESSA, *Easter in the Early Church*, no. 129. Source of the Augustine quotation is not cited.

⁴⁵³ It appears that in Rome, the faithful did not necessarily stay for the entire vigil. They may have returned home during the lengthy baptisms for a special paschal meal, and then returned for the Mass. Only in the fourth century did there appear a law of fasting prior to the reception of the Holy Eucharist (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 200). The current discipline of the pre-Eucharistic fast is found in *CIC/83*, c. 919, which is specific discipline for the West. The origins of the canon are complex; the discipline has undergone changes several times. The Eastern code in *CCEO/90*, c. 713, §2, generalizes the need for preparation prior to receiving the Holy Eucharist. However, it leaves the specific discipline to the authority of the Church *sui iuris* to which the member of the faithful is inscribed.

⁴⁵⁴ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 199. Other interesting developments took place on the way to the vigil. For instance, at some point during the eighth century, the blessing of light, albeit without accompanying formulae, entered the papal celebration of the Easter Vigil. In the later Middle Ages, we find texts for the blessing of the new fire, a procession with the now-familiar acclamation *Lumen Christi*, as well as the blessing of the Easter candle and even a text of the *Exsultet*. What has come to be known as the rite of light, however, could be seen as a matter of necessity for the nocturnal celebrations (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 180-181). In Rome, the Passion according to St. Mark was read, later moved to Tuesday of Holy Week, and the bishop would preach. The baptism water was blessed, and the baptisms were celebrated (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 199-200). The *Pontificale Romanum* is the first written record in which we find texts for these various ritual acts. For an examination of it, see M. ANDRIEU (ed.), *Le Pontifical romain au moyen âge I: Le Pontifical Romain du XIIIe siècle, Studi e testi*, 86, Vatican City, 1939, reprint 1984, XII, XXXII, 1-10. Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 180-181.

The liturgy became somewhat distorted with comparative swiftness. Already by the fifth century, adult baptisms were much less common. With fewer or even no adult baptism, the entire event was substantially shortened. This posed a difficulty because the point of the timing of the Vigil had been for all to be involved in an event that began on Saturday night and did not end until well into Sunday. Abbreviated by lack of baptisms, the Vigil and Mass were completed prior to midnight and thus still on Holy Saturday.⁴⁵⁵ Regardless of practice, it nonetheless “remained the rule well into the tenth century or even later, that the time of the Vigil should be such that the *Gloria* of the Mass might not be intoned until at least the first stars had become visible.”⁴⁵⁶ In other words, the Vigil part of the rituals could occur before sundown, but the Ordinary of the Mass could not begin until sundown.

By the sixth century, the Easter Vigil was becoming anticipated in the evening of the Saturday; Holy Saturday had become considered equivalent to other Lenten days.⁴⁵⁷ The Holy Saturday Mass was offered following the Divine Office minor hour of *None* which was approximately 15:00. *None* was later combined with other minor hours and celebrated in the morning.⁴⁵⁸ Timing of the Holy Saturday Mass moved with the timing of *None* and thus it was completed by mid-morning on Holy Saturday. Changes in societal norms and demands of employment were important influences on this change in observance as well.

⁴⁵⁵ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 200.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid. Already by the early fifth century, St. Jerome (+420) stated that it was sufficient for the faithful simply not to be dismissed prior to midnight.

⁴⁵⁷ See *ibid.*, 200-201. John the Deacon observed at the beginning of the sixth century that the Eucharistic part of the Mass that begins at the end of the vigil ceremonies had become part of the Saturday celebrations and were no longer being celebrated on Sunday (see JOHN THE DEACON, “Epistula ad Senarium, 12,” in *PL*, vol. 59, 405). Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 181.

⁴⁵⁸ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 200.

This schedule became canonized with the promulgation of *MR/1570*. With its prohibition of Masses after noontime, the Easter Vigil became a forenoon celebration. This continued until the mid-twentieth century.⁴⁵⁹

2.5.2 – *Dominica Resurrectionis and Octava Paschae*

The celebration of Eastertide as one unit of fifty days predates the development of Holy Week and the Triduum. “In the most ancient sources of the Roman Liturgy there is already present the outline of an organization of the Sundays of the Easter season into a season of Pentecost, that is, a liturgical period of fifty days.”⁴⁶⁰ In fact, evidence reveals that, already in the second century, the seven weeks following Easter were observed as a single period of the Easter feast. The term “Pentecost” referred to the entire fifty-day period, with an emphasis on the fiftieth day because it formed the conclusion to the entire period.⁴⁶¹ Jungmann states: “During this time no one was to fast; nor should one pray kneeling, but only standing, because we are all risen with Christ.”⁴⁶² White vestments were used as a symbol of this special time of festivity.

⁴⁵⁹ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 180.

⁴⁶⁰ “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 182.

⁴⁶¹ For example, Tertullian refers to it as a “feast day” that deserves the same “solemnity and joy” that characterizes Easter day see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries,” 147-148 and 148, footnote 34, and CANTALAMESSA, *Easter in the Early Church*, no. 92-93). Augé states additionally: “Pentecost, which had originally referred to the entire period of the fifty days after Easter, is no longer seen as one whole period of celebration; rather, Pentecost comes to refer to a single celebration, the fiftieth day after Easter. Finally, the preparation for Easter came to be organized and gave rise to Lent” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 177).

⁴⁶² See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 202. This practice continues today under some circumstances. For instance, during the ordination of priests, the 1985 *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* indicates at no. 580 that the deacon calls *Flectamus genua* prior to the chanting of the litany after which all but the ordinandi, who prostrate themselves, kneel. Then it is stipulated, “Tempore tamen paschali et dominicis, omittitur admonitio *Flectamus genua*; electus quidem procumbit, ceteri vero stantes remanent” (*Caeremoniale Episcoporum, ex decreto sacrosancti Oecumenici concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Ioannis Pauli pp. II promulgatum, editio typica*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1984).

Beginning in the fourth century, celebration of Pentecost Sunday took form as the last Sunday of the seven-week festivities.⁴⁶³ Rather soon, however, other aspects of the Paschal Mystery began to be accentuated during Eastertide, among them, the Ascension of the Lord and Pentecost. These celebrations developed not as a matter of historical recounting but to recapitulate the Paschal Mystery from a distinct perspective.⁴⁶⁴ By the late fourth and early fifth century, it is evident that the term “Pentecost” itself no longer referred to the fifty days of Eastertide, but to the particular feast of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁶⁵

The octaves of Easter and Pentecost appear to arise between the sixth and eighth centuries wherein formularies for the Mass of the Octave of Easter begin to appear. For example, the *Gelasianum Vetus* contains formularies for each day of Easter Week⁴⁶⁶ and the Sunday following, wherein the term “octave” is used.⁴⁶⁷ In the same source, the Sundays after the octave are numbered consecutively as a clear extension of Easter. It is also therein that we find Mass formularies for a Pentecost Vigil,⁴⁶⁸ vesper prayers for within the octave of Pentecost⁴⁶⁹ and for the Sunday of the Octave of Pentecost.⁴⁷⁰ This

⁴⁶³ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 202-203. As mentioned, the Minor Litanies occur on the three days preceding the Ascension.

⁴⁶⁴ See *ibid.*, 202. For an excellent treatment of recapitulation of themes in the calendar of the Latin Church, see M. FOLEY, “The Reform of the Calendar and the Reduction of Liturgical Recapitulation,” in A. REID (ed.), *Liturgy in the Twenty-first Century: Contemporary Issues and Perspectives*, London/New York, NY, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, 321-341.

⁴⁶⁵ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 182 and 182, footnote 11. See SIRICIUS, “Epist. 1, 2,” in *PL*, 13:1134-1135, and AMBROSIASER, “Quaestiones veteris et novi Testamenti,” in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 50, 167-168, available at https://archive.org/stream/corpus_scriptorum16wiengoog#page/n227/mode/2up (11 January 2022).

⁴⁶⁶ *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 77-80, marg. nos. 468-498. Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183.

⁴⁶⁷ *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 81, marg. nos. 499-503, “Octabas Paschae die domi[ni]jico.” Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183.

⁴⁶⁸ *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 98-100, marg. nos. 624-636. Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183.

⁴⁶⁹ *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 101, marg. nos. 646-651, “Item Orationes ad uesperos infra octabas Pentecosten.” Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183.

⁴⁷⁰ *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, 104-105, marg. nos. 676-682, “Orationes et praecis in dominica octauorum Pentecosten.” Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183.

lends a unique nature to Pentecost as its own celebration and not simply the culmination of “the week of weeks.” Pentecost takes on a similar value as that of Easter in its development into another day for conferring the Sacraments of Initiation.⁴⁷¹

A Mass formulary for Easter Sunday proper took some time to appear.⁴⁷² It was held without question that the faithful would have celebrated the nocturnal vigil. Because the Vigil began on Saturday and ended on Sunday there was no need for those who participated to celebrate again later on Sunday. Once the Vigil was moved to Holy Saturday morning, however, the connection to Sunday was lost.

With this in mind, a proper Mass formulary for Easter Sunday became warranted. The euchological and scriptural texts of this Mass accentuate the phenomenon of the resurrection and no longer the entire Paschal event. As it was codified in *MR/1570* and received in *MR/1962*, we can see this still reflected. The Mass formulary for Easter Sunday, *In Dominica sancta, ad missam*, bears little if any connection to the Easter Vigil.⁴⁷³ Additionally, with the new timing of the Easter Vigil came a new reckoning: The Octave Day of Easter became the following Saturday. The celebration of Easter thus developed into the Easter Triduum of the Sunday, Monday and Tuesday of Easter Week.⁴⁷⁴

2.5.3 – *Dominica in Albis in Octava Paschae*

The importance the Easter celebration was emphasized by the lengthy and complex season which followed it. It began with an octave of festival days for the Neophytes.

Jungmann states:

Each day had a Mass-formula of its own, and to each a station was assigned. The newly baptized took part in the stational service each day and received Holy Communion. In the

⁴⁷¹ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183. See Siricius above, who had spoken of Pentecost as a baptismal feast, not unlike Easter.

⁴⁷² Ibid., 181.

⁴⁷³ Augé observes this as well in AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 183.

⁴⁷⁴ See *ibid.*

afternoon they assembled again for a visit to the baptistery. This holiday week is brought to a conclusion by Low Sunday, of which the official name is *Dominica in albis* (“White Sunday”). It was the “Sunday of white garments” because the neophytes wore their white baptismal robes for the last time on this day. In later times, when Baptism was administered on Holy Saturday, the octave was concluded on Easter Saturday. Then the Sunday became known as the “Sunday for laying aside the white garments.”⁴⁷⁵

Due to the heightened importance of the Saturday after Easter as the Octave Day, it developed a vigil celebration to White Sunday similar to the Holy Saturday vigil of Easter Sunday. During the vigil in the evening of Saturday Octave Day, those were baptized who, for whatever reason, were unable to be baptized at the Easter Vigil.⁴⁷⁶

In addition to the development of a vigil of its own, replete with significant Easter ceremony, Pentecost was given its own octave, bringing the pascal season to a close with the Mass of the Saturday after Pentecost.⁴⁷⁷ The Ember Days, with their requisite fast and long preexisting the development of the Pentecost Octave, fall within the octave of Pentecost.⁴⁷⁸

The Sunday after White Sunday, became known also as “Good Shepherd Sunday.” The image of Christ the Good shepherd was particularly important to the early Christians as evinced by the images drawn in the catacombs by the hopeful persecuted Christians. The mystery of the one who gave his life for his sheep was particularly celebrated during this season celebrating exactly that mystery.⁴⁷⁹

A Sunday designated specifically for celebrating the mystery of the Holy Trinity developed over time, particularly in Gaul, and is first found definitively at Liege in 920. After much opposition and argumentation that such a celebration is but a redundancy, John

⁴⁷⁵ JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 201.

⁴⁷⁶ See *ibid.*, 203.

⁴⁷⁷ As it remains in the Extraordinary Form.

⁴⁷⁸ See JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 202. This may in some ways be incongruent with the theme of the octave. Nonetheless, the Ember Days predate the octave of Pentecost in the calendar.

⁴⁷⁹ See *ibid.*, 202.

XXII (1316-1334) adopted it in 1334 as a feast Double of the II Class and extended it to the entire Latin Church.⁴⁸⁰ Pius X in 1911 raised it to a feast Double of the I Class.⁴⁸¹

On Holy Thursday, focus upon the betrayal and suffering of the Lord overshadows the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. Thus, a time to celebrate this mystery developed into a special celebration on the first Thursday after the conclusion of the Easter Season.⁴⁸² Jungmann observes that the solemnity which came to be known as *Corpus Christi* “is the result of the eucharistic movement which arose about the beginning of the thirteenth century.”⁴⁸³

According to *MR/1570*, the Easter Season begins with the start of the Mass of the Easter Vigil and extends to *None* of Saturday within the octave of Pentecost, inclusive.⁴⁸⁴ There are three periods within this season: Eastertide, beginning with the Easter Vigil and ending with *None* of the Vigil of the Ascension; Ascensiontide, beginning with First Vespers for the Ascension of the Lord and extending to *None* of the Vigil of Pentecost; the Octave of Pentecost, beginning with the Mass of the Vigil of Pentecost and concluding with *None* of the Saturday following, inclusive.⁴⁸⁵ This structure is received into *MR/1962*; until the 1950’s, this structure underwent no remarkable changes.⁴⁸⁶

⁴⁸⁰ See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 202.

⁴⁸¹ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, *Urbis et orbis evulgato moto proprio Sanctissimi* assigning changes to the General Roman Calendar, 24 July 1911, in *AAS*, 3 (1911), 350-351, here, 351, IV. Therefore, in *MR/1962*, the First Sunday after Pentecost is impeded by the observance of the feast of the Holy Trinity, but the Mass formulary for the Sunday is used during that following week if there are ferias.

⁴⁸² See JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 204.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, 204.

⁴⁸⁴ See *ibid.*, 203.

⁴⁸⁵ *Novum rubricarum*, 13, no. 76, a)-c).

⁴⁸⁶ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 185, footnotes 20 and 21.

2.6 – Twentieth Century Alterations to the Sacred Liturgies of Holy Week

As demonstrated, from early in the Church's liturgical history, the sacred ceremonies of Holy Week were celebrated on the days and times historically associated with them. Thursday evening recalled the institution of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist; Friday afternoon celebrated the passion and death of the Lord; Saturday in the night hours celebrated the solemn vigil which brought the worshippers through the night into Easter morning celebration of the resurrection.⁴⁸⁷

Likewise, as demonstrated, the sacred rites had, over time, been transferred to the mornings of Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday, not without good practical cause⁴⁸⁸ but not without substantial symbolic diminution. The results of these changes are summarized by the Sacred Congregation for Rites:

This did not take place without detriment to the liturgical meaning and confusion between the Gospel narratives and the liturgical ceremonies attached to them. The solemn liturgy of the Easter Vigil in particular lost its original clarity and the meaning of its words and symbols when it was torn from its proper nocturnal setting. Moreover, Holy Saturday, with too early a recollection of the Easter gladness intruding into it, lost its original character as a day of mourning for the burial of the Lord.⁴⁸⁹

Additionally, changing times and secularization had taken their toll on the ability of the faithful to participate in these rites as they were no longer days of rest but regular workdays. Because the faithful had to be working on these days, the churches were nearly empty when the sacred Holy Week ceremonies were offered in the mornings of the Holy Days.⁴⁹⁰ During

⁴⁸⁷ See *Maxima redemptionis*, §1.

⁴⁸⁸ When the sacred ceremonies were moved to the morning, the faithful found this to be a great convenience. These days had borne an obligation for centuries and, due to the secular calendar, had been days for rest from work (see *Maxima redemptionis*, §§4, 5).

⁴⁸⁹ *Maxima redemptionis*, §3.

⁴⁹⁰ See *ibid.*, §5.

the seventeenth century, due to these social changes, the obligation to participate in the Holy Week ceremonies was lifted.⁴⁹¹

In 1946, Pius XII tasked the Sacred Congregation of Rites with investigating the possibility and plausibility of reforming the Holy Weeks rites and ceremonies.⁴⁹² It was decided that returning the Holy Week ceremonies to their more ancient timing was worth trial. This resulted in a year of experimentation in 1951. Participation was voluntarily and at the discretion of the diocesan bishop.⁴⁹³ Amid the acceptance and accolades after the first experimental year, there were also calls for adjustments, many of which were subsequently made.⁴⁹⁴

Ultimately, the experimental times and celebrations, with a number of adjustments, became normative by decree *Maxima redemptionis nostrae mysteria* of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on 16 November 1955, with accompanying instructions that act as rubrics for the celebration of the sacred events.⁴⁹⁵ The decree bound those who use the Roman Rite to follow the restored Order for Holy week in future. Other Latin rites were only bound to celebrate the reordered times for the services, and not necessarily the services

⁴⁹¹ See *Maxima redemptionis*, §4.

⁴⁹² KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 400.

⁴⁹³ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, *Decretum de solemni vigilia Paschali instauranda*, The Solemn Paschal Vigil Restored, 9 February 1951, in *AAS*, 43 (1951), 128-129. Amended to the decree is a set of rubrics for the celebration of the sacred events (see SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, *Rubricae Sabbato sancto servandae si vigilia paschalis instaurata peragitur*, 9 February 1951, in *AAS*, 43 [1951], 130-137). Feedback from the experimentation phase was so positive and enthusiastic that its use was extended for three years (see SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, *Decretum de facultativa celebratione instauratasi Vigiliae Paschalis ad triennium prorogate additis ordinationibus et rubricarum variationibus*, 11 January 1952, in *AAS*, 44 [1952], 48-49). As a consequence of heeding recommendations and criticisms received in feedback, changes in the order of the ceremonies and changes to the rubrics thereof are amended to the decree (see *Decretum de facultativa*, 50-52 and 53-63).

⁴⁹⁴ *Decretum de facultativa*, 48.

⁴⁹⁵ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, decree and instruction accompanying the Restored Order of Holy Week, 11 November 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), 838-847. SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, *Instructio de ordine hebdomadae sanctae instaurato rite peragendo*, 16 November 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), 842-847, English translation in BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES, *Papal Teachings: The Liturgy*, trans. Daughters of St. Paul, Boston, MA, St. Paul Editions, 1962, 468-470.

themselves.⁴⁹⁶ The new order came into effect on 25 March 1956, which that year was the second Sunday of Passiontide, Palm Sunday,⁴⁹⁷ by means of *Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae instauratus*.⁴⁹⁸

Furthermore, the revised Order of Holy Week prohibited Sanctoral commemorations and the *orationes imperatae*, those Collect prayers prescribed by the local ordinary, to be offered throughout the entirety of Holy Week.⁴⁹⁹ These changes to rank, timing and ceremonies did not alter the structure of the liturgical calendar.

The Restored Order of Holy Week was assumed into what became *MR/1962* and remains the standard order for the EF.

2.7 – Tempus per annum ante Septuagesimam and post Pentecosten

Two periods within the Temporal Cycle comprise groupings of Sundays that fall outside of specified seasons. As the number of Sundays and weeks without specific liturgical designation were taken over by other seasons, particularly Easter, the number of these days was reduced.

Following long-standing practice, *MR/1570* codified the *tempus per annum* in two periods. The first comprises the Sundays *post Epiphaniam* and/or *ante Septuagesimam*,

⁴⁹⁶ *Instructio de ordine hebdomadae sanctae*, no. 1.

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 2.

⁴⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 10.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 3. The revised Holy Week Services begin with the solemn blessing of and procession with palms. This is to take place in the morning, as was the prevailing practice, or after *Terce* (see *ibid.*, no. 6). The Chrism Mass on Holy Thursday is to take place after *Terce*. The so-called Mass of the Lord's Supper is to take place in the evening at a most convenient time, but not prior to 17:00 nor after 20:00 (see *Instructio de ordine hebdomadae sanctae*, no. 7). The Good Friday observance of the suffering and death of the Lord is to be celebrated in the afternoon, at approximately 15:00. For pastoral reasons, this may be moved to a later time, but not later than 18:00. There is no requirement indicating that the pastoral reasons be grave (see *ibid.*, no. 8). The Solemn Easter Vigil is to begin at approximately midnight, between Saturday and Sunday. Included is a provision that the diocesan bishop may allow anticipation of the Vigil but that it must not begin prior to dark and most definitely not prior to the evening twilight (see *ibid.*, no. 9). In Section III of the decree, one finds a derogation from canon law. *CIC/17*, c. 1252, §4, states that the Lenten fast ends after Noon on Holy Saturday. The new prescription states that the fast will, from thence, cease at Midnight on Holy Saturday (see *ibid.*, no. 10).

beginning 14 January and ending with *None* on the Saturday before *Septuagesima* Sunday. There are between four and six Sundays *post Epiphaniam*. This cycle counts Sundays by connection to the feast of Epiphany, a system originating in the eighth century. If the timing of Ash Wednesday curtails the number of Sundays after Epiphany, those remaining post-Epiphany Mass formularies are inserted later, prior to the twenty-fourth Sunday *post Pentecosten*.⁵⁰⁰ The Epiphany Mass formularies are deemed essential to the annual temporal celebration. Therefore, they are always used in their entirety, supplanting later Sundays *per annum*, if necessary, even if the time *post Epiphaniam* affords insufficient time to celebrate them all.

Chronologically, the second period *per annum* comprises the Sundays *post Pentecosten*. There are twenty-four Sundays *post Pentecosten*. With the Paschal celebration concluded, the public penance and fasting required of Penitents, interrupted by the Paschal celebration, were resumed. This period begins with First Vespers of Trinity Sunday, i.e., the First Sunday after Pentecost, and ends with *None* of the Saturday prior to the First Sunday of Advent, inclusive.⁵⁰¹

The Sundays of this time have a common structure but there is no prevailing plan to them and nothing specifically joining them. Regarding the Gospel readings assigned to these Sundays, Jungmann explains: “For the most part they are just important and pregnant excerpts from the Synoptic Gospels which do not happen to occur at any other time of the

⁵⁰⁰ See KUNZLER, *The Church's Liturgy*, 376.

⁵⁰¹ *Novum rubricarum*, 13, no. 77. That is, until the pre-Advent time as mentioned above (see JUNGSMANN, *Public Worship*, 214). “Pre-Advent” is a liturgical phenomenon and not a season.

year. There is only one principle which can be discerned as operative in certain cases, and that is a regard for the proximity of the feast of some outstanding Saint.”⁵⁰²

Unlike the cycle of Gospel readings, the cycle of Epistle readings comprises a series. It begins with parts of the Catholic Epistles, then Romans, I and II Corinthians and so on to Philippians.⁵⁰³ The Psalms in the Mass, taking their place in the three antiphons, run in series that are unrelated to each other.⁵⁰⁴ This order was codified in *MR/1570* and received into *MR/1962*, remaining the observance in the EF.

In synopsis, the Temporal Cycle codified in *GRC/1568*, received in *GRC/1960* and observed in the EF is as follows:

Advent;
 Christmas, including Christmastide and Epiphany;
 Sundays *per annum post Epiphaniam/ante Septuagesimam*;
Septuagesima;
 Lent, including Passiontide and the Sacred Triduum;
 Easter, including Eastertide, the Ascension and Pentecost;
 Pentecost and its Octave;
 Sundays *per annum post Pentecosten*.⁵⁰⁵

⁵⁰² This order is followed because at one time, the Catholic Epistles preceded those of St. Paul in the ordering of the Christian Scriptures. In earlier days, there were certain series of Sundays during this period. For instance, there was a series *post natale Apostolorum*, those being Ss. Peter and Paul, and another *post sancti Laurentii*. The euchological texts from these Sunday series were not incorporated into *MR/1570*, but the Gospels from them remain. Jungmann explains: “[... The] Fourth Sunday after Pentecost has the Gospel about St. Peter’s boat because it is taken from the Sunday which once fell near the feast of SS. Peter and Paul; the Eighth Sunday has that of the Unjust Steward derived from the Sunday which used to fall near the feast of St. Laurence, wise steward of the Church’s goods; and the Eighteenth Sunday has the Gospel about the healing of the lame man, taken from the Sunday which used to fall near the feast of SS. Cosmas and Damian” (JUNGMAN, *Public Worship*, 214-215).

⁵⁰³ See *ibid.*, 215.

⁵⁰⁴ See *ibid.* Of the *Tempus per annum*, Jungmann concludes: “From all this it is evident that to discover in one of these Sunday Mass-formulae any unity of thought, such as may be discerned in the formula for a feast day, is impossible. The various parts were not assembled according to any previously thought-out plan but have just been put together like a bouquet of variegated flowers which give joy to the heart and lift it up towards God” (*ibid.*, 215-216).

⁵⁰⁵ *Novum rubricarum*, 149, nos. 71-77.

2.8 – Development of the Sanctoral Cycle of the General Roman Calendar

The Sanctoral celebrations are for the most part those of Saints and *Beati*. Ideas, devotions and other isolated celebrations related to the mystery of redemption and ecclesiastical feasts are celebrated as well.⁵⁰⁶ Not all celebrations in the Sanctoral Cycle occur on dates fixed by the secular Western calendar; some are determined by the liturgical calendar, such as the date of Easter and the day of Christmas. For instance, the feast of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus is nineteen days after Pentecost, the date for which is dependent upon the date reckoned for the celebration of Easter in any given year. The First Sunday of Advent in any given year is determined by the day upon which 25 December falls that year.

Because the entire year is divided into seasons, it can be said that the Sanctoral Cycle is overlaid upon the Temporal Cycle; Sanctoral celebrations take place during some season, even in the divided season *per annum*. The temporal seasons affect the Sanctoral Cycle in minor and significant ways. Because the Temporal takes precedence over the Sanctoral, there are times when celebrations in the Sanctoral Cycle may be in some way impeded.

Sheppard summarizes the development of the Sanctoral Cycle:

⁵⁰⁶ The cult of the Saints is nearly as old as the Church herself, existing already in the mid-second century East and early third century West (see P. JOUNEL, “Chapter V: The Liturgical Year III; The Veneration of the Saints,” in A. BUGNINI, and C. BRAGA [eds.], *The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy*, trans. V. MALLON, New York, NY, Benziger, 1965, 240). For a comprehensive historical treatment of the matter, see H. DELEHAYE, *Les origines du culte de martyres*, 2e edition revue, Brussels, Bollandistes, 1933. Cf. BUGNINI and BRAGA, *Commentary on the Constitution*, 240, footnote 1. Devotion began centering at the burial places of the Saints and Martyrs to the point that the place of the relics and their veneration became confused with the origin of the devotion of the Saint. In the mid-fourth century, relics began to be divided and distributed among churches so that they might be more widely venerated. Elsewhere, images of the holy ones took their places in houses of worship and in homes and shrines. After violent struggle with the iconoclasts, the Council of Nice in 787 solemnly admitted the orthodoxy of the veneration of sacred images (see H. DENZIGER (ed.), *Enchiridion symbolorum: Definitionum et declarationem de rebus fidei et morum*, edition XXXIV emendata, Barcelona, Herder, 1967. Cf. JOUNEL, “Veneration of the Saints,” 240). The Council of Trent acknowledged this tradition and fostered it when, in the 25th session (1563), it vindicated the right of the Catholic Church to invoke the Saints and to venerate their relics and images (see ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF TRENT, Twenty-Fifth Session, 4 December 1563, “On the Invocation, Veneration and Relics of Saints, and on Sacred Images,” in *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 215-217).

The proper of the Saints, on the other hand, has a longer and more complicated history. Its origin is to be found in the celebrations which took place in Rome on the anniversaries of the martyrs (and afterwards of certain confessors) which found their way to Gaul, Germany and elsewhere through the diffusion of the Roman liturgical books — the various recensions of the Gelasian sacramentary and then the Gregorian as used by the pope and completed before being sent by Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne.⁵⁰⁷

Over time, local and regional Churches added Saints of their particular interest to their calendars. With the copying and sharing of liturgical books across different regions, feasts were inherited and retained by Churches having no connection with or little interest in these feasts.⁵⁰⁸

The foundation of the Franciscan Friars in the thirteenth century eventually led to a great expansion of the use of the Roman Rite. The Franciscans adopted the Roman Rite for the Mass as well as the Roman Divine Office and the Roman Calendar, due to what Francis and his men perceived as simplicity. Francis also believes his choice of liturgical system to be an opportune way to provide uniformity across the order, including their local parishes. As the Franciscan Friars rapidly expanded throughout the West, so did the Roman Rite they carried with them and all that went with it.⁵⁰⁹

As use of the Roman Rite spread, celebrations of local significance continued to be added to the calendar without extraneous celebrations being expunged. The result was that many local calendars were laden with hundreds of Saints, requiring multiple celebrations on single days in order to accommodate more Saints than days to celebrate them. There was no common sanctoral calendar in the West.

⁵⁰⁷ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 10.

⁵⁰⁸ See *ibid.*

⁵⁰⁹ See *ibid.*

2.8.1 – Post-Tridentine Reforms of the Sanctoral Cycle

The Ecumenical Council of Trent would transform the situation, and radically so. The principal concern of those reforming the calendar was to bring the Temporal Cycle of the liturgical year into greater illumination. To accomplish this, they greatly reduced the number of celebrations of Saints and *Beati*. Sheppard recognizes, “[... T]he real emergence of a basic or general calendar for all using the Roman rite did not occur until the reform of Pius V.” He then adds, “It must be said that the reform was rather timid.”⁵¹⁰

The task of reforming the Mass, Divine Office and accompanying liturgical calendar was delegated by the Council Fathers to a commission appointed by the pontiff.⁵¹¹ Their task was not the creation of a new Mass but rather to check and confirm the authenticity of practice and the orthodoxy of the euchological texts without changing the ancient practice of the Roman Church. A great amount of this effort focused on the purification of the ecclesiastical calendar by removing Saints, the number of which had become so that even Sundays were often surpassed by these other celebrations.

With approximately six exceptions, “only those Saints’ days celebrated in Rome prior to the eleventh century were accepted as legitimate for the new calendar. As a result, 157 days opened on the liturgical calendar, excepting octaves. A number of votive Masses and sequences were likewise removed from the missal.”⁵¹² The number of celebrations in the

⁵¹⁰ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 10-11.

⁵¹¹ PECKLERS, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 156. Unfortunately, proceedings of the commission that reformed the liturgical calendar have been lost to history. We find continuation of the work of this commission and other post-Tridentine liturgical reforms, however, in the work of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, created by Sixtus V in 1588, along with thirteen other Sacred Congregations in the Holy See. “Responsibilities for the congregation included care for the celebration of the rites, the restoration and reform of ceremonies, the reform of the liturgical books, regulation of the offices of patron Saints, the canonization of Saints, the celebration of feasts, the reception of dignitaries to Rome and the solution to liturgical difficulties raised by local circumstances” (PECKLERS, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 160). Cf. F. McMANUS, *The Congregation of Sacred Rites*, Washington, DC, Catholic University Press, 1954, 27.

⁵¹² PECKLERS, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 157-158. See also R. CABIÉ, “The Celebration of the Eucharist in the West,” 175. Just three decades after promulgation of *MR/1570*, the *GRC* would be modified

calendar that became GRC/1568 for the Latin Church was reduced to 149 when it was promulgated along with the revised *Breviarium Romanum*. What Sheppard describes as a “timid” post-Tridentine reform of the Sanctoral Cycle was rather bold, even when compared to the post-Vatican II calendar reforms, treated below.⁵¹³

2.8.2 – Subsequent Changes between the Councils of Trent and Vatican II

By the time of Benedict XIV (1740-1758), so many feasts had been added that the calendar was in a situation like that prior to the reforms of GRC/1568. Attempting to address the matter, Benedict XIV created a commission to review the situation and offer suggestions for liturgical reform. The recommendations for revision and omission made by the commission were so drastic, the Pontiff feared their implementation. Benedict XIV’s death in 1758 was also the death of that attempt to reform the calendar.⁵¹⁴

Considerably more Saints were added to the Roman Calendar over the next century and a half; every weekday of Lent had become filled with sanctoral celebrations. With so many feasts and no full formularies for most of them, the Mass was often a repetition of the limited formularies provided in the Commons.⁵¹⁵ The Sundays *per annum* were often supplanted by other celebrations and the former situation of many celebrations on the same calendar date returned.

by Clement VIII who added fifteen feasts. He promulgated revised editions of the Roman Breviary in 1602 and the Roman Missal in 1604. A scant three decades after this, Urban VIII added a dozen feasts with promulgation of revised editions of the Roman Breviary in 1632 and the Roman Missal in 1634. The GRC promulgated by Leo XIII in 1882 had some ninety-nine additional feasts, increasing the number from the post-Tridentine 149 to 275 (see PECKLERS, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 161).

⁵¹³ In the calendar of Pius V, there were, additionally, only two feasts of devotion: The Blessed Trinity and Corpus Christi (see SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 11).

⁵¹⁴ PECKLERS, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 164. At the same time, liturgical scholarship was increasing as ancient sources, such as sacramentaries and *Ordines* were copied and disseminated. This initiative was taken largely by Cardinal Giuseppe Tomasi (1649-1713) (see PECKLERS, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 164). See also P. JOUNEL, “From the Council of Trent to Vatican II,” in A.-G. MARTIMORT, et al., *The Church at Prayer, Volume I: Principles of the Liturgy*, New Edition, trans. M.J. O’CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1987, 72.

⁵¹⁵ See SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 11.

In 1911, Pius X (1903-1914), *inter alia*, moved the feast of Corpus Christi from the Thursday after Trinity Sunday to the Second Sunday after Pentecost.⁵¹⁶ When reordering the Divine Office that same year, he used the opportunity to make some changes to the Temporal and Sanctoral Cycles. This was the first concerted effort to do so since the post-Tridentine reforms.⁵¹⁷ Most significantly, he sought to restore and protect the prominence of Sunday in the Temporal Cycle.⁵¹⁸ This was accomplished mainly by a minor reduction in the number of Saints celebrated and reduction of the rank of some that had supplanted the observance of Sundays.⁵¹⁹

In 1913, Pius X called for extensive change to the Roman Calendar, recognizing that such an effort would take many years. It was not accomplished during his pontificate.⁵²⁰ What Pius X began was not continued by his successors. In fact, the next two successive

⁵¹⁶ See PIUS X, *Motu proprio De diebus festis*, 2 July 1911, in *AAS*, 3 (1911), 305. Something must have occurred between Pius X and the Sacred Congregation of Rites: the *motu proprio* was substantially reversed by decree of the Congregation twenty-two days later by means of *Urbis et orbis evulgato*, wherein the feast of *Corpus Christi* was restored to the Thursday after Trinity, but without obligation. *Corpus Christi* was renamed *Commemoratio Solemnis Sanctissimi Corporis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi* in the process and arrangements were made for the external Solemnity to be observed on the following Sunday, with specific rules for cathedral and collegiate Churches. Benedict XV eventually restored *Corpus Christi* as a day of obligation and reversed several other liturgical innovations of Pius X.

⁵¹⁷ See PIUS X, Apostolic Constitution *Divino afflatu* de nova psalterii in breviario Romano dispositione, 1 November 1911, in *AAS*, 3 (1911), decree, 633-638, rubrics 639-651, English translation available at <https://breviary.net/divino-afflatu.htm> (11 January 2022).

⁵¹⁸ “[... T]hat in the sacred liturgy those most ancient Masses of the Sundays during the year and of the ferias, especially those of Lent, recover their rightful place” (*Divino afflatu*, §6).

⁵¹⁹ “More than once, serious complaints have been made by prudent and pious men about this omission, on the ground that owing to it those in sacred orders have been deprived of so many admirable aids for praising the Lord and expressing the inmost feelings of the soul, and that it has left them without that desirable variety in praying so highly necessary for our weakness in supplicating worthily, attentively and devoutly” (ibid., §4. Cf. SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 11-12, and SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 151).

⁵²⁰ Pius X calls for, “restoring the calendar of the Universal Church to its original arrangement and style, retaining meanwhile the splendid richness which the marvelous fruitfulness of the Church, the Mother of Saints, has brought to bear upon it; utilizing appropriate passages of Scripture, of the Fathers and Doctors, after having reestablished the authentic text: Prudently correcting the lives of the Saints according to documentary evidence; perfecting the arrangement of numerous points of the liturgy, eliminating superfluous elements” (PIUS X, *Motu proprio Abhinc duos annos*, 23 October 1913, English translation in BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES, *Papal Teachings*, 227, marg. number 347 [16, 72]).

popes, Benedict XV (1914-1922) and Pius XI (1922-1939), added yet more feasts to the calendar.⁵²¹

Pius XII (1939-1958) himself added more celebrations until 1955 when, with *Cum nostra hac aetate*,⁵²² the rubrics were simplified. By means of this decree, all but three octaves were abolished and semidouble feasts were reordered into a simplified system of ranking days of both the Temporal and Sanctoral Cycles. By this reordering, it became possible to opt for the formularies of the daily Mass of Lent rather than the formulary for the feast of a Saint.⁵²³

⁵²¹ In 1925, Pius XI introduced the feast of the Kingship of Christ to the universal calendar. He stated, "We have commanded its observance on a Sunday in order that not only the clergy may perform their duty by saying Mass and reciting the Office, but that the laity too, free from their daily tasks, may in a spirit of holy joy give ample testimony of their obedience and subjection to Christ. The last Sunday of October seemed the most convenient of all for this purpose, because it is at the end of the liturgical year and thus the feast of the Kingship of Christ sets the crowning glory upon the mysteries of the life of Christ already commemorated during the year; thus too, before celebrating the triumph of all the Saints, we proclaim and extol the glory of Him who triumphs in all the Saints and in all the Elect" (PIUS XI, Encyclical *Quas primas*, 11 December 1925, English translation in BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES, *Papal Teachings*, 242, marg. no. 368 [15, 82, 83], and in SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 36-46).

⁵²² PIUS XII, *Cum nostra hac aetate*, 23 May 1955.

⁵²³ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 151. I Class feasts were allowed on the second, third and fourth Sundays of Advent. Formerly Semidouble Sundays were elevated in rank to Double. However, if any feast of the Lord or title of mystery of the Lord fell on a Sunday *per annum*, the Sunday formulary was reduced to the rank of a Simple Commemoration. The Octaves of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost were retained; all others, even in particular calendars, were suppressed. Abolishing Octaves left those weeks in need of reordering. Therefore, the former octave of 2-5 January was celebrated daily with the Mass of 1 January, without the Creed or the special *communicantes* in the Roman Canon. The former Epiphany Octave of 7-12 January became ferials. Up to the First Sunday after Epiphany, the Epiphany Mass formulary was repeated, without the Creed or the special *communicantes* in the Roman Canon. The weekday Masses thereafter up to 12 January, inclusive, were to use the Mass formulary of the First Sunday after Epiphany. That Sunday itself did not use its own Mass formulary because it was permanently impeded by the feast of the Holy Family, as mentioned above. The celebration of the Baptism of the Lord on 13 January was to use the Mass formulary that had been previously prescribed for the octave day of Epiphany. However, if 13 January fell on Sunday, the Mass of the Holy Family trumped it, without commemoration of the Baptism. The days between the Ascension and the Vigil of Pentecost were rendered Easter ferials, using the Mass formulary of the Ascension, without the Creed or the special *communicantes* in the Roman Canon. This was done even on the Friday prior to Pentecost, which had formerly required the formulary assigned to the Sunday. The days of the former octaves of Corpus Christi and Sacred Heart were rendered ferials *per annum*. The days of the Easter and Pentecost Octaves were elevated to Doubles, giving them precedence over all feasts; Commemorations were not to be allowed. The vigils of Christmas and Pentecost were privileged; the days of the Christmas Octave remained as they were. All other vigils, those of the Ascension, Assumption, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul and Lawrence were to be common. If any of these vigils fell on a Sunday, they were to be omitted, not even anticipated. On 1 May 1955, Pius XII introduced the feast of Saint Joseph the Worker, and issued complete texts for the Mass and the *Breviarium Romanum* (see SACRED

On 25 July 1960, John XXIII issued *motu proprio Rubricarum instructum* and approved the new code of rubrics which followed the next day in the instruction *Novum rubricarum* from the Sacred Congregation of Rites. In the reordering and simplification of the rubrics, the precedence of Sundays of the temporal cycle was further amplified. Several feasts were reduced in rank or eliminated from the sanctoral cycle altogether. Additionally, formularies for daily Masses were raised in rank so that it was possible to offer the Lenten Mass throughout most of the season.⁵²⁴ As a whole, the calendar remained the same; the ranks utilized in it were reordered within the existing framework and the number of feasts reduced.⁵²⁵ Perhaps most practically, a new Table of Precedence was created, which remains in force for the EF.⁵²⁶

On 25 January 1959, John XXIII announced that a new ecumenical council would take place. On 6 June 1960, Cardinal Cicognani was made president on a preparatory commission that would deal with liturgical matters; on 11 July of that same year, Father

CONGREGATION FOR RITES, *In solemnitate Sancti Ioseph Opificis*, in *AAS*, 48 [1956], 226-236). This Feast was established in opposition to the atheist communist celebration of May Day, a modern example of the Church Christianizing non-Christian celebrations. The celebration was placed on 1 May, with the rank of Double I Class. This required moving the feast of Sts. Philip and James from 1 May, where it had been fixed since the sixth century, to 11 May. The Pope also suppressed the Solemnity of St. Joseph, Spouse of the Virgin Mary, which had been in place on the second Wednesday after the Octave of Easter since the 10 September 1847 decree of Pius IX declaring it so (see J. PRCELA, *Joseph, Husband of the Immaculate Mary*, Victoria, BC, Friesen Press, 2016, 143-144).

⁵²⁴ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 151.

⁵²⁵ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 11-12.

⁵²⁶ See *ibid.*, 16. Seasoltz adds that the feast of the Precious Blood is abolished because it is repeated thematically in the feasts of Corpus Christi and the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In the *GRC/1960*, there are seventeen feasts of devotion, only two of which had been included in the *GRC/1568* reform. Most of these were retained in the post-Vatican II reordering with the rank of Optional Memorial. These include the celebrations of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Our Lady of Lourdes and the Immaculate Heart of Mary. At this same point, the celebrations of the Precious Blood of Jesus and the Holy Name of Jesus were abolished. The latter was restored in time, as will be seen below.

Annibale Bugnini was made secretary of that commission. Planning began immediately⁵²⁷ and work on liturgical affairs moved swiftly.

Novum Rubricarum of 1960 streamlined the more complex ranking of feasts to include only four categories, I Class, II Class, III Class and Commemoration. The same document also specified that all ranks on the GRC were to be celebrated, leaving few options.⁵²⁸ This system was not without its critics. Some found the refined system confusing. Some found use of the term “Class” to designate the various categories of feasts unsettling. With up to three Collects allowed in certain celebrations of Mass, the demand that all feasts be celebrated was found tedious by some.

The Instruction *Tres abhinc annos* of 1967 required that only one Collect could be offered in each Mass. It appears the hope was that this would allow for the celebration of lesser feasts. The result, instead, was that practically all Commemorations that fell during Lent or on days with I and II Class Feasts were not celebrated at all; they had become permanently impeded yet remained in the Roman Calendar. On the other hand, the Instruction introduced the practice of optional celebrations by allowing, on III Class Feasts, celebration of the Mass either of that feast or of the Saint who was commemorated during the Office of Lauds.⁵²⁹

Another criticism was that the seasons of the Temporal Cycle were yet insufficiently pronounced. For instance, it was observed that season of Advent lacked distinct preparation for celebrating the historical event of the Incarnation as well as the return of the Lord in

⁵²⁷ See A. BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948-1975*, trans. M. O’CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1990, here, 14. This body constructed what would become, after many drafts and discussions, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (see *ibid.*).

⁵²⁸ See NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, Liturgy Documentary Series, 6, Washington, D.C., Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1984, 81-82.

⁵²⁹ See NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 82.

glory at the end of the ages. Jenny observes, “For example, a proper Preface and ferial Mass formulas for Wednesdays and Fridays, and for the days from the 17th to the 23rd of December should be added.”⁵³⁰

2.9 – The Second Vatican Council and *Sacrosanctum Concilium*

On 4 December 1963, the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council issued *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. Following the example set by the Council of Trent,⁵³¹ the Constitution expressed desire for reform and presented general desires and guidelines but remanded the actual reform to post-conciliar bodies.⁵³²

Treatment of reformation of the Roman Calendar appears in SC nos. 102-111.⁵³³ The first several of these articles give principles for what a reformed Roman Calendar should include.

⁵³⁰ H. JENNY, “Chapter V: The Liturgical Year II; The Proper of Time,” in BUGNINI and BRAGA, *Commentary on the Constitution*, 236.

⁵³¹ COUNCIL OF TRENT, “Twenty-Fifth Session, 4 December 1563,” in H. J. SCHROEDER, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text with English Translation*, St. Louis, MO/London, B. Herder Book Company, 1941, 520, English translation in *ibid.*, 255. The actual methodology is found clarified in *Quo primum*: “Hence, We decided to entrust this work [of the revision of the Missal, see §1] to learned men of our selection. They very carefully collated all their work with the ancient codices in Our Vatican Library and with reliable, preserved or emended codices from elsewhere. Besides this, these men consulted the works of ancient and approved authors concerning the same sacred Rites; and thus, they have restored the Missal itself to the original form and rite of the holy Fathers. When this work has been gone over numerous times and further emended, after serious study and reflection, We commanded that the finished product be printed and published as soon as possible, so that all might enjoy the fruits of this labor; and thus, priests would know which prayers to use and which rites and ceremonies they were required to observe from now on in the celebration of Masses” (*Quo primum*, §2).

⁵³² Kunzler notes that in the reform of the Roman Calendar as mandated by the Second Vatican Council, “any attenuation to a purely psychological recalling is excluded” (KUNZLER, *The Church’s Liturgy*, 374). This excludes a notion that the Temporal Cycle is an historical retelling or an historically accurate timeline and does not attempt to be. Rather, the entirety of Christ’s mission is celebrated in cyclical fashion, fit into one calendar year and then restarted, as an annual cycle. Celebrations with some degree of accuracy are rare, for instance, the passion/death/resurrection event and, consequently, the Ascension and Pentecost. The remainder have been developed by the practice of the Church over the centuries.

⁵³³ There was some discussion regarding the time of the start of the liturgical year. Specifically, the question was whether the year should begin with Advent as it had for centuries or with *Septuagesima* Sunday. Rather than engage the discussion, the Constitution simply states that Easter is the apex of the temporal year. Similarly, discussion of the day of Easter is not included. It simply states that Easter is one of the Sundays of the year (see SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 152).

Treatment of the Roman Calendar in *SC* commences by reinforcing the importance of sanctifying the year by the celebration of the Temporal Cycle. It reinforces Sunday, the Lord's Day, as the weekly remembrance of the resurrection. The same paragraph declares that Easter is a singular Sunday among the Sundays of the year.⁵³⁴

The unique *hyperdulia* that is rendered to the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God, is asserted on account of the uniquely close bond she has with the saving work of her Son, since she is the Mother of God.⁵³⁵ The Constitution describes the Sanctoral observation of various feasts of martyrs and Saints and reinforces belief in the power of their prayers.⁵³⁶

The Constitution acknowledges that special exercises such as penance and piety, correspond to various times of the Church's year. Certain of these customs are enumerated.⁵³⁷ A hope is promoted that among these seasons, Lent would become a time of catechesis and recognition of sin.⁵³⁸ The Constitution extends the theme of penance by

⁵³⁴ See *SC*, no. 102. Zauner observes: "[...] Various things are said about the different parts of the liturgical year, but here the hinge of the whole calendar is indicated: the great solemnity of Easter, preceded by the time of the Passion, which prepares for the glorious Resurrection of the Lord. [...] The restoration of the liturgical year can begin if Sunday remains the day of the Lord" (F. ZAUNER, "Chapter V: The Liturgical Year I; The Nature of the Liturgical Year," in BUGNINI and BRAGA, *Commentary on the Constitution*, 229).

⁵³⁵ See *SC*, no. 103. Zauner will further observe, "The Blessed Virgin Mary is called the first and most excellent fruit of the Redemption. Thus, the whole veneration given to her redounds on her Son. Furthermore, she is the most pure image of the Church, and her different feasts joyfully urge, invite and fortify us to follow her example" (ZAUNER, "Nature of the Liturgical Year," 230). Paul VI would later reaffirm and amplify this in Paul VI, Apostolic Exhortation *Marialis cultus*, on rightly grounding and increasing Marian devotion, 2 February 1974, in *AAS*, 66 (1974), 113-168, and in *Notitiae*, 10 (1974), 153-197, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 467, 1204-1227.

⁵³⁶ See *SC*, no. 104.

⁵³⁷ See *ibid.*, no. 105. These include pious practices, instruction expounding upon the didactic nature of Catholic worship, prayer, penance and works of mercy. Zauner recalls, "The Fathers wished expressly that the Works of Mercy should be named here according to the law of the Gospel. The love of God necessarily includes the love of man, especially of the poor and the weak. [...] The seasons of liturgical worship and the days for works of charity go very well together" (ZAUNER, "Nature of the Liturgical Year," 232).

⁵³⁸ Jenny illuminates this hope of the council Fathers, stating, "Lenten catechesis should preach and inculcate always more deeply a sense of sin, especially in our days when the taste for supernatural things has gradually declined. Sin must be known as an offense against God, a voluntary violation of the law of God which does great injury against God the Father and breaks the essential link between Creator and creature, between the Author of life and mortal man, and leads to death: 'Sin entered into this world and through sin, death' (Rom. 5, 12). But sin has deadly effects not only on the personal condition of the sinner but also on human society. Hence the need for reparation on the part of the sinner, not only as an individual, but as a member of society and of the Church. Hence it is necessary to have common exercises of Penance, and

recommending exercises. The Paschal fast is strongly recommended and should be extended beyond Good Friday throughout Holy Saturday until the celebration of the Easter Vigil.⁵³⁹

Article 106 of the Constitution introduces the specific mandates for reform of the Roman Calendar. This section closely circumscribes the reform for which the Council Fathers were calling by stating, “The liturgical year is to be revised so that the traditional customs and discipline of the sacred seasons shall be preserved or restored to suit the conditions of modern times; their specific character is to be retained, so that they duly nourish the piety of the faithful who celebrate the mysteries of Christian redemption, and above all the paschal mystery.”⁵⁴⁰

The directives reiterate with more force the preeminence of Sunday. The Constitution states decisively, “Other celebrations, unless they be truly of greatest importance, shall not have precedence over the Sunday which is the foundation and kernel of the whole liturgical year” and that “Christ’s faithful are bound to come together into one place.”⁵⁴¹ The paschal

prayers should be said for sinners in the public prayer of the Mass” (JENNY, “Proper of Time,” 238). In a prescient way, Jenny continues, “To bring this about it would seem good to restore certain practices of the past, for example, the ancient Scrutinies, the imparting of the Creed, the giving of the Gospels. The passages from St. John’s Gospel that refer to Baptism (Chapter 4 on the Samaritan woman, Chapter 9 on the man born blind, Chapter 11 on Lazarus) should be read on Sundays rather than on weekdays; finally, in the common prayer special mention should be made of the Catechumens and the catechism children” (ibid.).

⁵³⁹ See SC, no. 110. “The fast would then extend beyond Holy Saturday Noon as is indicated in *CIC/17* c. 1252, §1, in order for the believer to bring himself nearer to the celebration of the sublime mystery of the Passion Event by seeing it as the breaking of the fast. [...] However, it does not seem that this extension [of the fast] should be mandatory. It would be better to recommend it, so that in spirit and truth with a pure mind of faith, the fast may be celebrated in tears and the mystery in joy” (JENNY, “Proper of Time,” 240). *Instructio de ordine hebdomadae sanctae*. no. 10 accomplished this, as noted above.

⁵⁴⁰ See SC, no. 107. SC no. 39 states that such adaptations are to be done according to the fundamental norms of the Constitution; no. 40 then addresses more radical adaptations that may be necessary, introducing what has become known as “inculturation.”

⁵⁴¹ Ibid., no. 106. In commenting and expounding upon this, and the importance of Sunday in the lives of the faithful, Jenny concludes by stating, “If at certain times and places it happens that work is of obligation on Sunday, Christians are always called and always will be to celebrate on that day the Resurrection. Hence it is clear that other celebrations unless they are truly of the greatest importance, should not have precedence over the Sunday” (JENNY, “Proper of Time,” 233-234).

mystery is preeminent in the Church's year of celebrations; all other celebrations pale by comparison.⁵⁴² Therefore, the Temporal Cycle is to be given precedence over the Sanctoral Cycle.⁵⁴³

In order that the Sanctoral Cycle not encroach upon the Temporal, *SC* calls for the feasts of many Saints inscribed in Roman Calendar to be relegated to particular calendars, leaving place in the calendar for "saints who are truly of universal importance."⁵⁴⁴ At the same time, the Constitution urges images and authentic relics of the Saints to be held in veneration and their accompanying feasts respected.⁵⁴⁵

Sacrosanctum Concilium orders the twofold character of Lent, that is, recalling or preparing for baptism and offering penance, to become more pronounced in the Mass and accompanying catechesis.⁵⁴⁶ This is to be accomplished by accentuating these aspects.⁵⁴⁷ Lenten instruction is to accentuate the fact of sin not only as a social abstract, but a personal reality countered by penance "which leads to the detestation of sin as an offence against God; the role of the Church in penitential practices is not to be passed over, and the people must be exhorted to pray for sinners."⁵⁴⁸

In summary, this section of *SC* expresses a desire for clarity in the Church's celebration of the liturgical year by means of a new General Roman Calendar. It seeks to bring the celebrations of Christian mysteries closer to the practice of the faithful. "And so, one sees

⁵⁴² See *SC*, no. 107. As demonstrated above, the liturgical seasons grew from Sunday into Easter and then to the Triduum. "Other times of the liturgical year were added later, for example, around the feast of the Nativity of the Lord or before Lent or after Pentecost, so that today all the events of salvation from the Messianic promises to the coming of the glory of the Lord - the whole work of Redemption - is accomplished each year through the sacred mysteries" (JENNY, "Proper of Time," 235).

⁵⁴³ See *SC*, no. 108.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 111.

⁵⁴⁵ See *ibid.*

⁵⁴⁶ See *ibid.*, no. 109.

⁵⁴⁷ See *ibid.*, no. 109, a).

⁵⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 109, b).

that through the liturgical year not only are past facts brought to mind, but rather that the history of salvation is actually going forward. Into this history the faithful are inserted, for it is our history which is continued in the Church and is brought to perfection in us day by day.”⁵⁴⁹

2.10 – Post-Vatican II Changes to the Temporal Cycle of the Liturgical Year

On 10 October 1963, Paul VI expressed his desire to mark the end of the second session of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council with a document of some kind that would include implementing norms of *SC* that could be dealt with more immediately. Admittedly, it would be incomplete law but something that the Council Fathers could have in their hands when leaving Rome. He placed Cardinal Lercaro in charge of producing the document. The next day, 11 October 1963, Lercaro asked Bugnini to produce a list of names of persons to help in the task, which he did the following day. The first draft was completed on 20 October and was eventually reworked. It was not ready in time for the closing of the session, but Paul VI mentioned in his closing address that it was forthcoming.⁵⁵⁰ After undergoing further revision, the Pope’s will became manifest as *motu proprio Sacram Liturgiam*, 25 January 1964. The scope of the document was broad.

The document’s introduction includes recollection of what *SC* expressed regarding the nature of the liturgy, participation by the faithful and their sanctification. It stressed study of the liturgy, particularly by clerics who were tasked additionally with mastering it, in

⁵⁴⁹ ZAUNER, “Nature of the Liturgical Year,” 232. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* appended a unique section to address the matter of creating a fixed calendar. This would be accomplished by fixing the date to Easter permanently. While this would simplify much of the Temporal Cycle, it would pose its own difficulties, not the least of which is ecumenical (see *SC*, Appendix: Declaration of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council on Revision of the Calendar, no. 131). For a fascinating presentation of several systems by which Easter may be transferred to a stable, fixed or immoveable date, see A. DIRKS, “Appendix: The Revision of the Calendar,” in BUGNINI and BRAGA, *Commentary on the Constitution*, 285-288.

⁵⁵⁰ PAUL VI, Address to the Council fathers *Tempus iam advenit*, 4 December 1963, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 34, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 9 (1963-1964), 225.

order that they may educate the future souls entrusted to them.⁵⁵¹ Consequently, the document stresses the need for liturgical training for those who aspire to the priesthood.⁵⁵² The document states that new principles should begin the following academic year.⁵⁵³ The *motu proprio* reiterates the Council of Trent's insistence on homilies.⁵⁵⁴ Additionally, it mandates the celebrations of the sacraments of Matrimony and Confirmation within the context of Mass.⁵⁵⁵

The document sought furthermore to provide guidance to those who were making unauthorized changes in their dioceses and parishes in the "spirit of the Council" while not truly fulfilling the vision of *SC*. In this *motu proprio*, Paul VI repeats the warning he had emphasized earlier in his closing address of 4 December 1963: "No attempt should be made to introduce into the official prayer of the Church private changes or unusual rites. [...] The nobility of ecclesiastical prayer and its melodious expression throughout the world is something no one would wish to disturb or damage."⁵⁵⁶

After the document had been disseminated and absorbed, it became clear that it was fraught with inaccuracies regarding liturgical and historical matters and difficulties brought about by a lack of clear wording. Consilium was tasked with making corrections, twenty of which were made before the document was published in *AAS*.⁵⁵⁷

⁵⁵¹ *Sacram Liturgiam*, 14.

⁵⁵² Here, *Sacram Liturgiam* echoes *SC*, nos. 15-17.

⁵⁵³ For the fulfillment of *SC* nos. 15-16 to take place, clarification was necessary regarding competencies among the dicasteries, since fulfilling these orders entailed a rearrangement of faculty schedules, and in fact the course of seminary studies.

⁵⁵⁴ *Sacram Liturgiam*, 4.

⁵⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 5. See C. BRAGA, "Appendix: The Apostolic Letter '*Sacram Liturgiam*,'" in BUGNINI and BRAGA, *Commentary on the Constitution*, 289-294.

⁵⁵⁶ PAUL VI, Address to the Council fathers *Tempus iam advenit*, 4 December 1963, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 34, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 9 (1963-1964), 225.

⁵⁵⁷ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 58-59.

Because the coordination of several other aspects of liturgical revisions relied upon the Roman Calendar, the study group charged with its revision was placed first in the committees of Consilium and thus became *Coetus* I. The Secretary of Consilium, Fr. Annibale Bugnini, became its Relator.⁵⁵⁸

On 23 January 1965, Consilium first met about the revision of the liturgical calendar. They began by studying the schema on the Temporal Cycle which had been prepared by *Coetus* I. The ensuing debate was so lively that on 12 February 1965, questionnaires were sent to *periti* and the consultors themselves in order to glean new suggestions.⁵⁵⁹ On 16 March 1965, a suggested schema for the Sanctoral was sent to the consultors of two additional Study Groups, each of which in turn produced a schema.⁵⁶⁰

⁵⁵⁸ Its secretary was A. Dirks. Its members were R. van Doren, J. Wagner, A.G. Martimort, Pierre Jounel, A. Amore and H. Schmidt. Pierre Jounel was appointed Relator for the *Coetus* in 1967 (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 305, and footnote 1. Cf. "Consilium, List of members (1964-1969)," in *DOL*, doc. 78, 214-217, gleaned from several sources as per *DOL*, 214, footnote **). *Coetus* I worked on the Sanctoral as well as the Temporal Cycles. Presidency of the work was reserved to the secretariat of Consilium until the final stage of work. Prior to commencement of the work, Bugnini was aware of what lay before them. He recalls, "When that point comes, this group will have to decide on dropping or keeping certain feasts and on the rank to be assigned to feasts and will thus directly impinge the sensitivities of individuals, associations, dioceses and religious families" (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 305).

⁵⁵⁹ See *ibid.*, 306.

⁵⁶⁰ See *ibid.* On 16 March 1965, the first schema of a Sanctoral Cycle was sent to the consultors of *Coetus* I and *Coetus* XVII. These schemata were further examined on 1, 12 April; they were reported to Consilium and discussed. From this emerged several guidelines, approved by the members. The guidelines for *Coetus* I in revision of the Sanctoral Cycle were derived from *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 107, 103, 108, 104 and 111 (see *ibid.*, 305-306). Concerning the Sanctoral Cycle, the relator presented the mandate of SC that the cult of the Saints must continue but that priority must be given to the mysteries of Christ. To achieve these ends, criteria were established: To prevent the Roman calendar from being essentially Mediterranean, the calendar is to retain or add Saints from around the world, including, for instance, Japan, Canada, Uganda and Oceania. Feasts that are not commemorations of Saints or of a mystery/event of Christ are to be reduced. It is permissible that several Saints be commemorated on the same day, leaving the celebrant free to choose which one of them to celebrate. All Apostles and Evangelists are to be retained. The universally venerated ancient Martyrs or those of some universal interest are to be retained. Others are to be added in order to represent all classes and states of life. The principal Doctors are to be retained and the others evaluated individually. Saints of general interest due to their spirituality or apostolate are to be retained (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 308).

These two schemata were subjected to examination by Consilium on 1 and 12 April 1965. On 25 April, at the first general meeting, those present openly discussed and approved the following points as guidelines for their upcoming work:

The First Sunday of Advent is the start of the liturgical year.

1 January celebrates the Holy Name, the commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the civil New Year.

Septuagesima is eliminated and taken over by Ordinary Time but most of the euchological texts will remain in use.

Lent begins with the First Sunday of Lent; ashes may be imposed from Ash Wednesday to the Monday after the First Sunday, according to the episcopal conference.

The Sacred Triduum begins on Holy Thursday Evening with Mass of the Supper of the Lord.⁵⁶¹

Pentecost's octave is suppressed.⁵⁶²

Celebration of the Ascension of the Lord may be transferred to the following Sunday if the episcopal conference wishes to do so.

The feast of the Blessed Trinity remains where it is and as it is.⁵⁶³

Regarding the Sanctoral cycle, principles proposed for its revision are approved for further work.⁵⁶⁴

From these points, work commenced on the reordering of both the Temporal and Sanctoral Cycles.

Concomitantly, Consilium reviewed holy days of obligation in response to the requests from national conferences for the competence to transfer to Sundays those that fall on weekdays. The primacy of Sunday as stated in *SC*, nos. 102 and 106 had to be respected

⁵⁶¹ This was determined only after considerable discussion. Several consultants wanted the three days to comprise Good Friday, Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday. The argument that the Last Supper is inseparable from the Passion prevailed (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 307, footnote 8).

⁵⁶² There was a good deal of disagreement and vacillation of opinion on this point. Finally, the suppression of the Octave was only accepted in light of using the euchological formularies in the nine days leading up to Pentecost (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 307, footnote 9). This did not appear to happen.

⁵⁶³ Suggestions were made for moving the day of the feast or combining it with a different feast, e.g., the Baptism of the Lord. After heated discussion, it was determined that because the feast celebrated in summary the entire work of salvation, it would not be suppressed (see *ibid.*, 307, footnote 10).

⁵⁶⁴ See *ibid.*, 306-307.

when making such a determination.⁵⁶⁵ The demands of work and the minority status of Christians in some places needed to be considered.⁵⁶⁶

Consilium responded by suggesting that all the Latin faithful celebrate Christmas on 25 December, Epiphany on 6 January, Ascension the fortieth day after Easter and Corpus Christi, the Thursday after Trinity Sunday. Additionally, episcopal conferences could ask for the Epiphany and the Ascension to be moved to a Sunday which would then become the proper observance in those areas.⁵⁶⁷ Corpus Christi could be requested to be transferred to the following Sunday, another Sunday or another appropriate day of the year.⁵⁶⁸ Episcopal conferences could ask the Holy See to remove the obligation for the other feasts listed in *CIC/17*, c. 1247, §1.⁵⁶⁹ Bugnini states, “Episcopal conferences should be given broad authority to determine what is best for the spiritual good of their faithful.”⁵⁷⁰

⁵⁶⁵ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 322.

⁵⁶⁶ See *ibid.*, 323.

⁵⁶⁷ By decree of 7 October 1977, the Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Worship transferred the feast of the Baptism of the Lord to the following Monday in those places wherein the Solemnity of the Epiphany of the Lord is celebrated on Sunday, 7 or 8 January. Otherwise, Epiphany Sunday would impede the Baptism of the Lord if it fell on either of those days (see CONGREGATION FOR THE SACRAMENTS AND DIVINE WORSHIP, Decree *Celebratio Baptismatis Domini*, on the celebration of the Baptism of the Lord, 7 October 1977, in *AAS*, 69 [1977], 682, and in *Notitiae*, 13 [1977], 477, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 460, 1192). Cf. SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 156.

⁵⁶⁸ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 323.

⁵⁶⁹ I.e., the Octave of Christmas (1 January); St. Joseph (19 March); Saints Peter and Paul (29 June); Assumption (15 August); All Saints (1 November) and Immaculate Conception (8 December) (see *ibid.*).

⁵⁷⁰ *Ibid.* Due to the number of changes in the calendar, particularly the number of obligation days, it was deemed necessary to clarify which days pastors and their equivalents were obligated to offer the *Missa pro populo*. The Sacred Congregation for Clergy responded by stating that those obligated to offer the *Missa pro populo* must do so on all Sundays and obligations days (see SACRED CONGREGATION FOR CLERGY, Decree *Litteris apostolicis*, on the obligation of celebrating the Mass *pro populo*, 25 July 1970, in *AAS*, 63 [1971], 943-944, and in *Notitiae*, 6 [1970], 380, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 283, 703). The current legislation on the matter is found in *CIC/83*: For bishops, c. 388; for diocesan administrators, c. 429, which turns back to c. 388; for pastors, c. 534. Before, during and following promulgation, several adjustments and changes had to be made to allow the calendar to be functional. For example, see SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree *Die 30 Iunii*, prescribing the collect *pro Papa* on 30 June 1964, the anniversary of Paul VI's coronation, 9 May 1964, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 10 May 1964, 8, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 496, 1282.

In non-Christian countries wherein a day other than Sunday is observed as the day of rest, such as Friday and Saturday in Israel and Friday in Muslim countries, these days may be chosen for the celebration of obligation days that fall during the week. The same is true for Saturdays that are a day of rest.⁵⁷¹ Popular non-Christian feasts, such as the secular new year, national holidays and the like, may be Christianized by celebrating a great Christian feast at the same time.⁵⁷²

The second report to Consilium followed in 1966. To speed-up work so other groups would be able to commence with their work, it was decided that addressing the calendar would be split between two *periti*: Fr. Jounel for the Temporal and Fr. Amore for the Sanctoral. Two points were discussed: the feast of the Holy Family, which will be examined below, and the vocabulary to be used when ranking liturgical days,⁵⁷³ which would then necessitate the creation of a new Table of Precedence.

After Consilium gave general approval to the two reports, *Coetus* I developed a final draft of a calendar. At the eighth general meeting of Consilium held on 10-19 April 1967, the body gave definitive approval to the draft of a substantially reordered Roman Calendar for those using the Roman Rite in the Latin Church.⁵⁷⁴

⁵⁷¹ Yet, in many places wherein Saturday is not a day of work, obligation days that fall on a Saturday have the obligation lifted.

⁵⁷² See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 324. How this may be possible is not explained. The following may be considered hypothetically: Canada Day is 1 July, and Canada's national feast day is Joseph, Husband of Mary, celebrated on 19 March. United States Independence Day is 4 July, and her national feast is the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary celebrated as an obligation day on 8 December. Perhaps this provision would make it possible for the Feast of Joseph, Husband of Mary, to be transferred to 1 July in Canada and the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary to be transferred to 4 July in the United States of America.

⁵⁷³ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 309.

⁵⁷⁴ Ibid.

2.11 – General Norms and the Creation of a New General Roman Calendar

On 21 March 1969, Consilium issued *General Norms for the Liturgical Year and the Calendar*,⁵⁷⁵ which had been approved by Paul VI the previous 14 February by means of motu proprio *Mysterii Paschalis*.⁵⁷⁶ This document is both didactic and directive. It sets forth the rationale behind the revisions that would become manifest practically in the forthcoming Roman Calendar.

2.11.1 – Ranking of Feasts

As mentioned, ranking feasts with the term “class” had not been welcomed by all.⁵⁷⁷ The *coetus* discussed use of more traditionally religious terms, “Solemnity,” “Feast,” “Commemoration” and “Memorial,” to replace them. This was not well received and there was lengthy discussion on the matter. At the same time, the term *memoria ad libitum* or “Optional Memorial” was constructed as a possible rank.⁵⁷⁸ The following 10-19 April of 1967, a draft was presented and approved, replacing the previous terms for ranks of feasts in the Roman Calendar, despite opposition.⁵⁷⁹

⁵⁷⁵ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES (CONSILIUM), *General Norms for the Liturgical Year and the Calendar*, 21 March 1969, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1969, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 442, 1155-1167.

⁵⁷⁶ PAUL VI, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Calendarium Romanum Mysterii Paschalis* approving the general norms of the liturgical year and the new *Calendarium Romanum*, 14 February 1969, *AAS*, 61 (1969), 222-226, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 440, 1152-1154.

⁵⁷⁷ “The new classification of celebrations retains this simplified division. Not everyone accepted the term ‘Class,’ even though it was an appropriate word, and therefore more traditional specifically religious terms were chosen for the three grades of celebration: ‘solemnity,’ ‘feast’ and ‘memorial,’ with the latter being either ‘obligatory’ or ‘optional’” (NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 82. Cf. *Novum rubricarum*, nos. 1-12, 118-119). See NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 91-145, for an outline of each Saint, each feast and what was changed, suppressed or left unchanged in *GRC/1969*. The section is entitled “Commentary on the General Roman Calendar” with the following asterisked note: “This commentary is the work of Consilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. It appeared in the Latin edition typical edition of *Calendarium Romanum* (21 March 1969) but was marked as ‘non-official.’ The translation into English was prepared by the International Committee on English in the Liturgy, 1975. With the permission of ICEL, a few minor alterations have been made by the Secretariat of the Committee on the Liturgy, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, to bring the commentary into conformity with the additions and changes made in the General Roman Calendar between 1969 and 1984.”

⁵⁷⁸ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 309.

⁵⁷⁹ See NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 82, and BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 309.

According to the *GNLYC*:

1. The rank of “Solemnity” is equivalent to I Class. There are four moveable solemnities (Holy Trinity, Corpus Christi, Sacred Heart and Christ the King), and ten fixed.⁵⁸⁰
2. The rank of “Feast” is equivalent to II Class. There are two moveable (Holy Family and the Baptism of the Lord), and twenty-three fixed.⁵⁸¹
3. The rank of “Memorial” [obligatory] is equivalent to III Class.⁵⁸² There are sixty-five Memorials.⁵⁸³
4. The rank of Optional Memorial is a novelty. There are ninety-four in the new GRC.⁵⁸⁴ A Saint or *Beatus* designated as an Optional Memorial may be celebrated in both the Divine Office and the Mass. Each is given a proper Collect and a hagiographical reading in the Office of Lauds.⁵⁸⁵

Apart from the seasons of Advent and Lent, it is possible to celebrate the Mass of any Saint listed in the day’s Martyrology.⁵⁸⁶ Evaluating the importance of offering such celebrations is left to the discretion of the celebrant. Choosing which celebrations to observe should not be considered insignificant.⁵⁸⁷ If the celebration of a Saint is always impeded because it occurs in the seasons of Lent or Advent or during the Octave of

⁵⁸⁰ See NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 82-83.

⁵⁸¹ See *ibid.*, 83-84.

⁵⁸² The term has early twentieth century historical precedent in the monastic calendar. See *ibid.*, 84.

⁵⁸³ See *ibid.*, 85-87. Only Obligatory Memorials with proper Scripture readings have a complete Mass formulary. For others, the readings, responsorial Psalm, verse before the Gospel and the Gospel itself may be taken from the readings prescribed for the ferial in the *OLM* (see *ibid.*, 88).

⁵⁸⁴ See *ibid.*, 87. There are six in January, six in February, six in March, eight in April, ten in May, eight in June, ten in July, ten in August, four in September, ten in October, seven in November and eight in December.

⁵⁸⁵ See NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 87. The rank of Memorial continues to exist as a remembrance of a Saint or *Beatus* on his or her *dies natale*, more or less, and are more a part of daily life in the Mass. Whether a Memorial is Obligatory or Optional, the Collect of the Saint or *Beatus* is prayed. The Prayer at the preparation of the gifts, the post-Communion, Scripture readings and chants may be chosen from the texts either of the Saint or *Beatus* or from the weekday Mass formulary (see *ibid.*, 84, 88). Use of the Propers and Commons in the *OLM*, with their plentiful selections of Scripture readings, does not seem to be encouraged. Rather, more importance is given to the semi-continuous readings prescribed for the ferial.

⁵⁸⁶ Such is the case with IV Class feriales in the EF (see *Novum rubricarum*, nos. 302-303).

⁵⁸⁷ See NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 87. In reality, they have been minimized by being placed in a newly created Class that renders them optional. Introduction of the term “Optional” may be interpreted as indicating something of lesser or little significance. In some cases, there are relegated to mere Commemorations.

Christmas, celebration of these Saints may still occur, celebrated similarly to that of an Optional Memorial.⁵⁸⁸

The *GNLYC* present a revised Table of Precedence which alone governs the relativity of liturgical days to their celebration. It elevates the level of certain days and feasts and the level of many, but not all, Sundays. If multiple feasts occur on the same day, the one with the highest rank is celebrated. If a Solemnity is impeded by a day of higher precedence, it is transferred to the closest available day.⁵⁸⁹ This new Table of Precedence is mandated for all those using the Roman Rite, or a particular calendar, in a particular Church and in families of religious.

2.11.2 – The Prominence of Sunday

According to the *GNLYC*, all Sundays of the year are elevated to the rank of Solemnity. The celebration of Sunday surpasses other observance permanently assigned to a Sunday with four exceptions: Holy Family Sunday within the octave of Christmas; the Baptism of the Lord on the Sunday following 6 January; Holy Trinity Sunday after Pentecost and Christ the King, the last Sunday in Ordinary Time.⁵⁹⁰ Seasoltz summarizes the result of this change stating:

Sundays now have an almost unique position in the calendar. They may be superseded only by feasts of the Lord, such as the feast of the Holy Family, the Baptism of the Lord, Holy Trinity, Christ the King and other major solemnities. In effect, the only Saints' feasts that can be celebrated on Sunday are the Birth of John the Baptist, the Apostles Peter and Paul,

⁵⁸⁸ NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 87. These celebrations are termed Commemoration, a classification apart from Solemnity, Feast, Obligatory Memorial and Optional Memorial. Only the proper Collect is permitted.

⁵⁸⁹ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES (CONSILIUM), *General Norms for the Liturgical Year and the Calendar*, 21 March 1969, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1969, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 442, 1155-1167, here, 1158-1159, no. 60. For instance, if the Solemnity of the Annunciation of the Lord occurs during Holy Week, it is always transferred to the Monday after the Second Sunday after Easter. Celebrations of a lower rank that would occur in similar celebrations are omitted that year (see *ibid.*, no. 60).

⁵⁹⁰ See *General Norms for the Liturgical Year*, nos. 4-6. Article 7 adds that Epiphany, Ascension and Corpus Christi are assigned to a Sunday in places where they do not bear an obligation. Several episcopal conferences had obtained the faculty to move the celebration of the solemnities of Epiphany, Ascension and Corpus Christi to a nearby Sunday and have the obligation to attend Mass on the proper date removed (see SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 150).

the Assumption of Our Lady, All Saints and patronal feasts. In Advent, Lent and the Easter season, Sundays have absolute priority.⁵⁹¹

2.11.3 – Ember Days and Rogation Days

The *GNLYC* indicates that Rogation Days and Ember Days are occasions for prayers for such things as various human needs.⁵⁹² “Their celebration is to be adapted to cultural conditions, and the national conferences of bishops are to determine when they are to be celebrated and the forms that the celebrations should take. Mass formulas for such celebrations are provided in the new Roman Missal.”⁵⁹³

The Rogation Day of 25 April, the Greater Litany, is abolished in GRC/1969 on the basis that it was a distinctly Roman event and always coincides with the feast of St. Mark

⁵⁹¹ SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 152. When undertaking consideration of the sanctification of Sunday, the CDF and the Sacred Congregation for Clergy became involved, as the matter seemed to be outside the expertise of Consilium. The Sacred Congregation for Clergy sent a questionnaire to episcopal conferences to obtain data to discuss at a plenary session. The same Congregation asked the CDF for its views. The CDF in turn queried its members and *periti* on three points: regarding the sanctification of Sunday, could it be possible to grant a weekday for certain circumstances or categories of persons to fulfill the obligation to assist at Mass? Could some major feasts other than those mentioned be transferred to Sundays? Should the Sunday obligation continue to be serious? (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 324-325). Meeting on 6 March 1972, members of the Sacred Congregations for Clergy, for the Doctrine of the Faith and of Sacred Rites decided a document would be produced in response to these and other questions that included a section on doctrine by the CDF and a section on regulation by the Congregation for Clergy. “At this point a lengthy correspondence began between the three Congregations, the Secretariat of State and the episcopal conferences. The whole business became so entangled that the document was never published” (ibid., 325). Ultimately, the matter was never addressed by these bodies. The precept to assist at Sunday Mass already existed in the *CIC/17* c. 1248, and was retained similarly in *CIC/83* c. 1247: “On Sundays and other holy days of obligation, the faithful are obliged to participate in the Mass. Moreover, they are to abstain from those works and affairs which hinder the worship to be rendered to God, the joy proper to the Lord’s Day, or the suitable relaxation of mind and body.”

⁵⁹² *General Norms for the Liturgical Year*, no. 45. In the unofficial Commentary provided by Consilium mentioned above, it is stated: “By means of devotional practices, instruction, prayer and works of penance and mercy, the Church, according to traditional practices, ‘completes the formation of the faithful during the various seasons of the year’ (SC, no. 105). These celebrations recur at certain times of the year and include the great litanies of 25 April, the lesser litanies (rogation days) and the ember days” (NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, 70).

⁵⁹³ SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 154. These are the Masses for Various Needs and Occasions. There are euchological texts for some 49 of these Masses for Various Needs and Occasions, but none specified for the Ember or Rogation Days. Among them are two sets of texts for “At Seedtime” and one for “After the Harvest” which may reflect an aspect of the theme of these days appropriately. The texts for these days as they exist in *MR/1962* do not appear to have been carried into the post-Vatican II Missals (see *MR/2008usa*, 1137-1140, nos. 27 A, 27 B and 28). This is perhaps due to the expectation that the focus of these days would be changed as proposed. In that case, several of the Mass formularies offered in the OF Missal would be appropriate for use on Ember and Rogations Days.

the Evangelist. Observance of the Rogation Days prior to the Ascension of the Lord, the Lesser Litanies, is something left to the episcopal conferences.⁵⁹⁴ These bodies may decide to suppress them, keep them as they are or even transfer them to days that do not immediately precede the Ascension.⁵⁹⁵

The same *GNLYC* presents a shift of focus for observance of the Ember Days. Rather than thanksgiving for the fruit of the earth and human labor that accompanies it, these days are to be in some way for those who are in want of these material necessities.⁵⁹⁶ That direction is logically accompanied by prayerful attention to the needs of those who are unemployed and other such matters of the good of persons. “The dates are to be fixed by the bishops’ conferences, which will also decide how often they are to occur; suitable votive Masses will be used, those, that is, which are most in harmony with their object.”⁵⁹⁷ Non-specific Mass formularies are provided in the *MR/1969* in the Votive Masses for Various Needs and Occasions.⁵⁹⁸ Bugnini records, “In an audience granted to Father Bugnini on 6 November 1971, the Pope would insist that the periods which replace the Ember Days be carefully determined by the conferences and that they be also days of prayer

⁵⁹⁴ See *General Norms for the Liturgical Year*, no. 46.

⁵⁹⁵ See SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 15.

⁵⁹⁶ See *General Norms for the Liturgical Year*, no. 45.

⁵⁹⁷ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 15. See also BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 321.

⁵⁹⁸ See *General Norms for the Liturgical Year*, no. 47. The later *Calendaria particularia* of 1970 would reiterate, “It is for the conference of bishops to decide for its own region how the celebrations corresponding to the rogation days, which may be suppressed, and ember days are to be observed. The conference is therefore to decide the time and number of days for rogations and also the time, number and purpose of the days corresponding to the ember days. For such days, the conference is likewise to specify which votive Masses are to be used on those days from among those given in the new edition of the Roman Missal for various needs and occasions” (SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, *Calendaria particularia*, Instruction on the revision of particular calendars and of the propers for offices and Masses, 24 June 1970, in *AAS*, 62 [1970], 651-663, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 481, 1245-1256, here, 1253, no. 38).

for ecclesiastical vocations.”⁵⁹⁹ It is noted that these observances were particularly dear to Paul VI.⁶⁰⁰

2.11.4 – Advent

According to some authors, the penitential nature of Advent has been eliminated; it is to be exclusively a time of joyful and hopeful waiting for the coming of the Lord.⁶⁰¹ However, the actual words of the *GNLYC* in translation, state: “Advent has a twofold character: as a season to prepare for Christmas when Christ’s first coming to us is remembered as a season when that remembrance directs the mind and heart to await Christ’s Second Coming at the end of time. Advent is thus a period for devout and joyful expectation.”⁶⁰²

⁵⁹⁹ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 321, footnote 39. Already in 1970, Sheppard had written, “The Ember days are to be days of prayer for peace, justice, for those in want and of thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth. The dates are to be fixed by the bishops’ conferences, which will also decide how often they are to occur; suitable votive Masses will be used, those, that is, which are most in harmony with their object” (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 15).

⁶⁰⁰ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 214, footnote 19. See also *Notitiae*, 9 (1973), 273, and *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 405. Bugnini recalls from a letter proposed by Consilium: “The [episcopal] conferences were urged to set aside special times of the year for prayer intentions (a replacement for the Ember Days); it was emphasized that these intentions should always include prayer for priestly and religious vocations” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 214).

⁶⁰¹ For example, Sheppard holds, “Advent no longer has any penitential characteristics and becomes solely a period of joyful awaiting of the Lord’s coming” (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 14). He believes that, borrowing from the East, revision to Advent, particularly the Fourth Sunday, will bring to light the Old Testament patriarchs and foreshadowing of the birth of the Lord from the Virgin. This would be somewhat reflective of the medieval feast on 22 December of the *Expectatio partus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary (see SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 14). Bugnini holds that, with Advent focused solely on the coming of the Lord, the twofold aspect of this is brought out. The second coming is highlighted in the first two weeks of Advent; the historical Nativity becomes the focus from 17-24 December (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319). Augé intimates a slightly more inclusive position: “Advent is therefore not a penitential time that looks forward to the return of the Lord for judgment but rather a celebration of the Incarnation, and only in that light a time of waiting for the Parousia” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 203). During the reform of the Roman Calendar by Consilium, the CDF, when reviewing changes, stated that “Advent is not only joyful expectation but also a time of penance” (ibid., 310). To this, Consilium responded, “The aspect of interior renewal as an element in repentance was to be brought out in the readings” (ibid., footnote 14). Regardless of outlook on the season, “Violet or purple is used in Advent” as the color of the vestments/paraments, evoking penance (see SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, *General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, art. 308, d, in *DOL*, doc. 208, 525, remaining in *GIRM/2008usa*, no. 346, d).

⁶⁰² *GNLYC*, no. 39. It does not state that “devout ... expectation” precludes devout penitential preparation. Because Ordinary Time ends with readings that look forward to the Parousia, culminating in the

The same norms indicate that Advent begins with First Vespers of the Sunday that falls on 30 November, or that nearest to it, and ends with First Vespers of Christmas.⁶⁰³ Each weekday from 17-24 December has a Mass formulary proper to it, which had not previously been the case. Until 16 December, the weekdays each have a proper Collect and scripture reading. The eschatological aspect is pronounced more in the first two weeks in both the scripture and euchological texts with the remaining time, particularly from 17 December, more focused upon preparation for the historical Nativity at Christmas.⁶⁰⁴ This arrangement is not without criticism.⁶⁰⁵

2.11.5 – Christmas, Christmastide and Epiphany

According to the *GNLYC*, the season of Christmas has been reformed. It will begin with First Vespers of Christmas and ends with the Sunday after Epiphany.⁶⁰⁶ The beginning of the season remains on the eve of Christmas and continues through either the Sunday after Epiphany or the Sunday after 6 January in those places where the Epiphany is celebrated on Sunday. In other words, it ends with the celebration of the Baptism of the

solemnity of Christ the King as the last Sunday of Ordinary Time, necessarily the Sunday before Advent, the “pre-Advent” period mentioned by Jungmann, above, has been retained.

⁶⁰³ See *GNLYC*, no. 40.

⁶⁰⁴ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 202-202. Concerning the rearrangement of scriptural texts for the Advent Mass formularies, see A. CARIEDO, “Il lezionario del Tempo di Avvento: Nell’attesa della tua venuta,” in *Il Messale Romano del Vaticano II: Orazionale e Lezionario*, (coll. Quaderni di Rivista Liturgica 6) Turin-Leumann, (1984), 1:39-70. Concerning the euchological texts of those same Mass formularies, see M. AUGÉ, “Le collette di Avvento-Natale-Epiphania nel Messale Romano,” in *Rivista Liturgica*, 59 (1972), 614-627; B. BAROFFIO, “Le orationi dopo la comunione del Tempo di Avvento,” in *Rivista Liturgica*, 59 (1972), 649-662; G. FRANCESCONI, “Per una lettura teologico-liturgica dei prefazi di Avvento-Natale-Epiphania del Messale Romano,” in *Rivista Liturgica*, 59 (1972), 628-648; F. BROVELLI, “Le orazioni del Tempo di Avvento e di Natale,” in *III Messale Romano del Vaticano II: Orazionale e Lezionario*, in *Rivista Liturgica*, 6, Turin-Leumann, (1984), 1:97-136. Cf. AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 203, footnote 54. *MR/1970* and *MR/1975* contain Mass formularies for each Sunday of Advent and for each individual weekday from 17-25 December. For the weekdays up to and including 16 December, there is one single daily Mass formulary, which was simply repeated daily (see *MR/1975*). From the promulgation of *MR/1985* to the present, there is a unique Mass formulary for each Sunday and weekday of the season of Advent (see *MR/2008usa*).

⁶⁰⁵ Seasoltz observes that the season of Advent is left somewhat ambiguous with its shift of focus (see SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 153-154).

⁶⁰⁶ See *GNLYC*, no. 33.

Lord.⁶⁰⁷ Therefore, Epiphanytide, the *Tempus Epiphaniae* in the EF, which begins with the feast on 6 January, has been deleted from GRC/1969. The Advent, Christmas and Epiphany seasons are classed together under the title “The Manifestation of the Lord.”⁶⁰⁸

The custom of celebrating three Masses for Christmas Day remains as an option in the OF for every priest.⁶⁰⁹ If one chooses to do so, he must celebrate them according to the sequence and general timing of night, dawn and day, rather than one immediately after the other.⁶¹⁰ These Masses retain the focus found in *MR*/1962: the Mass at night highlights the historical birth, the Mass at dawn highlights the strength of Christ the Light and the Mass during the day, the original Roman Mass for Christmas, contains the Johannine Overture, “raising the feast in its significance for man’s salvation far above a romanticization which can be problematic and from a consumerism which falsifies its very core.”⁶¹¹

Yet a fourth Mass formulary has been added, that for use as a Vigil Mass. The Holy Gospel therein is that of Matthew 1:1-25, the genealogy of the Lord. In places that do not celebrate vigils or anticipated Masses, this Mass is the last Mass of Advent.⁶¹²

⁶⁰⁷ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 153.

⁶⁰⁸ See *GNLYC*, no. 32.

⁶⁰⁹ See *ibid.*, no. 34.

⁶¹⁰ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 197. The current rubric reads: “On the Nativity of the Lord all Priests may celebrate or concelebrate three Masses, provided the Masses are celebrated at their proper times” (*MR*/2008usa, 36).

⁶¹¹ KUNZLER, *The Church’s Liturgy*, 416.

⁶¹² Under such circumstances, the arrangement becomes awkward; it contains the *Gloria* and propers for the Eucharistic Canon. Additionally, the difficult Gospel selection makes it a reasonable temptation for a celebrant to choose the readings from the Mass *in nocte* instead (see KUNZLER, *The Church’s Liturgy*, 416). If one attends all the Christmas Masses, the purpose of the euchological texts becomes known: the grand mystery, from the earthly genealogy of the Lord to the proclamation that he is the divine Word who was with God and is God incarnate, is expressed fully. At least for the year 1967, those places that did not anticipate Masses the day prior were instructed to use the Mass of 23 December rather than the new vigil Mass formulary for Christmas (see SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Declaration *Cum Dominica IV Adventus*, on the evening Mass for 23 December 1967, 12 December 1967, in *Notitiae*, 3 [1967], 428, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 447, 1174-1175).

The Christmas Octave has been retained as well as the traditional feasts celebrated within it.⁶¹³ This makes the days within the octave of lower rank than those of the Octave of Easter. While there is no rank assigned to the Christmas Octave in the GRC/1969, it becomes clear that the days within this octave are different from those of Easter's Octave. This retains some harmony with the past.

Christmastide has been retained but radically reordered. According to Bugnini, Christmas ends on the Sunday after Epiphany; the Holy Name of Jesus is assumed into 1 January, Mary Mother of God; Holy Family is transferred to the Sunday within the Octave and the Baptism of the Lord is celebrated on the Sunday after Epiphany.⁶¹⁴

The view prevailed that 1 January should be restored the feast of the Motherhood of Mary. This feast hearkens to the ancient Roman liturgy and links Rome with the East where, on 26 December, Our Lady is "congratulated" (*Mansourati*). In the texts of the Mass, the Marian feast is given primacy, although other themes are mentioned⁶¹⁵ As a consequence, the unparalleled composite celebration of 1 January has become the Solemnity *In octava Nativitatis Domini, Sollemnitas Sanctae Dei Genetricis Mariae*, the oldest Marian feast of the Roman Church.⁶¹⁶ Due to the focus of the celebration, the 11 October Feast of the Motherhood of Mary was abolished.⁶¹⁷

Consilium concluded "that the Gallican theme"⁶¹⁸ of the Circumcision should be eliminated. The Holy Name of Jesus is also recalled on this day.⁶¹⁹ Thus, the specific

⁶¹³ See *GNLYC*, no. 35.

⁶¹⁴ See *ibid.*, nos. 33-38, and BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319.

⁶¹⁵ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 306-307, footnote 5.

⁶¹⁶ See SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 14, and SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 153.

⁶¹⁷ *Ibid.*, *The New Liturgy*, 14.

⁶¹⁸ More precisely, the historical event recounted in the Holy Gospel. See Luke 2:21.

⁶¹⁹ "1 January, the octave day of Christmas, is the solemnity of Mary, Mother of God. It also recalls the conferral of the Holy Name of Jesus" (*GNLYC*, no. 27).

celebration of the Holy Name of Jesus, on the Sunday between 1 January and the Epiphany, is abolished. The reasons given for this are that the Gospel reading of the feast is shared with that of 1 January and that the feast is a relatively new one, dating to 1721 in response to a request of Emperor Charles VI.⁶²⁰ A votive Mass of the Holy Name of Jesus was retained but reformed. No attention is given to the secular New Year.⁶²¹

In October of 1966, Consilium took up discussion of the Feast of the Holy Family of Jesus, Mary and Joseph, which had been introduced by Leo XIII on 14 June 1892 by means.⁶²² By that time, many regions were celebrating the Epiphany on the Sunday after 6 January, impeding that Sunday, which had been celebrated as the feast of the Holy Family. Consilium decided not to suppress the feast because “this feast had undeniable pastoral advantages and fitted nicely into the Christmas season from the viewpoint of the ideas it conveyed.”⁶²³ It was decided that the feast would occupy the Sunday within the Octave of Christmas.⁶²⁴ The Feast of the Holy Family is celebrated on Friday, 30 December, when the Octave Day falls on Sunday.

⁶²⁰ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 14.

⁶²¹ It was thought that the newly introduced Universal or Prayer of the Faithful should be used for recalling New Year’s Day, although some of the Fathers would have liked to see it mentioned in the texts of the Mass.

⁶²² LEO XIII, Apostolic letter in forma brevis *Neminem fugit* de institutione Consociationis Sacrae Familiae unice et universalis, 14 June 1892, in *ASS*, 25 (1892-1893), 8-15, partial English translation available at <https://www.the-american-catholic.com/2015/12/27/breve-neminem-fugit/> (11 January 2022). This was followed by a decree presenting the Mass and Divine Office formularies for the newly established feast of the Holy Family (see SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree *de novo Officium et Missa S. Familiae*, 14 June 1893, in *ASS*, 26 [1893-1894], 52-53).

⁶²³ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 309.

⁶²⁴ Bugnini states that the feast of the Holy Family “highlights the mystery of the incarnation whereby the Son of God acquires a fully human place in the family [...] and because the feast of Christmas reunites so many families around the domestic hearth. On both accounts the feast serves as the basis for timely pastoral reflections” (ibid.). This celebration is acknowledged as being out of place chronologically. The Holy Gospel pericope assigned for Lectionary Cycle Year A, Matthew 2:13-15, 19-23, begins, “When the magi had departed....”

In the GRC/1969, the Epiphany retains celebration of the three significant moments of manifestation of our Lord: to the Magi, at his baptism and through the events at the wedding in Cana.⁶²⁵ These themes are highlighted over the course of the new three-year *OLM* rather than on consecutive days following the feast of Epiphany as in the EF.

In the revision, the Epiphany lost its octave. As well, the Epiphany-minded Mass formularies of the Sundays after Epiphany of *MR/1962* were not carried over or used intact elsewhere in the OF.

2.11.6 – *Septuagesima*

Bugnini recalls, “On one occasion Pope Paul VI compared the complex make up of *Septuagesima*, Lent, Holy Week and Easter Triduum to the bells calling people to Sunday Mass. The ringing of them an hour, a half-hour, fifteen and five minutes before the time of Mass has a psychological effect and prepared the faithful materially and spiritually for the celebration of the liturgy.”⁶²⁶ With this level of devotion on the part of the Pontiff, it may be surprising that one of the most significant changes to the Temporal Cycle is the deletion of the season of *Septuagesima*.

Bugnini recalls, “There was disagreement on the suppression of the *Septuagesima* season. Some saw these weeks as a step toward Easter.”⁶²⁷ “Then, however, he continues, “The view prevailed that there should be a simplification: it was not possible to restore Lent to its full importance without sacrificing *Septuagesima*, which is an extension of Lent.”⁶²⁸ He adds, “[... B]y and large the present texts will continue in use....” Ultimately,

⁶²⁵ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 309.

⁶²⁶ *Ibid.*, 307, footnote 6.

⁶²⁷ See *Ibid.*

⁶²⁸ *Ibid.* The proceedings of *Coetus I* state that the season was abolished for the benefit of the faithful: “[T]he penitential character of the time of *Septuagesima* or pre-Lent is difficult for the faithful to understand without many explanations” (Schemata, no. 75, *de Calendario*, 3 [10 April 1965], 2. Cf. *ibid.*, 109, footnote 62). Later historical study has shown, however, that this period of pre-Lent arose organically from the

the days that had comprised *Septuagesima* and their Mass formularies were deleted.⁶²⁹ The entire season was assumed into the time *per annum* that follows the Baptism of the Lord.⁶³⁰

2.11.7 – Lent and the Fast

Inseparable from the observance of Lent is the fast. Three years prior to the promulgation of the GRC/1969, Paul VI issued Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* on fast and abstinence.⁶³¹ This document is influential in the reform of the Lenten season in the new Roman Calendar. In it, Paul VI states that “Lent retains its penitential character.”⁶³² Obligatory days of penance throughout the Church, East and West, comprise all Fridays as well as Ash Wednesday for the West or the first day of Great Lent for the East.⁶³³ It states succinctly, “The substantial observance of these days is of grave obligation.”⁶³⁴

enthusiasm of the faithful (see CALLEWAERT, “L’oeuvre liturgique,” 647–648, in PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 109, footnote 64). Nocent said the abolishment of *Septuagesima* was necessary for the faithful to see the liturgical year in a clear way, and ‘not be confused by diverse “anticipations” (see Schemata, no. 65, *de Calendario*, 2 [15 March 1965], 13). Cf. PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 109, footnote 63.

⁶²⁹ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 307. When the *Coetus* for assigning formularies for the Mass and Divine Office received the calendar within which they were to work, there was no place for *Septuagesima* because *Coetus* I had eliminated it (see PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 102, footnote 36). In the revised Missal and Divine Office, no formulary has been retained; not even a pair of texts from a single formulary appears in them (see PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 102, 103, and 103, footnote 38).

⁶³⁰ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319, and PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 98.

⁶³¹ PAUL VI, Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* on fast and abstinence, 17 February 1966, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 177-198, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 358, 936-943. The document was promulgated exceptionally in *L’Osservatore Romano* and the prescriptions therein became effective 23 February 1966.

⁶³² See *Paenitemini*, II, §1.

⁶³³ See *ibid.*

⁶³⁴ See *ibid.* The following query was submitted to the Sacred Congregation for the Council: Is the grave obligation to be understood as pertaining to each individual day of obligatory penance prescribed for the whole Church or is it to be understood as pertaining to the overall observance of penitential days with the prescribed practice? To the first part of the question, the Sacred Congregation replied “No.” To the second part of the question, the same responded: “Yes. In other words, a person sins gravely by the omission, without any excuse, of a considerable portion, quantitatively or qualitatively, of the overall prescribed penitential observance” (SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE COUNCIL, Reply to a query in the Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini*, no. II, §2, 24 February 1967, in *AAS*, 59 [1967], 229, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 359, 943).

The document clarifies that abstinence⁶³⁵ is the type of penance to be observed on the specified days unless a particular Friday is a holy day of obligation. Both fast⁶³⁶ and abstinence apply as the forms of penance to be observed on Ash Wednesday for the West, the first day of Great Lent for the East as well as on Good Friday.⁶³⁷ Pastors and parents are exhorted to educate and form those who are younger with a true sense of penance.⁶³⁸ The tenets and requirements of *Paenitemini* were canonized in the Code of Canon Law promulgated in 1983, particularly in cc. 1249-1253.⁶³⁹

⁶³⁵ The document describes abstinence as forbidding the use of meat, but not the use of eggs, dairy and condiments containing animal fat (see *Paenitemini*, III, §1). The faithful are bound to abstinence from the age of fourteen years (see *ibid.*, IV).

⁶³⁶ The document describes fasting as taking only one full meal a day but does not forbid taking some food in morning and evening. Approved local custom determines quantity and quality thereof and is to be observed (see *Paenitemini*, III, §2). The faithful are bound to fast from the age of twenty-one until the beginning of the sixtieth year (see *ibid.*, IV). Particular law in the United States of America lowers the age of obligatory fasting to 18. This was promulgated by means of a memorandum to all diocesan bishops in the territory of the episcopal conference, 29 February 1984 (see <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/canon-law/complementary-norms/canons-1252-and-1253-observance-of-fast-and-abstinence.cfm> [11 January 2022]). With the promulgation of *Paenitemini*, the obligatory days of fast for the Lenten season of *Quadragesima* have been reduced from forty to two: Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, a reduction of 95%.

⁶³⁷ See *Paenitemini*, II, §2.

⁶³⁸ See *ibid.*, IV. Based upon the provisions of *Christus Dominus* no. 34, 4, the local episcopal conference may transfer the penitential day for good reason and while respecting Lent. The same body may also substitute other forms of penance, especially considering charitable works and devotional prayer and practice in place of fast and abstinence (see *Christus Dominus*, 38, and *Paenitemini*, VI, §1). Every bishop and pastor, every superior of a clerical religious order, for their own respective subjects, may grant individuals or families dispensation or mitigation from the penitential exercises of fast and abstinence and describe devotional acts in their place (see *ibid.*, VIII, and X, §1). Further exceptions to the requirements of fast and abstinence presented in *Paenitemini* appear in the 1977 decree *Apostolatus maris*, from the Sacred Congregation for Bishops: “No. 2. Seamen are dispensed from the law of fast and abstinence in the Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* ch. III, II, §§2 and 3. Nevertheless, it is suggested that when they take advantage of this dispensation they compensate by some appropriate act of devotion and that as far as possible they keep both fast and abstinence on Good Friday. No. 3: All those who are aboard ship for any reason as well as those who have any dealings with the ship are dispensed during the voyage from the law of fast and abstinence given in the Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* ch. III c, II §§ 2 and 3, but with the qualification in the preceding number being observed” (SACRED CONGREGATION FOR BISHOPS [PONTIFICAL COMMISSION ON MIGRANTS AND TRAVELERS], Decree *Apostolatus maris*, on the pastoral care of seamen and ship passengers, 24 September 1977, Part II, ch. II, nos. 2-3, in *AAS*, 69 [1977], 737-746, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 330, 840-842, here, 841-842).

⁶³⁹ The current *Code* exhorts the faithful to penance, in the general timbre of *Paenitemini*. *CIC/83*, c. 1249 accentuates the power of the faithful doing penance together on certain appointed days: “The divine law binds all the Christian faithful to do penance each in his or her own way. In order for all to be united among themselves by some common observance of penance, however, penitential days are prescribed on which the Christian faithful devote themselves in a special way to prayer, perform works of piety and charity, and deny themselves by fulfilling their own obligations more faithfully and especially by observing fast and

When compared to its iteration in *MR/1570* and *MR/1962*, Lent in the *GRC/1969* remains structurally similar. The *GNLYC* states, “The Lenten liturgy [...] prepares the faithful, who recall their baptism and do penance in preparation for Easter.”⁶⁴⁰ Lent is preparation for celebrating the entire paschal mystery, preparation for which is primarily accomplished through prayer and penance as well as the formation of catechumens.⁶⁴¹

The season retains its name of *Quadragesima* and its beginning on Ash Wednesday.⁶⁴² In order to retain its eponymous forty days, Sundays excluded, Lent runs from Ash Wednesday to the Mass in *Cena Domini* on Holy Thursday, exclusive.⁶⁴³ In this fashion, the season of Lent is distinguished from the Triduum,⁶⁴⁴ which itself becomes redefined.

abstinence, according to the norm of the following canons.” *CIC/83*, c. 1250 parallels *Paenitemini*, II, §1: “The penitential days and times in the universal Church are every Friday of the whole year and the season of Lent.” *CIC/83*, c. 1251 parallels *Paenitemini*, III, §1 and *Paenitemini*, II, §2: “Abstinence from eating meat or some other food according to the prescripts of the conference of bishops is to be observed on every Friday of the year unless a Friday occurs on a day listed as a solemnity. Abstinence and fasting, however, are to be observed on Ash Wednesday and Good Friday.” The canon slightly mitigates the exception granted in *Paenitemini*, II, §2, which provides the exception from abstinence if the Friday is a holy day of obligation. The canon extends the exception to all Solemnities. *CIC/83*, c. 1252 closely reflects *Paenitemini*, IV, but mentions the age of majority versus the specific age of twenty-one: “The law of abstinence binds those who have completed their fourteenth year of age. The law of fasting, however, binds all those who have attained their majority until the beginning of their sixtieth year. Nevertheless, pastors of souls and parents are to take care that minors not bound by the law of fast and abstinence are also educated in a genuine sense of penance.” The influence of *Paenitemini*, VI, §1 is apparent in *CIC/83*, c. 1253, which reflects the decree in spirit in a simplified way: “The conference of bishops can determine more precisely the observance of fast and abstinence as well as substitute other forms of penance, especially works of charity and exercises of piety, in whole or in part, for abstinence and fast.”

⁶⁴⁰ *GNLYC*, no. 27. This reflects the requirements set forth in *SC*, nos. 109, 109, a) and 110.

⁶⁴¹ *GNLYC*, no. 27.

⁶⁴² Much discussion ensued over the day to begin the Lenten season. A number of consultors wanted Lent to begin on the Sunday after Ash Wednesday. Bugnini observes, however, “A strictly penitential rite on Sunday would be a contradiction. Leaving the imposition of ashes on the preceding Wednesday was one way of adhering to tradition, but it had the drawback of keeping the association with Mardi Gras” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 307, footnote 7). The matter was remanded to Paul VI who insisted that Lent begin on Ash Wednesday, retaining the four days prior to the First Sunday, stating, “It would be admittedly difficult, and even questionable, to introduce [the four days prior to the First Sunday of Lent] for the first time in our day; but now that they have been accepted by all the peoples who follow the Roman Rite, it is not a good idea to suppress them, especially if the rite of the imposition of ashes is to be observed on the Wednesday before the first Sunday, as is now the case” (ibid., 310-311, footnote 15).

⁶⁴³ See *GNLYC*, no. 28.

⁶⁴⁴ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 191.

The penitential observances assigned for the Lenten season continues to begin on Ash Wednesday. The blessing and distribution of the ashes has been slightly simplified from that in the EF. The ritual has been repositioned to takes place after the Gospel or homily during the proper Mass.⁶⁴⁵

Bugnini states that “suppressed as a title is ‘Passiontide;’ the entire season is termed *Quadragesima*.”⁶⁴⁶ The penitential character of Lent receives emphasis during the first two weeks by means of the revised Mass formularies. The baptismal aspect receives primary emphasis during the next three weeks by the same means. The scriptures and Orations from antiquity on the Third, Fourth and Fifth Sundays of Lent are restored, i.e., the Samaritan, the Man Born Blind and the raising of Lazarus, respectively.⁶⁴⁷

What is Passion Sunday in the EF becomes styled the Fifth Sunday of Lent in the Ordinary Form. The following Sunday combines both Passion and Palm Sundays, with the commemoration of the Lord’s entry into Jerusalem. On that same day, one of the Passion

⁶⁴⁵ See AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 191. The OF Mass formularies provide a wide selection of scriptural texts for the days of Lent. The Sundays are unique in that there are more options than in other seasons. In all years, the first Sunday of Lent uses the temptation of the Lord in the desert; the second Sunday of Lent uses the Transfiguration. These are taken from Matthew, Mark and Luke, respectively, in Years A, B and C. Years B and C then continue in their own vein but always allow the readings from the corresponding Sunday of Lent in Year A, particularly if there are catechumens and celebration of the baptismal scrutinies, i.e., exorcisms (see AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 191-192). “The scrutinies should take place within the ritual Masses, [...] which are celebrated on the Third, Fourth and Fifth Sundays of Lent. The readings with their chants are those given for these Sundays in the Lectionary for Mass, Year A” (*MR/2008usa*, no. 146, 87). These same Gospel pericopes, i.e., the Samaritan woman (John 4:5-42), the healing of the man born blind (John 9:1-41) and the raising of Lazarus (John 11:1-45), are assigned in *MR/1570* for weekdays during Lent and continue in the same way as received in *MR/1962*.

⁶⁴⁶ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319. In practice, it appears only the title of Passiontide had been discontinued, as Bugnini literally states. In the OF, from the Fifth Sunday of Lent, focus shifts primarily to the Passion as it does in Passiontide as observed in the EF. Indeed, in the OF, there exists two prefaces for the season of Lent. The first is assigned for use up to the day before the Fifth Sunday of Lent, what is Passion Sunday I in the EF. The second is assigned for use from the Fifth Sunday of Lent through Palm Sunday and the first three days of Holy Week. This segmentation corresponds exactly to Passiontide as observed in the EF. Bugnini admits the existence of the essence of Passiontide without using the title. He states succinctly, “The final two weeks [of Lent] are dominated by preparation for the celebration of the passion” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319).

⁶⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 319.

accounts from the Synoptic Gospels is read.⁶⁴⁸ Because there is no longer the season of *Septuagesima* preceding Lent, use of the Alleluia discontinues on Ash Wednesday.⁶⁴⁹

The ritual for Palm Sunday remains relatively unchanged. It comprises a commemoration of the Lord's triumphal entry along with the blessing and distribution of palms. However, Matthew's account of the Passion is no longer strictly assigned to Palm Sunday. Rather, one each of the three Synoptic passion accounts is read in the new three-year cycle of the *OLM*. Therefore, the accounts from Mark and Luke are no longer read on the Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week as in the EF. Those days have proper readings in the same manner as other days.⁶⁵⁰

The season ends before the evening Mass of the Lord's Supper on Holy Thursday. The last Mass of the Lenten seasons is the Chrism Mass offered by the bishop on Holy Thursday morning.⁶⁵¹

2.11.8 – The Sacred Paschal Triduum

Some Consilium members expressed a desire that the *Triduum Sacrum* would comprise Good Friday, Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday.⁶⁵² This arrangement enjoys historical precedent.⁶⁵³ Others noted that the Last Supper is inseparable from the Passion.⁶⁵⁴ It was ultimately agreed that the Sacred Triduum begins Holy Thursday with the evening Mass.⁶⁵⁵

⁶⁴⁸ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 13-14.

⁶⁴⁹ By the time of *MR/1975* and following, each day of Lent has its own euchological text and Mass formulary.

⁶⁵⁰ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 13-14.

⁶⁵¹ See *ibid.*, 15. For an unusual exception, see SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE EVANGELIZATION OF PEOPLES, rescript (Antilles), allowing the blessing of oils on the evening of the Wednesday of Holy Week, 14 January 1969, prot. no. 6444/68, and *CLD*, vol. 7, 35-36, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 457, 1189.

⁶⁵² BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319.

⁶⁵³ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 13.

⁶⁵⁴ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 307, footnote 8.

⁶⁵⁵ The Mass of Sacred Chrism, then, when celebrated as customary on the morning of Holy Thursday, is the last Mass of Lent. In 1965, concelebration became permitted at the Holy Thursday morning Chrism Mass (see SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES [CONSILIUM], Decree *Quamplures Episcopi*, promulgating the text of changes in the Order of Holy Week, 7 March 1965, in *AAS*, 57 [1965], 412-413, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 454, 1186-1187, here, §2).

“It is not a preparation for Easter,” Sheppard observes, “but rather the celebration of the Christian Pasch: the passion, death and resurrection of Christ.”⁶⁵⁶ In order for it to include three days and yet still include the passion, death and resurrection, the triduum runs from the Thursday evening Mass of the Lord’s Supper until vespers on Easter Sunday.⁶⁵⁷ In an effort to emphasize what is celebrated in these sacred days, the name of the event has changed from *Triduum Sacrum* to the *Sacrum Triduum Paschale*.⁶⁵⁸ Therewith, the Easter Triduum is abolished. Rather than two consecutive celebrations of a triduum, there is one Sacred Paschal Triduum of Thursday evening to Sunday evening.

2.11.9 – Eastertide

As explored above, history reveals that the Easter Season is the first temporal season to have been celebrated in the Church, already in the second century and long prior to development of a structured observance of Lent to precede it.⁶⁵⁹ In order to restore some of the ancient sense to the Easter season being one unitary feast, the Sundays of Eastertide in the GRC/1969 have been renamed from Sundays “after Easter” to Sundays “of Easter.”⁶⁶⁰ These Sundays now rank in privilege along with those of Advent and Lent.⁶⁶¹

The Octave of Easter remains in place due to its connection to the period of mystagogy following the initiation of the catechumens at the Easter Vigil.⁶⁶² White Sunday has become the Second Sunday of Easter; its historical significance and its accompanying Easter rituals have been deleted. Each weekday Mass of Eastertide has a proper Collect,⁶⁶³

⁶⁵⁶ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319.

⁶⁵⁷ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 13, and SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 152.

⁶⁵⁸ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 152.

⁶⁵⁹ See *ibid.*, 152.

⁶⁶⁰ See *ibid.*, 13, and AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 182.

⁶⁶¹ *GNLYC*, no. 59.

⁶⁶² See *ibid.*, no. 24.

⁶⁶³ See SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 13.

which is now true in Advent and Lent as well.⁶⁶⁴ “So that the season shall contain precisely fifty days⁶⁶⁵ the octave of Pentecost has been abolished.”⁶⁶⁶ Eastertide in the OF concludes with the day of Pentecost because the historical event being celebrated fell on the Hebrew feast of Pentecost.⁶⁶⁷

The Ascension continues to be designated as the Thursday forty days after Easter in GRC/1969, but celebration of it may be moved to the following Sunday. *Tempus Ascensionis* is also abolished in the reordered calendar. “The days between the Ascension and Pentecost will give special emphasis to the coming of the Holy Spirit, thus compensating in some degree for the loss of the octave of Pentecost.”⁶⁶⁸ This period of time is to be one of expectation of the Holy Spirit; the Mass formularies have been created

⁶⁶⁴ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 320-321.

⁶⁶⁵ Bugnini asserts, “This is attested by the ancient and universal tradition of the Church, which has always celebrated the seven weeks of Easter as though they were a single day that ends with the feast of Pentecost. For this reason, the octave of Pentecost, which was added to the fifty days of Easter in the sixth century, has been abolished” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319).

⁶⁶⁶ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 153. The suppression of the Octave of Pentecost caused much concern. Bugnini recalls, in part, “This suppression, which was agreed upon only after some discussion, subsequently caused confusion and second thoughts. Perhaps the abrupt passage from the Solemnity of Pentecost to Ordinary Time made people very uneasy. In some areas, Pentecost is continued into the following day, which is a feast, and the shift to Ordinary Time is smoother. The suppression of the octave of Pentecost followed logically from consideration of the inherent structure of the Easter season. Pentecost is the octave Sunday after Easter. An octave of an octave is illogical. Scholars admitted this without difficulty...” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 319, footnote 38). Bugnini bolsters the decision by pointing out that the liturgical commission appointed by Pius XII in 1948 had also seriously considered this subject and elimination of the octave as a solution (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 320, footnote 38 continued from 319). However, the commission appointed by Pius XII did not abolish it, which may provide more support to those in opposition to its suppression than to Bugnini’s defense of it. Bugnini explains the conditions under which the suppression of the Octave of Pentecost was accepted, recalling, “The suppression was accepted with the expectation that the formularies of the octave would be used during the nine days of preparation for Pentecost. On this point again there were changes in mind, but the decision of the Fathers finally prevailed” (ibid., 307, footnote 9). It was further stated to Consilium that the octave of Pentecost could be abolished only if the Mass formularies of those days were used for the Masses between Ascension and Pentecost (see ibid., 310-311).

⁶⁶⁷ Acts 2:1: “When the day of Pentecost came, they were all together in one place” (NIV). That is, the Hebrew celebration as described in Deuteronomy 16:9, as the Feast of Weeks, seven weeks and one day after the first Sabbath during the feast of Unleavened Bread. In Exodus 23:16, the celebration is referred to as the Feast of the Harvest and in Numbers 28:26 as the Day of First Fruits. The precise length of days as fifty is prescribed in Leviticus 23:16.

⁶⁶⁸ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 13.

to express this.⁶⁶⁹ The OF has two Mass formularies for Pentecost: a vigil and a daytime. The euchological texts of the entirety of Eastertide attempt to stress that the whole of Eastertide is a season of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷⁰

During proceedings of Consilium, positioning the feast of the Holy Trinity or suppressing it included “heated discussion.” Some believed its celebration is a summary of the work of salvation, impoverishing the calendar if it were suppressed. “Various suggestions were made for transferring the feast to another day or combining it with another feast, for example, the Baptism of Jesus.”⁶⁷¹ It remains where it was and how it was. Its celebration in GRC/1969, with reformed euchological texts, coincides with that of the EF.

2.11.10 – *De Tempore*, after the Baptism of the Lord and after Pentecost

After all the seasons and their connected celebrations, there remains the rest of the year which has no name other than *de tempore*.⁶⁷² These times occupy roughly the same periods in the GRC/1969 as they did in GRC/1960, lengthened due to the elimination of *Septuagesima* and the Octave of Pentecost.

The first period *de tempore* begins the Monday following the Sunday after 6 January and ends the eve of Ash Wednesday, inclusive. The second begins the Monday after

⁶⁶⁹ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 320.

⁶⁷⁰ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 190. Augé adds, “It might be a minor detail, but it would probably be more meaningful if on Pentecost Sunday, the end of the Easter season, the liturgical color was not red but the same white that was used on the other days of the fifty-day season of Easter” (ibid.).

⁶⁷¹ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 307, footnote 10.

⁶⁷² “The post-Vatican II Reformers did not introduce the term *per annum* into the liturgical books, but they did put it to an entirely new use. *Per annum* is found in pre-1970 Office books, but not Missals. It designates prayers, antiphons or hymns that are used during more than one proper season. That is, prior to the post-Vatican II reforms, *per annum* was a collective term used to refer to more than one season, each of which had its proper name. There were no weeks *per annum*, but only *per annum* texts. Further, all the proper names designating periods of time in the pre-Vatican II calendar identify the seasons of the Church year with the mysteries of salvation (or the feasts which celebrate the mysteries) either by looking forward to them, as in the case of Advent, *Septuagesima*, and *Quadragesima* (Lent), or recalling them, as in the seasons of the Nativity, after Epiphany, Paschaltide and after Pentecost. The new *per annum* nomenclature abandons this custom” (PRISTAS, “Parachuted into Lent,” 103, footnote 40).

Pentecost and ends prior to First Vespers of the first Sunday of Advent.⁶⁷³ Sometimes viewed as a single bipartite season, it comprises thirty-three or thirty-four weeks.⁶⁷⁴ Because the Sundays therein are numbered sequentially, that is, with ordinal numbers, the *de tempore* periods have come to be known by the frequently misunderstood but nonetheless insipid name of “Ordinary Time.”

Each Sunday *de tempore* is given its own euchological texts in *MR/1969*, along with scripture texts that rotate through the new three-year cycle of Sunday readings found in the *OLM*. While it has been said that these Sundays “and their respective weeks [...] have been given a unity, a continuity and an internal cohesion,”⁶⁷⁵ in a season wherein the various aspects of the mystery of salvation unfold,⁶⁷⁶ the overall period *de tempore* in fact

⁶⁷³ See *GNLYC*, no. 44, and AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 204. These Sundays somewhat correspond in time to the Sundays after Epiphany and the Sundays after Pentecost in the *GRC/1960*. There are more such Sundays in the *GRC/1969*, however, since *Septuagesima* with its three Sundays have been abolished and assumed into the Sundays *per annum*.

⁶⁷⁴ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 14. The exact number of these Sundays is determined by the reckoning of the First Sunday in Advent. There is a maximum of thirty-four Sundays *per annum* (see SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 154). Some of these Sundays occur between the end of Christmastide and the beginning of Lent. The remainder occur from the Sunday after Pentecost up to and including the Feast of Christ the King, which was moved to the last Sunday *per annum* from its prior time of celebration on the last Sunday in October where it had been placed in order to be proximate to the celebrations of All Saints and All Souls (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 320).

⁶⁷⁵ AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 204. This is not ostensibly the case, however, as Augé himself explains the organization of Ordinary Time: “The Sundays of Ordinary Time may be thought of as Sundays in a pure state. They express, without any secondary specification, the mystery of Sunday as a weekly celebration of Easter. Ordinary Time celebrates the mystery of Christ (and the Church) in their totality every week, especially on Sunday” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 205-206, and cf. *GNLYC*, no. 43). “The Sundays and the weekdays of Ordinary Time derive their character especially from the biblical readings assigned by the [*OLM*]. Whereas the readings chosen for the seasons that have a particular liturgical character are chosen so as to be in harmony with those seasons, the readings of Ordinary Time work according to a principle of semi-continuity; that is to say, an entire book is read in a sequence, with some sections being omitted for pastoral reasons” (AUGÉ, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 204). He continues: “Sunday has three readings: the first from the Old Testament, the second from an Apostle (a letter or the Book of Revelation), and Gospel. Beginning with the third Sunday there is a semi-continuous reading of the synoptic Gospels: Matthew (Year A), Mark (Year B), and Luke (Year C). In Year B, given the brevity of Mark’s Gospel, five readings from John are inserted after the sixteenth Sunday. The Old Testament readings are thematically harmonized with the Gospels. The apostolic readings, also semi-continuous, are taken from the letters of Paul, James and Hebrews. The readings for the thirty-fourth Sunday, the last in Ordinary Time, celebrate Christ the universal King.” Of the formularies, he states, “The contents of the euchology for the Sunday Masses of this liturgical period consider the mystery of Christ in an extremely varied fashion” (Augé, “Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite,” 205, and cf. *MR/2008usa*, *Praenotanda*, no. 105-107, 32-33).

⁶⁷⁶ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 153.

celebrates no particular aspect of the mystery of salvation.⁶⁷⁷ At the time *MR/1969* was promulgated, the weekdays in Ordinary Time did not have their own Mass formularies. Therefore, it was “allowable to choose any of these Sunday Mass propers that is suitable in order to avoid repeating throughout the week the same Mass and to give greater variety.”⁶⁷⁸

In the reordered Roman Calendar, four solemnities occur on Sundays during the post-Pentecost period *de tempore*. These celebrations begin with Trinity Sunday and Corpus Christi Sunday and conclude with Christ the King, the last Sunday of the liturgical year. In the midst of this, the solemnity of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus is celebrated on the Friday that occurs 19 days after Pentecost.

2.12 – Changes to the Sanctoral Cycle of the General Roman Calendar

Sacrosanctum Concilium established the general principal by which the Saints and *Beati* would be retained, added or eliminated in the re-ordering of the Sanctoral Cycle: these are not to intrude upon the Temporal Cycle.⁶⁷⁹ In order to do this, celebrations in the revised Roman Calendar should be of universal significance, relegating the rest to local calendars.⁶⁸⁰ This should result in a Temporal Cycle that is more visible.⁶⁸¹

Revision of the Sanctoral Cycle, including studies performed, underwent five general stages: first report, second report, examination by the Curia, papal approval and publication and new revisions.⁶⁸² The *Coetus* produced 17 schemata, from the first introduced on 19 January 1965 to the seventeenth introduced on 14 December 1967.⁶⁸³

⁶⁷⁷ SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 154.

⁶⁷⁸ SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 14.

⁶⁷⁹ SC, no. 108. See JOUNEL, “Veneration of the Saints,” 241.

⁶⁸⁰ SC, no. 111.

⁶⁸¹ See also JOUNEL, “Veneration of the Saints,” 240.

⁶⁸² See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 306-318.

⁶⁸³ See *ibid.*

Using the GRC/1960 as a foundation, Consilium chose names considered to be of universal importance to retain, eliminated those whom scholars found to have little historical foundation and added other names in order to achieve a calendar they perceived would be universally appealing.⁶⁸⁴ Feasts that were removed were relegated to use in particular calendars.⁶⁸⁵ The dates of many remaining Saints were rearranged to their *dies natale*, the day of their “birthday” into heaven, or closer to it than had been the date previously assigned.⁶⁸⁶

On 18 April 1967, the draft was presented to Paul VI who ordered that it should be submitted to the CDF and the Congregation of Rites for examination. The draft was presented to these dicasteries that December.⁶⁸⁷

⁶⁸⁴ Seasoltz observes, “Geographically, all five continents are now represented, but Eastern Europe is poorly represented; Italian and French Saints are the most numerous. Chronologically, the selection covers the whole period of the Church’s history, but there is a certain emphasis put on the early martyrs whose acts are authentic. Most of those with dubious legends have disappeared from the Calendar” (SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 154). Similarly, Sheppard observes, “An effort has been made to make the new calendar an expression of the universality of holiness both in time and space. Thus in addition to many Saints who lived in the early days of the Church, or in the countries bordering the Mediterranean, there are now feast days for more recent Saints (St. Mary Goretti, for example) or of other parts of the world (the martyrs of Nagasaki for the Far East, those of Uganda, for Africa, St. Peter Chanel for Oceania, the Canadian martyrs for North America, St. Martin Porres for South America, St. Thomas More for England, St. Ansgar for the northern countries)” (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 16).

⁶⁸⁵ Some of those removed include ancient patrons. For example, Saints George, Nicholas, Elizabeth of Portugal, Catherine of Alexandria, not to mention the great Jesuit feast of the Most Holy Name of Jesus. Of relegating many Saints to local calendars, if the local Churches so choose, Jounel remarks, “This is in perfect agreement with tradition, for the cult of the Saints which arose around their tombs was for a long time confined to individual places, and when it spread further, it was inserted in the calendar in the modest form of the ‘memoria’” (JOUNEL, “Veneration of the Saints,” 241).

⁶⁸⁶ Ibid., 15-16. Nonetheless, as far as possible, Saints are assigned to the day of their *dies natale*. If this is not possible, other important dates are considered, such as that of episcopal ordination, canonization or transfer of relics. Saints of universal relevance are selected for inclusion in the GRC relegating others to local, national, regional or diocesan calendars according to their cult. Saints are chosen to bring out “universality of holiness in both time and space.” Saints from the Mediterranean and Saints from antiquity now appear among more recently canonized Saints and those from other parts of the world. A novel practice of Optional Memorial celebrations is introduced for many Saints who may have broad but not universal appeal or applicability (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 321; SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 12).

⁶⁸⁷ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 309-310, and footnote 11. Bugnini mentions no other such intervention; it may have been extraordinary.

On 18 May 1968, the Pope submitted his observations, followed by the reply and observations of the CDF.⁶⁸⁸ The resulting comments of the two Congregations and of Paul VI indicate that they were not initially enamored of the proposed reordered Roman Calendar. A joint commission was formed with three members each of the CDF and Consilium to examine the observations of the Pope along those of the CDF.⁶⁸⁹

It was agreed that twenty-three Saints ranked as Optional Memorials in the draft would be elevated to Obligatory Memorials. The Pope had personally named twelve of these.⁶⁹⁰

2.13 – Promulgation of GRC/1969

Once Consilium had made revisions, Paul VI accepted them, noting through the Secretariat of State that “the new group of Saints assigned an Obligatory Memorial instead

⁶⁸⁸ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 309-310, and footnote 11. The report from the CDF began with general considerations. The removal or reduction of several recently introduced feasts by popes was seen as dangerous to the practice of religion. “The principle that the liturgy of the season should take precedence over the cult of the Saints should be harmonized with the psychological and pedagogical considerations that underlie the Sanctoral and with ecumenical and traditional motifs” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 310). Consilium responded by explaining: “[...]n regard to the suppression of recently instituted feasts, that the intention was not to cast doubt on the validity of the magisterium’s action but rather to be faithful to liturgical principles. For these feasts, even a brief time after their institution, had little following in many regions. As for the cult of the Saints, this was ensured by the inclusion, for special reasons, of some Saints in the general calendar, while the others were left to local celebration” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 310, footnote 13). Further, the report from the CDF made several precise observations regarding the Sanctoral. It was insisted that the feasts of our Lady (Lourdes, Rosary, Motherhood, Queenship, Presentation, Immaculate Heart, the Dolors and the Name of Mary) remain obligatory celebrations. This insistence likewise included the feasts of Archangel Gabriel, Guardian Angels, Doctors of the Church and that the feast of the Visitation should continue to be 2 July. “The Pope asked that some Saints be given an Obligatory Memorial. All the requests were accepted, but Consilium reserved the right to study the cases of some Saints whose feasts regularly occur in Lent and for whom an Obligatory Memorial was therefore impossible, for example, Sts. Perpetua and Felicity and St. Patrick” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 311, footnote 16). Further specific points were made in the CDF response. For instance, it was stated that Optional Memorials should be minimal since they could tend to be used as “a convenient system for leveling down,” the cult of the Saints. Another point made was that the calendar should remain open to the further addition of Saints (see *ibid.*, 311). To this, Bugnini made reply, “The principle of the Optional Memorial proved, on the contrary, to be effective and acceptable. It made it possible to increase the number of Saints in the calendar and the number of requests for inclusion that are made to the Church; it also gave places and individuals ample room for choice” (*ibid.*, footnote 17).

⁶⁸⁹ See *ibid.*, 310 and 310, footnote 12.

⁶⁹⁰ See *ibid.*, 312 and 313, footnote 19.

of an Optional will all be added to the original list.”⁶⁹¹ Juridic motion took place in several swift steps:⁶⁹²

1. 14 February 1969, *Mysterii paschalis*, approving new norms for the calendar, was prepared and given to Paul VI.
2. 21 March 1969, decree *Anni liturgici ordinatione* promulgating GRC/1969 is issued from the Sacred Congregation of Rites.⁶⁹³
3. 21 March 1969, the *GNLYC* is promulgated.
4. 28 April 1969, The Pope announced publication of the new calendar at a consistory.⁶⁹⁴
5. 28 April 1969, the new Congregation for Divine Worship is created.⁶⁹⁵
6. 9 May 1969, the revised calendar was presented to the press.
7. 1 January 1970, GRC/1969 becomes effective.⁶⁹⁶
8. 17 May 1970, a notification indicates that the GRC would be used as presented on an interim basis throughout 1971.⁶⁹⁷

Mysterii paschalis and *Anni liturgici* were published together with the new calendar and the new *Ordo Missae*.⁶⁹⁸

In the consistory held 28 April 1969, Paul VI described the purpose of the changes resulting in the GRC/1969:

The goal in reworking [the liturgical calendar] has been to see to it that the elements of each liturgical season focus more clearly on the paschal mystery of Christ as the center of all liturgical worship. The new calendar also ratifies, as far as possible, the celebration of

⁶⁹¹ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 313.

⁶⁹² See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 151.

⁶⁹³ SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree *Anni liturgici ordinatione* promulgating the *editio typica* of the General Roman Calendar, 21 March 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 163-164, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 441, 1154-1155. *Anni liturgici* amplified *Mysterii paschalis* and included interim calendar adaptations for the Divine Office and Roman Missal. Shortly thereafter, *Decreto Sacrae Congregationis Rituum* presented similar interim adaptations for local calendars (see SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction *Decreto Sacrae Congregationis Rituum*, on the interim adaptation of particular calendars, 29 June 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 [1969], 283, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 480, 1244).

⁶⁹⁴ PAUL VI, Address *Nostrum hoc consistorium* to a consistory, excerpt on the liturgy and on the division of the Sacred Congregation of Rites into two congregations, 28 April 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 425-432, and in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 128, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 14 (1969-1970), 157-164, and in *DOL*, doc. 93, 238. See also SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 150-151.

⁶⁹⁵ See *Nostrum hoc consistorium*.

⁶⁹⁶ See *Mysterii paschalis*.

⁶⁹⁷ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Notification *In decreto*, on the calendar for 1971, 17 May 1970, in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 193, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 443, 1167.

⁶⁹⁸ See *Anni liturgici*, and BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 310, footnote 11.

Saints' feast days, choosing Saints whose life and example have importance for the universal Church; other Saints, less well known, are left to local veneration, in accordance with the true historical import of their lives and feast days. The aim of this approach is to show that holiness in the Church is relevant for all times and all places, and that all of the faithful, in every class of society, are summoned to seek after holiness....⁶⁹⁹

The GRC/1969 retains the feasts of the Lord apart from the Holy Name of Jesus and Most Precious Blood.⁷⁰⁰ SS. Peter and Paul are celebrated together on 29 June as customary but only one other feast for each is retained. The two celebrations of the Chair of Peter are combined on 22 February; the Conversion of St. Paul is celebrated on 25 January.

⁶⁹⁹ PAUL VI, Address to a consistory, *Nostrum hoc consistorium*, (excerpt), on the liturgy and on the division of the Sacred Congregation of Rites into two congregations, 28 April 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 425-432, and in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 128, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 93, 238. Cf. SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 150-151. Sheppard responded to the changes positively: "Explained in terms of the divisions of the Missal it means that the Proper of the Season is of primary importance and the Proper of Saints must not be allowed to impede the celebration of the paschal mystery either in its weekly form (on a Sunday) or in the annual unfolding of its preparation and realization in the course of the year" (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 10). He finds *Mysterii paschalis* and the reordered calendar the culmination of the liturgical movement that had been in progress. He observes, "The point is then made that the 'unfolding of the liturgical year is not just a commemoration of the actions by which Jesus Christ, by dying, has brought about our salvation. Nor is this unfolding merely a commemoration of past events so that the faithful, even the simpler, might be instructed and nourished by meditating on them....' The celebration of the liturgical year enjoys a sacramental power and a particular efficacy to nourish Christian life" (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 10). He then identifies a curiosity: "Certain feasts have been deleted from the calendar; they no longer figure even as optional commemorations. [...] It has been laid down that although their names, and some others, are removed from the general calendar of the Church, it is still allowed to keep their feasts at local level. [...] It certainly seems odd that these names should be allowed to continue to figure even in local calendars" (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 17-18). Seasoltz responds in generally positive terms as well but offers this observation regarding changes made to dates of celebrations: "There has been much shifting of dates in the new calendar, and in most cases the shift has restored the Saints to their proper feast days. In some cases, however, the dates have been changed for questionable reasons. It is unfortunate that better account was not taken of the tradition of local Churches. Although uniformity is generally desirable in the matter of liturgical calendars, local churches should have been given the right to honor their Saints on the traditional day. Thus, certain changes in the Sanctoral calendar have caused not only confusion but also some hostility, both of which could probably have been avoided" (SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 154-155).

⁷⁰⁰ Foley observes that in *SC*, the Fathers affirm the correlation between the Mass and the great mysteries of salvation (see, for example, *SC*, nos. 5 and 6). At the same time, the Constitution demands that the reformed rites "be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation" (*SC*, no. 34, and cf. *SC*, no. 62). This "may to some degree have unwittingly contributed to a flattening of a sense of mystery and hence mitigated any perceived need for recapitulation..." (FOLEY, "Reform of the Calendar," 339). For more on this matter, one might enjoy the intellectual calisthenics of another proponent of this theory found in C. PICKSTOCK, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1998, 170-76. She will posit that the architects of the post-Vatican II reformation of the *GRC/1969* and the Rites as well as *SC* itself operated under what she terms a "soft Cartesianism" that dismissed any value of liturgical recapitulation, resulting in a flat calendar. For a gentle philosophical wrangle with Catherine Pickstock's position, see BALDOVIN, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 13-32.

Apart from celebrations of Our Lady, the Apostles, Angels and St. Joseph, there are fifty-eight Obligatory Memorials and ninety-two Optional Memorials.⁷⁰¹ Comprising the distribution of antiquity are sixty-four Saints and *Beati* from the first millennium and seventy-nine from the second. “The centuries most heavily represented are the fourth (25), the sixteenth (17) and the eighteenth (17). With geographical distribution, there are 126 feasts of persons from Europe, eight from Africa, fourteen from Asia, four from the Americas and one from Oceania.”⁷⁰² The names removed from the calendar are remanded to particular calendars to be created by the episcopal conferences, diocesan bishops and families of religious. Particular calendars are to maintain a structure in accordance with that of the GRC/1969.⁷⁰³

Public reception of the reordered Sanctoral Cycle in GRC/1969 was more controversial than that of the Temporal Cycle. On 9 May 1969, Pierre Jounel held a press conference; it was a disaster. Catholic journalists and press had a strongly negative reaction. They were disturbed by the number of Saints and *Beati* that had been eliminated or demoted in rank, particularly their own patrons or those of their region, nation, religious group or diocese. The change of feast days for several popular remaining Saints was also found frustrating.

⁷⁰¹ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 322. Among other notable changes, it was decided that the feast of the Holy Family would be celebrated on 30 December if Christmas fell on a Sunday. All Souls would be celebrated if it fell on a Sunday. Consilium voted in favor of this based upon pastoral considerations and the paschal light the feast shines upon Christian death (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 315-317). See also L. CIAPPI, “Santissimo Corpo e Sangue di Cristo,” in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 275-278, and by the same author, “Variationes in Calendarium Romanum inductae,” in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 191. Overall, paring down of the number of celebrations in the Sanctoral Cycle was far less than what the Trent post-Conciliar reforms accomplished. Sheppard makes a constructive general criticism, stating: “In general, it can be said that those days which occur on a weekday (and whose celebration cannot supersede a Sunday) as a general rule pass by without any notice being taken of them by the ordinary member of a congregation. The change in the color of the vestments, the slight variations that occur in the proper of the Mass are actually ritual occasions affecting only the clergy and very few of the laity. It might have been more realistic to confine the Saints days to those which are really celebrated; [...] In other words, the revision of the calendar might well have been very much more drastic...” (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 17).

⁷⁰² SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 17.

⁷⁰³ See *ibid.*

“Thus, feelings were touched that resulted in an unfavorable reception of the new calendar.”⁷⁰⁴

Numerous requests flooded the Sacred Congregation from groups, nations and religious for their particular interest in the Sanctoral Cycle to be studied anew.⁷⁰⁵ Many cases were studied.⁷⁰⁶ A vote was taken on each individually; all changes were denied.⁷⁰⁷

2.14 – Post-Promulgation Modifications to the General Roman Calendar

On 20 September 1977, the Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Saints issued notification *On Some Aspects of the Calendar and Liturgical Texts*.⁷⁰⁸ In this document, the Congregation admits that a high number of beatifications and canonizations

⁷⁰⁴ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 315. Regarding the press conference *inter alia*, see *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 294-303. See also BUGNINI, “Il nuovo Calendario,” in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 14 May 1969, and in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 83 (1969), 160-201.

⁷⁰⁵ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 315. Bugnini states, “This explains why the preparation of the calendar was conducted with such secrecy. The subject was an explosive one. The secrecy hurt the preparation and reception of the calendar, but it also cut down on polemics. For the same reason, the Congregation refused, even later on, to accept requests for the introduction of new celebrations into the calendar, since to accept even a few would have brought down an avalanche of them” (ibid.).

⁷⁰⁶ Of changes, Bugnini concludes, “[O]ther requests came in or those already mentioned were renewed. There was a movement in favor of introducing a celebration of Mary as Mother of the Church. It was in fact allowed only for particular calendars, usually on the Monday after Pentecost. [...] But no further changes were accepted for the celebrations in the General Calendar” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 318-319).

⁷⁰⁷ See ibid., 318. The most requested feast for restoration was that of the Precious Blood. Consilium denied that this was important for the universal calendar and pointed out that local Churches were free to have it in their particular calendar. However, the name of the feast of Corpus Christi was expanded to be the “Solemnity of the Body and Blood of Christ.” Making St. Nicolas an Obligatory Memorial was raised strongly by many, even from the Congregation for Divine Worship. It was denied (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 315-317). See also L. CIAPPI, “Santissimo Corpo e Sangue di Cristo,” 275-278, and by the same author, “Variationes in Calendarium Romanum inductee,” in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 191. Shepherd concludes with a hopeful caveat: “If [the GRC/1969] does not suffer the fate of that of Pius V or Pius X, and in the course of a few years become overloaded once more with feast days, it should prove for some time to come a valuable aid in promoting a living liturgy, and with the number of optional celebrations it offers the possibility of some adaptation to local needs and aspirations” (SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy*, 18). For the future of the GRC/1969, Seasoltz cautions, “History has shown, however, that the feasts of Saints tend to infiltrate the temporal cycle. Such intrusions will have to be resisted. Ecumenical discussions have raised a number of important questions concerning the possibility of a fixed date for Easter and a common calendar shared by various Churches, but solutions to these problems have been left to the future” (SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 155).

⁷⁰⁸ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Notification on some aspects of the calendar and liturgical texts, 20 September 1977, available in Italian at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20000628_calendari_it.html (11 January 2022). English translations are my own.

had taken place since the Second Vatican Council. The consequence of these acts, coupled with an increase in rank of some existing celebrations, had been the reduction of unimpeded days in the calendar.⁷⁰⁹ This was making the overlay of local celebrations onto the General Roman Calendar increasingly difficult.

When considering a change of dates for certain solemnities, the Congregation admitted only those exceptions already in place. That is, the transfer of Epiphany, Ascension and Corpus Christi to the nearest Sunday, if they do not bear obligation;⁷¹⁰ the transfer of St. Joseph Day to a time outside of Lent, if it does not bear obligation and the episcopal conference finds it appropriate;⁷¹¹ the transfer of All Saints Day to another day more in harmony with local culture.⁷¹² Otherwise, the dates given in the General Roman Calendar are to be maintained. The Congregation urges, in general, to safeguard the liturgical year with great attention. Above all, the primacy of Sunday must be maintained.⁷¹³ The document reasserts that the celebrations in local calendars are “precisely regulated by current legislation.”⁷¹⁴

At the same time, the Congregation allows for some exceptions from the general norm requiring that the days of Lent, the Octave of Easter and the days from 17-24 December be

⁷⁰⁹ *Notification on Some Aspects of the Calendar and Liturgical Texts*, no. 3.

⁷¹⁰ See *GNLYC*, no. 7.

⁷¹¹ See *ibid.*, no. 56.

⁷¹² See *Calendaria particularia*, no. 36.

⁷¹³ “[... C]I si dovrà attenere alle date del Calendario Generale ed in genere bisogna salvaguardare con grande attenzione l’anno liturgico, e soprattutto il carattere del tutto particolare della domenica quale ‘giorno del Signore,’ in cui la Chiesa fa memoria della passione, della risurrezione e della gloria dei Signore Gesù (cf. *SC*, no. 106)” (*Notification on Some Aspects of the Calendar and Liturgical Texts*, no. 16).

⁷¹⁴ See *Notification on Some Aspects of the Calendar and Liturgical Texts*, no. 18. The Notification adds a note on the reform of calendars that pre-existed the Second Vatican Council. It stresses that the task of experts is, *inter alia*, a rigorous application of the norms prescribed by *Calendaria particularia*, nos. 18-20 regarding historical investigations (see *Notification on Some Aspects of the Calendar and Liturgical Texts*, no. 47).

free from sanctoral celebrations. During these times, it states, “a certain freedom is left with regard to one’s own holidays and one’s own non-Obligatory Memorials.”⁷¹⁵

The document draws attention once again to the allowance granted for observance of any Saint inscribed in the Roman Martyrology. This may be done on ferials *per annum* during Advent prior to 17 December, during Christmastide beginning on 2 January and during Eastertide. “In such periods, even when there is an Optional Memorial, the celebrant may offer both the Mass of the feria and that of a Saint inscribed on that day in the Roman Martyrology.”⁷¹⁶

In an anticipatory way, John Paul II approved *editio typica tertia* of the post-Vatican II Roman Missal in 2000.⁷¹⁷ In it was included additional Eucharist Prefaces, a revised and amplified *GIRM*, additional feasts in the Sanctoral Cycle, especially of some recently canonized Saints as well as additional Mass formularies and collects for Various Needs and Occasions. Notably, the feast of the Most Holy Name of Jesus was restored as an Optional Memorial on 3 January,⁷¹⁸ and its counterpart, the feast of The Holy Name of the Blessed Virgin Mary, was restored as an Optional Memorial on 12 September. At the same time, the feast of St. Catherine of Alexandria was restored as an Optional Memorial on 25

⁷¹⁵ “[... S]i lascia una certa libertà per quanto riguarda le feste proprie e le memorie proprie non obbligatorie” (*Notification on Some Aspects of the Calendar and Liturgical Texts*, no. 17). This is unclear. Perhaps it intimates an openness on the part of the Holy See to consider approval of local celebrations on impeded days on a per-case basis.

⁷¹⁶ “In tali periodi, anche quando c’è una memoria facoltativa, egli può celebrare sia la messa della feria che quella di un Santo iscritto quel giorno nel Martirologio Romano” (*Notification on Some Aspects of the Calendar and Liturgical Texts*, no. 33).

⁷¹⁷ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Decree *Tertio ineunte millennio* concerning the third typical edition, 20 April 2000, prot. no. 143/00/L.

⁷¹⁸ With the release of the revised Roman Missal in March 2002, this feast was restored, with a full formulary of euchological texts, placed on 3 January as an Optional Memorial. In the composition, the Holy Name of Jesus does not appear in any of the proper Orations of the day or their conclusions, nor in the Communion Antiphon. It appears only in the Entrance Antiphon (Phil. 2:10-11) which, in widespread practice, is omitted or replaced.

November. With the canonization of Faustina Kowalska on 30 April 2000, the Second Sunday after Easter became styled *Dominica II Paschae seu de divina misericordia*.⁷¹⁹

On 25 December 2006, the Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Saints issued another notification regarding the further inscriptions of Saints into the GRC.⁷²⁰ Not unlike that issued almost thirty years earlier in 1977, this Notification draws attention to yet more beatifications and canonizations resulting in further reduction in unimpeded free days in the General Roman Calendar.⁷²¹ The Congregation admits that further additions to the calendar continued to pose difficulties for those attempting to compose and insert particular calendars therein; the particular calendars themselves had often increased in numbers of celebrations. Further additions would also make it difficult to offer the traditional Saturday Memorial of the Blessed Virgin Mary.⁷²² The Congregation announced stricter criteria by stating, “Therefore, it will be difficult for the future to make further entries without applying some strict criteria.”⁷²³

⁷¹⁹ During the canonization ceremony, John Paul II declared: “It is important then that we accept the whole message that comes to us from the word of God on this Second Sunday of Easter, which from now on throughout the Church will be called ‘Divine Mercy Sunday’” (JOHN PAUL II, Homily at the canonization of Blessed Faustina Kowalska, Declaration of Divine Mercy Sunday, 30 April 2000, in *AAS*, 92 [2000], 670-674, here, no. 4, English translation available at http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/homilies/2000/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_20000430_faustina.html [11 January 2022]). A plenary indulgence was attached to related devotions performed on that day.

⁷²⁰ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Notification On the insertion of Saints into the General Roman Calendar (= *Insertion of Saints into the GRC*), 25 December 2006, in *Notitiae*, 42 (2006), 618-619, accompanied by Commentary (= *Commento*), in *Notitiae*, 42 (2006), 620-621, available in Italian at www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/santi-nel-calendario-generale-notificazione-commento-nota.pdf [11 January 2022]. English translations are my own.

⁷²¹ And indeed, this has continued to happen. Pope Francis has inscribed several new celebrations into the universal calendar. Notable among them are the Memorial of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the Church on the Monday after Pentecost; the Optional Memorials of Our Lady of Loreto, 10 December; St. Faustina Kowalska, 5 October; Pope St. Paul VI, 29 May and Pope St. John XXIII, 11 October. Incidentally, the date chosen for the latter observance is not 3 June, the date of his death, but rather the anniversary of him opening the Second Vatican Council.

⁷²² See *Commento*, §3, *Insertion of Saints into the GRC*.

⁷²³ “Perciò, sarà difficile per il futuro fare ulteriori inserimenti, se non applicando rigorosamente alcuni criteri” (*Commento*, §3, *Insertion of Saints into the GRC*). Then follows 12 strict guiding criteria for the addition of Saints to the universal calendar in the “Nota esplicativa dei number 2 e 4 del documento ‘L’Inserimento di Santi nel Calendario Romano Generale,’” accompanying *Insertion of Saints into the GRC*.

Benedict XVI issued an emended reprint of the *editio typica tertia* in 2008 (MR/2008), correcting misprints and some other details, such as the insertion of *unum* at the beginning of the Apostles' Creed in concordance with the Nicene Creed. A supplement includes celebrations, such as that of Saint Pio of Pietrelcina, added to the universal calendar after the initial printing of the 2002 edition. In the United States of America, this edition of the Roman Missal did not appear until 2010, effective 2011.⁷²⁴

2.15 – Particular Calendars for Local Churches

A form of particular calendar for local Churches existed at the time of the post-Vatican II reforms under the name of *Proprium sanctorum pro aliquibus locis*. These fell into obsolescence or at least became inadequate at the time of the promulgation of GRC/1969. It was replaced, however, with a broader, though similar, provision. The ability to celebrate Saints and *Beati* that had been removed from GRC/1969 was provided through the creation of particular calendars for local Churches and religious institutes. These could be created anew or result from revision of an existing *proprium sanctorum*.⁷²⁵

Beginning with the *GNLYC*, the Holy See sought to facilitate the creation of particular calendars by giving greater latitude to particular Churches and episcopal conferences in their creation. At the same time, however, the requirements were, and remain, closely

⁷²⁴ MR/2008usa was confirmed by decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments on 26 March 2010, prot. no. 1464/06/L. Proper adaptations for the United States were confirmed on 24 July 2010, prot. no. 577/10/L. The Missal was put into use on 27 November 2011, the First Sunday of Advent. See "Forward to This Edition," in MR/2008usa. Most volumes of the new MR/2008usa are printed in 2011. Therefore, it is sometimes called the 2011 edition.

⁷²⁵ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 155, footnote 12. Dioceses, regions and religious institutes had their own existing schedules of festival celebrations, their *proprium sanctorum*. It appears that the Holy See was involved in the existence of these local calendars. For instance, in response to a plea from his legate in France, Pius VII conceded a reduction in the number of obligations days there (see PIUS VII, Decree *Apostolicae Sedis*, of Cardinal Caprara, Legate in France, 9 April 1802, English translation in BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES, *Papal Teachings*, 103-104, marg. no. 126 [79]).

circumscribed. For instance, the Holy See requires their own review of each of these calendars.

The *GNLYC* state that the Temporal Cycle of the General Roman Calendar must remain intact in any proposed local calendar and must take preeminence over any individual feast. Local feasts must exist in harmony with the universal celebrations and must be in keeping with the Table of Precedence. The Holy See expressed a concern that particular calendars could become oversized. Accordingly, the celebration of any one Saint or *Beatus* is limited to one day on the calendar. There is provision that, for persuasive pastoral reasons, a second day may be recognized for the transfer or discovery of the bodies of patrons or founders of Churches or of families of religious. This second feast would be an Optional Memorial only. Celebrations that exist by virtue of indult may not duplicate other existing celebrations, nor may they be disproportionately multiplied.⁷²⁶

Further, the *GNLYC* indicates that a particular calendar is most practically created by the insertion of feasts into the existing GRC. For diocesan calendars, this would allow for celebrations of the diocesan patrons, the anniversary of the dedication of the cathedral, the Saints and *Beati* who are in some significant way connected to the diocese, such as their place of birth or death or place of their long-time domicile. For an individual church building, the days proper to it are listed in the Table of Precedence. Additionally, there could be the local celebration of Saints who are buried in that church building.⁷²⁷

⁷²⁶ *GNLYC*, no. 50.

⁷²⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 52. Amid the loss of many Saints and *Beati* from the Roman Calendar, a practical query was submitted to the Congregation of Rites: "Must the title of a church be changed when it presents an historical problem or is no longer listed in the General Calendar? Reply: No. Every church retains its title and celebrates the corresponding feast even if the General Calendar no longer carries the title. At the time of the study preparatory to a revision of the particular calendars, the question of titles might well be brought up and dealt with in the light not only of historicity but also of the spiritual and pastoral values affecting the faithful" (*Notitiae*, 5 [1969], 404, no. 8, English translation in *DOL*, 1163, footnote R¹¹).

The aforementioned *Calendaria particularia* came into existence in June 1970 as assistance in the creation of particular calendars. By it, all indults pertinent to the local observance of feasts in any proprium *sanctorum pro aliquibus locis* are abrogated. Each ordinary is asked to send the SCDW details of liturgical privileges that had been granted them in the past, that is, details of their existing *proprium sanctorum*, “so that proper revisions could be made where necessary and new local calendars established.”⁷²⁸ The same document makes provision for adapting local celebrations by transfer of some of them to Sunday.⁷²⁹

This Instruction requires that a critical study be made of under consideration for inclusion in the particular calendar prior to its proposal to the Holy See.⁷³⁰ Appropriate

⁷²⁸ See SEASOLTZ, *New Liturgy; New Laws*, 155, footnote 12. When a diocese or religious family has several beatified or canonized members, not too many are to occupy the particular calendar. Because the arbitrary term “too many” is not defined, further guidance is provided: “A single celebration is only for the Saints or *Beati* who have significance for the whole diocese or religious institute. For instance, this could include the founders, those who were martyred or brought special grace by their outstanding merits. Others are restricted to celebration at those places where they have closer ties or where they are buried. A single collective celebration may be added to the particular calendar that includes all their Saints and *Beati* or separated by Class, such as martyrs, virgins, and so on” (*Calendaria particularia*, no. 17).

⁷²⁹ “For the pastoral advantage of the people, it is permissible to observe on the Sundays in Ordinary Time those celebrations that fall during the week and have special appeal to the devotion of the faithful, provided the celebrations take precedence over these Sundays in the Table of Liturgical Days. The Mass for such celebrations may be used at all the Masses at which a congregation is present” (*Calendaria particularia*, no. 58). Regarding the transfer of such a local feast to a Sunday, the following practical question was posed to the Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1969: “Query: May the anniversary of the dedication of a church and the solemnity of the patron or title of a church be transferred to a Sunday? Reply. Yes, in the following case: the Sunday is in Ordinary Time or in the Christmas season and the anniversary is of a particular church or the solemnity is of the principal patron of a specific place or of the title of a particular church. [...] No, if the transfer would be to a Sunday of Advent, Lent or the Easter Season, or to one on which any solemnity of the Lord, of Mary or of the dedication of the cathedral church or the patron of a region or nation or a secondary patron” (*Notitiae*, 5 [1969], 402, no. 16, English translation in *DOL*, 1165, footnote R¹², no. 1). A similar question posed in 1975 received a somewhat different response: “Query: May the anniversary of the dedication of the cathedral be celebrated on a Sunday in Ordinary Time? Reply: No. The case involves celebrating a particular feast of the Lord throughout a diocese. [...] In the table of liturgical days (no. 5) only feasts of the Lord listed in the General Calendar take precedence over Sundays of the Christmas Season and Sundays in Ordinary Time; proper feasts do not and the celebration of the dedication of the cathedral church is a proper feast. [...] The basis for this rule is to safeguard the special character of Sunday and to prevent it from being supplanted by other celebrations” (*Notitiae*, 11 [1975], 61, English translation in *DOL*, 1165, footnote R¹², no. 2).

⁷³⁰ This measure was included to ensure historical authenticity as well as to establish the origin and spread of the *cultus* attached to them.

experts are to be consulted in these matters.⁷³¹ Furthermore, the preparation of particular calendars is “to include expunging the names of Saints about whom little or nothing is known historically except such names. The same is true of Saints’ names that in the past were entered in a calendar because of some special reason but now have little or no relevance to the diocese or religious institute.”⁷³²

Finally, once all is prepared, the proposal is to be sent to the Congregation for Divine Worship in triplicate. A brief explanation of rationale is to be included, particularly if any element or elements depart from conformity with the General Calendar.⁷³³

The later *Instructione de Constitutione* of 14 June 1971 states that use of proper calendars is to remain in force, altering ranks of feast as necessary to conform with the new norms of the GRC/1969. For all else, the norms issued by the conference of bishops are obligatory. Revising particular calendars is to be completed within the period determined for this work, that is, within five years.⁷³⁴ Conferences of bishops are to determine a date for the GRC/1969 to become obligatory within their territories. Pending completion of

⁷³¹ *Calendaria particularia*, no. 18.

⁷³² *Ibid.*, no. 19.

⁷³³ *Ibid.*, no. 6. A further provision is made for particular calendars in dioceses wherein the borders have been redrawn or have been merged with others. The particular calendar of the surviving diocese is to include the names of all those on the calendars of all the territories involved if such Saints have significance to the entire new entity (see *Calendaria particularia*, no. 20).

⁷³⁴ *Instructione de Constitutione*, no. 6. For the preceding, *Calendaria particularia* states that particular calendars, derived after consultation with the clergy and persons concerned, or members of the religious institute, must be part of the process of editing. These calendars are to be approved by the competent authority [the episcopal conference for seculars; the religious superior for religious] and given to the Congregation for Divine Worship for confirmation within five years of the publication of the new Roman Missal and Breviary. Once approved, it must be followed as obligatory by all those to whom it pertains. No subsequent changes can be made without the consent of the Apostolic See. The document further presents rules to be followed for use of the Roman Missal, Liturgy of the Hours and the calendar; it presents solutions for difficulties in the calendar for the years 1972 and 1973 (see *Calendaria particularia*, no. 4).

translations, the conferences of bishops are to issue rules in both Latin and the vernacular that will be used for the celebration of the Mass and the Liturgy of the Hours.⁷³⁵

In 1974, the SCDW issued *Novo Calendario Romano*⁷³⁶ to speed up the preparation and presentation of particular calendars. At the time of its writing, the new General Roman Calendar, the new Roman Missal and the *GNLYC* had been completed and promulgated. However, the Holy See was awaiting proposals of particular calendars from around the world. Apparently, submission of these was not happening at the pace expected. The document recalls rules to be followed in the revision of particular calendars.⁷³⁷

In 1977, the same Sacred Congregation issued further norms in *Calendaria et propria*.⁷³⁸ This document includes reprimand for the slow response on the part of many particular Churches. The document reminds ordinaries and others of the helpful norms and clarifications issued in *Novo Calendario Romano*.

Number 394 of the *GIRM* includes treatment of local calendars. As the latest universal statement on the matter, it generally reiterates the preceding documents on the creation of

⁷³⁵ An update from the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship was published, stating: “The instruction on the revision of particular calendars and the propers of offices and Masses, issued 24 June 1974, required that all calendars and propers be submitted for confirmation ‘within five years of the publication date of the new Roman Missal and the Breviary.’ The new Roman Missal was in fact published on 26 March 1970 and The Liturgy of the Hours on 11 August 1971. Therefore, on 11 April 1976 the available time for the completion of the revision of propers will come to an end” (*Notitiae* 9, [1973], 284, English translation in *DOL*, 1246, footnote R¹, and cf. *Calendaria particularia*, no. 4).

⁷³⁶ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Letter *Novo Calendario Romano* to bishops and general superiors of religious, to speed up preparation of the particular calendars of dioceses and religious institutes, as well as of proper texts for the Roman Missal and the Liturgy of the Hours, February 1974, in *Notitiae*, 10 (1974), 87-88, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 482, 1256-1257.

⁷³⁷ *Novo Calendario Romano*, nos. 1-4.

⁷³⁸ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR SACRAMENTS AND DIVINE WORSHIP, Norms *Calendaria et Propria*, on particular calendars and the propers of Masses and offices, December 1977, in *Notitiae*, 13 (1977) 557-558, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 483, 1257. The document states, “Calendars and propers of Masses and offices were to be prepared and confirmed, according to the norm of the Instruction *Calendaria particularia*, 24 June 1970, no. 4, within five years of the date of publication of the new Roman Missal and of the Breviary. Yet six years after the *editio typica* of both the Roman Missal and the Liturgy of the Hours, the work of revising the calendars and propers of both dioceses and religious institutes is still not finished. In order that the work in question may be completed as quickly as possible by those involved, this Congregation considers it useful to recall the principles and norms already issued on this matter.”

particular calendars. It contains specific reference to the inclusion of Rogation and Ember days in local calendars: “In the drawing up of the Calendar of a nation, the Rogation Days and Ember Days should be indicated (cf. no. 373), as well as the forms and texts for their celebration, and other special measures should also be kept in mind.”⁷³⁹

2.16 – *Cum Sanctissima* Permitting Celebration of New Saints in the EF

As mentioned, the calendar used for the *Forma extraordinaria* was last updated on 26 July 1960. Thus, when one makes use of this Form, Saints subsequently added are not celebrated; this explains the concerns of Benedict XVI expressed in *CGF*. Decree *Cum sanctissima*, issued from the CDF, to which the competencies formerly entrusted to the PCED have been transferred,⁷⁴⁰ seeks to address this.⁷⁴¹ The accompanying *Nota praevia* states that the decree serves to “fulfill the mandate given by Benedict XVI to facilitate the celebration of more recently canonized Saints according to the *Forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite.”⁷⁴²

⁷³⁹ *GIRM/2008usa*, no. 394. In 1966, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops of the United States of America issued a Pastoral Statement on Penance and Abstinence wherein is found the revised disposition of particular law regarding vigils and Ember Days: “Vigils and Ember Days, as most now know, no longer oblige to fast and abstinence. However, the liturgical renewal and the deeper appreciation of the joy of the holy days of the Christian year will, we hope, result in a renewed appreciation as to why our forefathers spoke of ‘a fast before a feast.’ We impose no fast before any feast-day, but we suggest that the devout will find greater Christian joy in the feasts of the liturgical calendar if they freely bind themselves, for their own motives and in their own spirit of piety, to prepare for each Church festival by a day of particular self-denial, penitential prayer and fasting” (<http://www.NCCB.org/prayer-and-worship/liturgical-year/lent/us-bishops-pastoral-statement-on-penance-and-abstinence.cfm>) (11 January 2022). This Statement does not include mention of Rogation Days; no subsequent document specifically addresses them in the local Church. The only ostensible legislation regarding Rogations Days appears in a Pastoral Letter issued from the Second Provincial Province of Baltimore, dated 27 October 1833, mentioned above.

⁷⁴⁰ See FRANCIS, On Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*.

⁷⁴¹ See Appendix I for the full text of *Cum sanctissima* and accompanying *Nota praevia*. For similar observations on *Cum sanctissima* published after completion of this section, see A.P. MARCELLO, III, “Canonical Commentary on the New Pontifical Decrees on Saints’ Days and New Prefaces in the Traditional Missal,” at *Rorate Caeli*, 26 March 2020, <https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2020/03/canonical-commentary-on-new-pontifical.html> (11 January 2022).

⁷⁴² See *Nota praevia*, *Cum sanctissima*, §1.

Cum sanctissima grants generous provisions for the *ad libitum* celebration of Saints canonized after 26 July 1960, on their feast days, except on days with celebrations that may not be impeded.⁷⁴³ The *ad libitum* characteristic of the general provision renders all such celebrations optional; the sources of the euchological texts to be used are circumscribed. The decree protects Sundays and seventy III Class feasts from becoming impeded by use of its provisions.

The brief decree comprises three unnumbered paragraphs serving as introduction and *ratio*. These are followed by eight numerically ordered articles.⁷⁴⁴ Finally, an appendix is attached containing a list of III Class feasts which may never be impeded when making use of the provisions of the decree.

The CDF studied the GRC/1960 together with *periti* and those involved with its use. Among those matters examined was “the density of the existing calendar (particularly as regards III Class feasts), the consideration of all the repercussions of any potential changes, the always preferable consistency between Mass and the Divine Office and the matter of the liturgical texts to be used.”⁷⁴⁵

The Congregation determined that “in this context, it appeared that rather than dealing with this or that more recent Saint, it would be more appropriate to lay down a general principle that would enable [...] the celebration of any Saint canonized after the 1960’s on the date of their proper feast.”⁷⁴⁶ Such celebrations would be allowed within the rubrical structure of the Extraordinary Form.

⁷⁴³ That is, I Class feasts (equivalent to Solemnities in the OF), II Class feasts, (equivalent to Feasts in the OF) and certain III Class feasts (equivalent to Obligatory Memorials in the OF).

⁷⁴⁴ Number 3 of the decree treats the applicability of the decree’s provisions to the *Breviarium Romanum*. Number 7 treats Religious Institutes and Societies of Apostolic Life. Neither of these provisions falls within the scope of this work (see *Cum sanctissima*, nos. 3, 7).

⁷⁴⁵ See *Nota praevia*, *Cum sanctissima*, §2.

⁷⁴⁶ See *ibid.*, §3.

The Decree presents the rules governing the sources of the liturgical texts to be used when the choice has been made to celebrate a Saint that does not appear in *the GRC/1960*.⁷⁴⁷

Three sources of texts are identified in the *Nota*, in descending order of rank:

1. The *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis*;
2. A “special supplement” to be created and published in future by the Holy See;
3. The existing *Commune Sanctorum*.⁷⁴⁸

The *Nota praevia* indicates that the provision of *Cum sanctissima* allowing the celebration of more recently canonized Saints “remains optional.”⁷⁴⁹ The same *Nota* exhorts the celebrant to “make use of good pastoral common sense” when deciding whether to employ the decree’s provisions.⁷⁵⁰ The *Nota* affirms that feasts *ad libitum* numbered at least 25 during the period between the post-Tridentine reforms and the reforms of Pius X.⁷⁵¹ Allowance is given for *ad libitum* commemoration of future canonized and beatified persons,⁷⁵² if the Saint or *Beatus* appears in the *Proprium pro aliquibus locis* or in the aforementioned “Special Supplement” to be created and published by the Holy See.⁷⁵³

In order to allow for additional celebrations within the GRC/1960, this decree expands the definition of *Missae festivae latiore sensu*. Such Masses are those celebrated from the martyrology of the day or from the *Proprium Sanctorum*. Article 1 of *Cum sanctissima*

⁷⁴⁷ “Ad formulam Missae et Officii secundum suprascriptas ordinationes eligendam, nisi habetur in Proprio Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis Missalis Romani anni MCMLXII vel in eius novo Supplemento a S. Sede approbato, sumitur de Communi Missalis vel Breviarii. Quotiens in eodem Communi plures exstant formulae, electio fit ad libitum celebrantis. Formula autem quae recensentur in praedicto Proprio Sanctorum vel Supplemento adhiberi debent eo die quo in iis habetur” (*Cum sanctissima*, art. 5).

⁷⁴⁸ See *Nota praevia*, *Cum sanctissima*, §5.

⁷⁴⁹ See *ibid.*, §6.

⁷⁵⁰ See *ibid.*, §8.

⁷⁵¹ See *ibid.*, §6.

⁷⁵² “Commemoratio praeterea ordinaria ad libitum celebrantis admitti potest de Sancto vel Mysterio eo die quo recensetur in Proprio Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis vel in novo Supplemento tam in Missa quam in Officio diebus liturgicis III vel IV classis, servata Rubricae Generales, 111 d)” (*ibid.*).

⁷⁵³ See *ibid.*, §7. This allows for ongoing growth, adjustment and adaptation with reduced need for juridic action.

states that this *latiore sensu*, formerly affecting only IV Class feasts, is now broadened to include some III Class feasts and vigils. However, the provision includes provision of I and II Class feasts⁷⁵⁴ as well as several specific III Class feasts and vigils. Article 2 states that these *missae festivae latiore sensu* “may be celebrated in honor of Saints canonized after 26 July 1960 [...] on their respective liturgical feast day.”⁷⁵⁵

Article 8 refers to a list of seventy III Class feasts, attached in Appendix, which may never be impeded by employing the provisions of the decree.⁷⁵⁶ The *Nota praevia* states that the celebrations found on this list reflect “the particular importance of the feasts in question, on the basis of precise criteria, e.g. the importance of these respective Saints in the Plan of Salvation or in the history of the Church, their importance in terms of either the devotion they have generated or their writings, or the antiquity of their worship in Rome.”⁷⁵⁷

There is no instruction regarding the possible reduction of a III Class feast by use of a second Collect on those feasts which may not be impeded. The decree does not indicate when its provision becomes effective or when the “Special Supplement” from the Holy See might be expected.⁷⁵⁸

Broad latitude is granted to the individual celebrant when deciding if and what additional Saints and *Beati* to commemorate under the provision of *Cum sanctissima* or even to make no use of it at all. The decree does not mention and therefore does not preclude involvement of diocesan bishops and episcopal conferences in issuing local

⁷⁵⁴ Thereby protecting Sundays from an improper use of the provision of this decree.

⁷⁵⁵ See *Nota praevia, Cum sanctissima*, §4.

⁷⁵⁶ “Dies festi III classis qui his ordinationibus neque impediri neque omitti possunt enumerantur in sequenti tabella. Dicta festa celebrari possunt etiam in feriis III classis Quadragesimae et Passionis, facta commemoratione feriae iuxta rubricas” (ibid., §8).

⁷⁵⁷ See *Nota praevia, Cum sanctissima*, §9.

⁷⁵⁸ Therefore, on a local level and at this writing, there is no guidance provided for one who may wish to celebrate a more recently canonized Saint or one of local interest.

guidelines or even particular calendars. In fact, extending the provision of *latiore sensu* provides an ideal setting in which to create a particular calendar.

2.17 – Presentation of a Proposed *Proprium Sanctorum* for Canada and the USA

The development of the General Roman Calendar has been explored in order to reach an understanding of the tone of the seasons and the organization and precedence of celebrations in the liturgical year in both Forms of the Latin Rite. Proposals that insert enrichment into the celebrations of either Form must consider compatibility with the history of its respective liturgical calendar, reflecting a natural integration consistent with the work achieved in the reforms following the Councils of Trent and Vatican II, the respective roots of the Roman Calendars in current use.

Creation of a particular calendar or new *Proprium Sanctorum*, the fruit as it were of the preceding research, is facilitated by the provisions of *Cum sanctissima*. Due to the provisions of *Novum rubricarum*, the ranks are easily translatable between both calendars.

The notion of such a proposal finds its origin in *CGF*. Its practical nature is allowed by the concessions and restrictions of *Cum sanctissima* within the ordinances of the *GNLYC*, *Calendaria particularia* and related documents. Its various celebrations occur as the result of application of *Novum rubricarum*.

Advantageously, particular calendars for the dioceses of Canada and the United States of America for use in the OF already exist. Consequently, there is no need, for instance, to determine the relevance of any Saint to these regions or the veracity of related hagiography. There is no need to present a rationale or defense or to create Mass formularies for each. These requirements have been met and approved by the Holy See for use by dioceses in the territories of both episcopal conferences. Each Saint or *Beatus* has been assigned a date,

liturgical rank and some degree of Mass formulary. The work that remains, then, is to fit the celebrations from the OF particular calendars into GRC/1960, using its rules, as adapted now by *Cum sanctissima*. The result is found in Appendix II.

When considering how such a proposal could receive juridic approval, some local guidance is helpful. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops provides a description of the way by which Saints and *Beati* are to be submitted for inscription into the particular calendar of a diocese or region.⁷⁵⁹ The information provided follows the requirements set forth in the above-mentioned documents regarding the preparation and submission of such calendars. It includes the statement that local requests ultimately must be submitted to the Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments for approval.

The current circumstances, however, present a unique situation of competence. What affects the *Forma extraordinaria* came under the governance of the CDF, by means of the new special section which possessed the competencies formerly enjoyed by the PCED. These competencies were then transferred to the Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments and to the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life by means of *motu proprio Traditionis custodes*.⁷⁶⁰ Because this proposal treats dioceses only, it seems appropriate that requests would be brought before the appropriate episcopal conference and, upon agreeing to request the translation of the

⁷⁵⁹ See <http://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/sacred-art-and-music/including-saints-or-blessed-in-diocesan-calendars.cfm> (11 January 2022).

⁷⁶⁰ *TC*, Art. 7: The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments and the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, for matters of their particular competence, exercise the authority of the Holy See with respect to the observance of these provisions.

national particular calendar into a *proprium sanctorum for aliquibus locis* for the dioceses of each conference, the request would then be sent to the CDWDS.

Conclusion

The liturgical calendar has influence upon the faithful in myriad ways. Primarily, it determines the times and dates of the celebration of the Divine Mysteries. While the Mass is undoubtedly the preeminent act of worship, what is prayed in it and how it is offered is first determined by its operation within the liturgical calendar and affected significantly by changes to the calendar.

Closely related to changes in the calendar are the disciplines attached to the calendar. These direct the lives of the faithful throughout the various liturgical and natural seasons. These disciplines influence our outward behavior in feasting and fasting, alms-giving and public witness. Therefore, observance of the calendar itself influences our communal worship while observance of the related disciplines influences our inward disposition as salvation history unfolds in the yearly cycle. Once this is taken into grasp, it becomes apparent that the juridical documents on the liturgical calendar represent a living and lived faith.

Reviewing the history and development of what became the GRC/1960 governing the Extraordinary Form contextualizes the GRC/1969 governing the Ordinary Form and facilitates its understanding. Ultimately, the former was reformed into the latter. The history and development of the liturgical calendar is by one consideration rather simple. For the most part, it developed into the Sanctoral and Temporal Cycles beginning from the earliest times. Rome's coalescence of local and Gallican practices took some time and were likely

confusing to some along the way but the calendar, with some exceptions, retained a high degree of consistency.

Because the two calendars differ, mutual enrichment between them must be undertaken with some care and understanding for each to retain its internal integrity. As demonstrated above, it is not possible merely to overlay the substance of one calendar upon the other. Nonetheless, there appears to be a great deal of opportunity for mutual enrichment between the calendars governing each Missal. As demonstrated, the Ordinary Form calendar includes many more recent celebrations that could be added to that governing the Extraordinary Form. Encouraged by the provision of *Cum sanctissima* expanding the *Missae festivae latiore sensu* and understanding of the *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis*, it appears the time is right for, and the mind of the Holy See is agreeable to, the creation of genuine particular calendars for use in the EF of the Mass. These latter acts by the CDF underscore the profound respect that the pontificate of Francis has for mutual enrichment as first proposed by Benedict XVI. The tenets of those juridic documents governing the creation of particular calendars seem all the more reasonable to apply to the GRC/1960. The juridic documents may now be revisited with a specific purpose for their application.

In addition to adding more recently canonized Saints to the calendar governing the OF, other changes of mutual enrichment could be made to bring the OF and EF celebrations closer in relation to each other as well as in line with the ancient historical practices of the Church. Among these are technical matters that would require little effort to accomplish:

1. Adoption of common discipline regarding the celebration of Obligation Days;⁷⁶¹
2. Inscription of modifications to all affected liturgical calendars.⁷⁶²

Some ways of enrichment are more pastoral in nature. Some could affect celebration of the Mass itself and thus may require more effort:

1. Observance of Ember Days could be reintroduced;⁷⁶³
2. Some form of *Septuagesima* could be restored.⁷⁶⁴

Other enriching considerations affect matters of discipline:

1. Restoration of the historical Great Fast of Lent;⁷⁶⁵
2. Restoration of Sunday as the historically preeminent day of worship.⁷⁶⁶

By its nature, the General Roman Calendar does not remain static. The several additions and modifications made to it following the promulgation of the calendars that govern each Form of the Mass stand as evidence of this. This characteristic makes modification to the Roman Calendar the most understandable, though its implementation may not be the most

⁷⁶¹ These could be determined by the competent authority in the same way that the observance of Obligation Days is determined for the OF. In this way, the celebration of certain feasts will take place on the same day without regard to which Form of the Mass is celebrated.

⁷⁶² When a new Saint or *Beatus* is added to the General Roman Calendar or to a local particular calendar, the inscription could be made into both liturgical calendars.

⁷⁶³ The matter of Ember Days appears to have fallen fallow, regardless of the beautiful and germane recommendations for their use that emerged from the post-Conciliar reforms. Ember Day observances serve to give the faithful a means of celebration apart from Sundays and Solemnities that affects their home life and prayer and may include liturgical celebrations.

⁷⁶⁴ Perhaps the external marks of the period could differ in some ways from that of the EF, but this would not be essential. A brief period of preparation for the celebration of the great mysteries brought to light in Lent and Easter would be very helpful to the faithful, clergy and lay alike, so that a jarring transition is avoided, and the personal responsibility required for the observance of Lent may be embraced.

⁷⁶⁵ The season of Lent exists as the season of the Great Fast of forty days. The season exists in the OF unaltered from that of the EF. That is, in the OF, it still provides forty days, Sundays excepted. However, in the OF, the fast has been reduced to two days: Ash Wednesday and Good Friday, with Holy Saturday recommended.

⁷⁶⁶ The disciplines for the OF that allow Sunday “anticipated” Masses to begin in the afternoon prior have diminished the understanding of the preeminence of Sunday and do not appear to connect to Sunday, nor to the notion of the day beginning at sundown nor to the ancient practice of the Vigil. Restoring “anticipated” Masses to begin at a time that is clearly the evening prior to Sunday would help restore the connection that has been lost to a notion now of “weekend Masses.” It would establish a connection to early Church’s celebration of the eve of Sunday and of the Solemn Easter Vigil. The time for evening celebrations could be determined in much the same way that Jews observe the Sabbath beginning at Friday sundown. Calendars that give local times of sunset in any given area are readily available.

uncomplicated. Enthusiastic support for mutual enrichment of the General Roman Calendar by means of *Cum sanctissima* enacted under the pontificate of Pope Francis has provided encouragement and a pathway for present and future modifications and considerations.

CHAPTER III

ENRICHMENT OF EUCHARISTIC PREFACES

Introduction

The number of Eucharistic Prefaces received in *MR/1962* is rather few when compared to the extensive treasury in *MR/2008*. In recognition of this fact, Benedict XVI requested that “some” of the new Eucharistic Prefaces found in the OF may and should be added to *MR/1962*. The Pope’s choice of terms places a significant, but not fully circumscribed, limitation upon which Eucharistic Prefaces may and should be added. Examination of the available texts is required in order to determine which of the new Eucharistic Prefaces can and should be inserted into the existing corpus of those found in *MR/1962*. Having examined the General Roman Calendar above, understanding the placement and use of each Eucharistic Preface is facilitated.

In general, it is necessary to assess which of the Eucharistic Prefaces found in *MR/2008* demonstrate compatibility and consistency with the sources and retain respect for the history of those that have been received in *MR/1962*. More specifically, to make these assessments, sources for the Eucharistic Prefaces need to be examined, for in most instances, the same sources were used by those involved in the reform of both Missals. It is inevitable that not all Eucharistic Prefaces in *MR/2008* will be appropriate for insertion into *MR/1962*, the acknowledgement of which, one may venture to surmise, led Benedict XVI to use the limiting term “some.”

The proceedings of the Pontifical Commission for revision of the Missal appointed by Pius V following the Council of Trent have been lost to time.⁷⁶⁷ With little documentation

⁷⁶⁷ See PECKLERS, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 156.

remaining from the post-Tridentine reforms, reverse-engineering the Eucharistic Prefaces of *MR/1570* as it were can bring us to an understanding of the reformers' decision. This historical treatment is richer than it is complex. It is also briefer than that presented in Chapter III due to some overlap that does not need to be repeated in detail in this chapter.

On the other hand, the post-Vatican II proceedings on the liturgy are well-recorded. *Coetus XVIIIbis*,⁷⁶⁸ the same *Coetus* responsible for the revision of the Oration formularies was responsible for the revision of the Eucharistic Prefaces.⁷⁶⁹

This chapter's exploration of the meaning, development and use of the Eucharistic Preface examines the texts in the sources employed at the times of revision. This will make it possible to determine respectful compatibility, consistency and usefulness for mutual enrichment between the two Missals. Once these examinations have been completed, and the rationale and framework provided by decree *Quo magis* has been considered, a proposal will be made for several Eucharistic Prefaces present in *MR/2008* to be inserted into *MR/1962*.

3.1 – Definition and Description of the Eucharistic Preface

Nathaniel Marx reflects inquisitively upon the Pontiff's request for mutual enrichment, stating, "The desire to commemorate Saints that had not been canonized in 1962 is self-explanatory, but why should the revised Prefaces deserve special attention in this context?"⁷⁷⁰ A partial answer to Marx's well-placed inquiry, it should be noted that the unique nature of the Eucharistic Preface and its importance in the Mass of the Latin Church

⁷⁶⁸ *Coetus XVIIIbis* comprised Placide Bruylants, OSB, and Antoine Dumas, OSB, became "the two scholars who led the study group charged with revising the Orations and Prefaces of the Missal" (MARX, "Revision of the Prefaces," 351).

⁷⁶⁹ For a thorough examination of the revision of the orations in the Roman Missal promulgated by Paul VI, see L. PRISTAS, "Theological Principles that Guided the Redaction of the Roman Missal (1970)," in *The Thomist*, 67 (2003), 157-195.

⁷⁷⁰ MARX, "Revision of the Prefaces," 350.

cannot be overstated. Unlike the Oriental traditions, wherein the many Eucharistic anaphora treat the fullness of salvation history, the Latin usage retains the ancient and unchanging core of the Eucharistic Canon which in turn is customized as it were by the text of the Preface assigned to it at the given celebration of Mass. Therefore, rather than having multiple Eucharistic Prayers, the Latin liturgy employs a plethora of Eucharistic Prefaces to bring to light the reason for, or particular point of, thanksgiving of the Mass in which it is used.

The Eucharistic Preface is rooted in Hebrew prayers of thanks and as such is one of the last vestiges of our Hebrew spiritual roots found in the Mass of the Latin Church. Its historical development is swift; it has retained its form from ancient times to the present. The number of Prefaces available for use in the various Gallican and Roman liturgies has varied widely in number and content according to region and era. Until the reforms following the Council of Trent, composition and choices of texts were made locally and governed by custom. From the time of the promulgation of *MR/1570*, pontifical legislation has bound the entire Latin Church, with some local exceptions, to specific texts and the circumstances under which they are used.

The term *praefatio* comes to us in English and French as “preface” and “*préface*,” respectively. Most commonly a literary term, it refers to an introduction, foreword, prologue, an addendum to a published work. In this context, the text of a preface risks being considered unessential because it is not a part of the main work.

The term is used quite differently in the context of the Mass in the West where it enjoys its own history. Of this, Jungmann states:

[...] We must correct the notion that *Praefatio* is to be rendered as foreword or introduction; this is an arbitrary translation. *Praefatio* is indeed made up of the words *prae* and *fari*, to speak before. But it need not be taken only in a temporal sense, one speech

before another. It can also be thought of in terms of space, speaking before an audience. The word was used in this sense in pre-Christian sacral language; it was the speech made before the divinity or else the speech made before the assembly. A public proclamation was also called a *Praefatio*. This word was transferred to the liturgical language of Christendom and at least at Rome continued to be used in its original sense. *Praefatio* was therefore the solemn prayer and was part of the canon; in fact, for a time, the whole canon was, it would seem, called *Praefatio*.⁷⁷¹

Bouyer believes that the specifically liturgical use of this term began to narrow by the Middle Ages when it came to refer only to the text that precedes the Canon, i.e., that part that ends with the *Sanctus*. He describes this unique preface, the Eucharistic Preface, as “the beginning of the Eucharistic consecration, projecting it, so to speak, in the line of a glorification of the Creator and Savior God.”⁷⁷² In fact, the oldest documentation available presents the text of the Preface immediately beneath the title of the Eucharistic Canon.⁷⁷³ This indicates that the earliest recorded concept of the format of the Mass in the West has remained intact. In the earliest centuries, the Eucharistic portion of the Mass was a *Eucharistia*, primarily an elaborate prayer of thanksgiving amid which occurred the consecration of the Holy Gifts. It is that concept of thanksgiving that attains formal expression in the Eucharistic Preface.⁷⁷⁴

⁷⁷¹ J. JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great*, trans. F. BRUNNER, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1959, 300. According to Bouyer, it appears that in Roman usage, this *prae fari* or *praefari* “applied to the pontiff’s pronouncement of a consecratory prayer in a raised voice” (“... s’appliquait à la prononciation à haute voix par le pontife d’une prière consécrationnaire.”) At the same time, the liturgical books of the Gallicans rituals, those non-Roman Western liturgies, used the terms *immolatio* or *contestatio* for the part of the ritual called the “Preface” in the Roman books. These Gallican rituals used the term “Preface” to refer to “a kind of monition prior to an office and was limited to giving it the particular tone” (“... une sorte de monition antérieure à un office et qui se bornait à en donner la tonalité particulière”) (L. BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” in *La Maison-Dieu*, 87 [1966], 97-110, here, 97). Translations are my own.

⁷⁷² “... le commencement de la consécration Eucharistique, la projetant, pour ainsi dire, dans la ligne d’une glorification du Dieu créateur et sauveur” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 97).

⁷⁷³ In the older of the Gelasian sacramentaries, for instance, (see *Gelasianum*, Liber III, 16; in the Wilson version, 234) the words *Incipit canon actionis* appear before what we would call today the *Praefatio communis*, the simple Common Preface, and continues immediately with the text of what we would now call the Roman Canon without so much as a space between them (see JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 300).

⁷⁷⁴ See JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 300. It may also be that the Preface gets its original name of something spoken aloud because the Roman Canon has been offered quietly from early times.

The Preface is a uniquely Roman changeable section of the Eucharistic prayer preceding the unchangeable section appropriately termed “Canon.” The Western formula of the Eucharistic Prayer possesses an alternating element of thanksgiving at the beginning that emphasizes the temporal or sanctoral observance at that particular Mass. “A particular aspect of the economy of salvation can be developed each time, the aspect which suits the day’s feast, although the Canon remains the same.”⁷⁷⁵

Dumas situates and grounds the existence of the Preface in the Mass, stating: “Why does the people of God, today, in this liturgical time, in such circumstances, proclaim the greatness of their Lord and offer to him in Eucharist the sacrifice of Christ? From the solemn opening of the Eucharistic Prayer, this is for the Preface to say.”⁷⁷⁶ Content of the unique Roman phenomenon of the Eucharistic Preface varies throughout the year in order that the mysteries of the Lord and feasts of the Saints may be amplified singularly.⁷⁷⁷

The variable Eucharistic Preface is an integral part of the Eucharistic Prayer. This Roman tradition is known for its richness, number and quality, since the times of the oldest Western traditions and texts.⁷⁷⁸ As Marx describes, “In other words, a survey of the *mirabilia Dei* for which praise and thanks are offered is achieved through a *variable* Preface. The ‘treasures’ of euchological composition produced by this reliance on a variable Preface supply the ‘*Eucharistia* par excellence’ of the Roman Eucharistic prayer.”⁷⁷⁹

⁷⁷⁵ C. VAGAGGINI, *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform*, New York, NY, Alba House, 1967, 86.

⁷⁷⁶ “Pourquoi le peuple de Dieu, aujourd’hui, en ce temps liturgique, dans telles circonstances, proclame-t-il les grandeurs de son seigneur et lui offre-t-il en Eucharistie le sacrifice du Christ? C’est à la préface de le dire, dès l’ouverture solennelle de la prière Eucharistique” (A. DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 85 [1971], 16-28, here, 17-18).

⁷⁷⁷ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, 117.

⁷⁷⁸ VAGAGGINI, *The Canon of the Mass*, 36-37.

⁷⁷⁹ MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 358.

Bruylants describes the Preface as a text in which “is evoked the marveling memory of redemption, which raises us in a wave of enthusiasm toward God, at the moment when we are preparing to celebrate this mystery in its entirety, or in one of its particular aspects, during the Eucharistic action, which actualizes for us the redemptive will of our God.”⁷⁸⁰

In a word, the Roman Preface is a variable part of the Eucharistic prayer that expresses the reason for celebrating thanksgiving at that moment, temporal or sanctoral. The theme of thanksgiving expressed in the Preface as the Mass fluctuates and flows throughout the Temporal and Sanctoral Cycles of the liturgical calendar.⁷⁸¹

Such is not the case in the development of Christian worship in the East. Oriental liturgies have a great plurality of Eucharistic Prayer formulae, but each anaphora forms a single unit and each “surveys the whole field of the Christian economy in a new way.”⁷⁸² There is no ostensible reference to the day, time or feast being celebrated. In Eastern worship, one would turn to other parts of the liturgy to find reference to the feast.⁷⁸³

Conversely, the result of the variety of Prefaces in Latin practice results in a lack of a single synopsis of the entire economy of salvation. In Western worship, one would need to synthesize all the Eucharistic Prefaces in order to achieve that.⁷⁸⁴

⁷⁸⁰ “On pourrait dire que dans la préface l’Eglise évoque le souvenir émerveillé de la rédemption, qui nous soulève en un élan d’enthousiasme vers Dieu, au moment où nous nous apprêtons à célébrer ce mystère, dans son intégralité ou dans un de ses aspects particuliers, au cours de l’action Eucharistique, qui actualise pour nous la volonté rédemptrice de notre Dieu” (P. BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” in *La Maison-Dieu*, 87 [1966], 111-133, here, 115).

⁷⁸¹ JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 117.

⁷⁸² Ibid., vol. 2, 118. See also VAGAGGINI, *The Canon of the Mass*, 36, 85, 86.

⁷⁸³ VAGAGGINI, *The Canon of the Mass*, 36. See also JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 117.

⁷⁸⁴ Ibid., 36. Vagaggini embellishes, stating: “In contrast to the East, it is customary throughout the West to vary the first part of the anaphora in accordance with the feast. This is in a special way a hymn of rejoicing and praise for the gifts of creation and providence and for the wonders that God has actually done for us in saving us; above all for what he has done for us in his Son, Jesus Christ. These are the elements that go to make up the Prefaces of the Roman tradition...” (ibid., 85).

3.2 – The Eucharistic Preface and Hebrew Patrimony

Comparatively, the Preface does not have the most complicated history and development. Its format, however, retains some of the last vestiges of Jewish worship, the roots of all Christian worship, Occidental and Oriental.

Louis Bouyer, appointed 16 March 1966 as consultor to Consilium,⁷⁸⁵ insists that a thorough understanding of the Mass must begin with an understanding of the ancient sources of the Eucharistic Preface. He states, “The first point to emphasize is that the ancient Roman Preface, like its equivalents in the first part of the anaphora of Oriental liturgies, proceeds from a dual Jewish source.”⁷⁸⁶

For observant Jews past and present and for Jewish Christians, particularly before separation from the temple and synagogue occurred, the practice of calling down a blessing or *berakhah* upon someone, something or some situation is of tremendous importance. Such *berakhot* bear particularly importance within the context of a meal.⁷⁸⁷

In the development of the Eucharistic Preface, Bouyer points to the three or four *berakhot* that are prescribed to follow a meal in which bread has been consumed. The first praises God for the sustenance that he provides for all His creatures. The second expresses particular thanksgiving to God in the name of Israel for the land God has given her, for liberation from the Egyptians, for the gift of the covenant and for the revelation of Holy Scripture in the Torah.⁷⁸⁸

⁷⁸⁵ BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 945.

⁷⁸⁶ “Le premier point qu’il faut souligner est que l’antique préface romaine, comme ses équivalents dans la première partie de l’anaphore des liturgies orientales, procède d’un double source juive” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 98-99).

⁷⁸⁷ For another discussion of this matter, see T.J. TALLEY, “From Berakah to Eucharistia: A Reopening Question,” in *Worship*, 50 (1976), 115-137.

⁷⁸⁸ See T. GALE, *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 2007, at <https://www.encyclopedia.com/religion/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/grace-after-meals> (11 January 2022). See also S. SCHECHTER and L. N. DEMBITZ (eds.), from *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1906, at <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/6843->

Bouyer identifies a parallel between this ancient Jewish practice and the most ancient of Christian Eucharistic worship. The *berakhot* have been Christianized in the liturgy of Addai and Mari, traced to the seventh century, widely held to originate in the third, as well as that of the *Apostolic Tradition* attributed to St. Hippolytus in the early to mid-third century.⁷⁸⁹ Two *berakhot* have been merged, as it were, by Hippolytus into the formula of the Eucharistic Preface.⁷⁹⁰

The ancient Christian texts transform the Jewish prayers into their fulfilment in Christ. Thanksgiving for creation becomes thanksgiving for re-creation in Christ, in and by whom all things were made. Thanksgiving for the general history of salvation becomes specific thanksgiving for redemption by the cross of Christ. Thanksgiving for the Paschal covenant becomes thanksgiving for the new *Pasch*, “where the definitive People of God was recreated in the immolated and glorified body of the Word made flesh.”⁷⁹¹ The Hebrew motif of thanksgiving was carried so deeply and reverently by the early Christians into their worship that it imbued even the Grecophones to the degree that they eventually name their worship precisely that: *ευχαριστία*, thanksgiving, Eucharist.⁷⁹²

In addition to thanksgiving, an element of supplication quickly and necessarily entered the worship of the Divine One who stated, “Ask and you will receive.” Jungmann asserts,

[grace-at-meals](#) (11 January 2022). Though considered a *berakhah*, the third is a prayer of petition to have mercy upon Israel, to restore the Davidic kingdom and the Sacred Temple, to sustain Israel forever. A fourth *berakhah*, to which Bouyer does not refer, is a later addition.

⁷⁸⁹ See BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 99.

⁷⁹⁰ See *ibid.*

⁷⁹¹ “... où le Peuple de Dieu définitif a été recréé dans le corps immolé et glorifié de la Parole faite chair” (*ibid.*, 100). Soon, the Scriptures would become part of Christian Eucharistic worship, taken as they were from the synagogue where they were followed by three *berakhot* consisting mainly of thanksgiving and concluded with what we call the *Sanctus* (see *ibid.*).

⁷⁹² See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 116. What is unclear is whether, in its earliest period, the Christian Eucharistic liturgy emphasized thanksgiving over and above the expression of praise and/or adoration. These became ever-important elements in the Eucharistic prayer, particularly after the *Sanctus* was introduced (see *ibid.*).

“Petition, too, is included along with the thanksgiving, at first tentatively, later even in a relatively developed form. But it is equally evident from the earliest sources that in principle, and aside from certain more recent marginal developments, the keynote of the *Eucharistia* that now begins has always been thanksgiving.”⁷⁹³

As time progressed, Christians were more distanced from Hebrew worship. Additionally, the majority of Christians were coming from non-Jewish backgrounds without any experience of Hebrew worship. Consequently, the theme of thanksgiving, originally Hebraic in nature, became less common in, but did not entirely disappear from, the Mass of the West.⁷⁹⁴

3.3 – Purpose of the Eucharistic Preface

The soul’s ancient longing for salvation finds its fulfillment in the mystery of the immolation on Calvary of the only One capable of offering to the Father an acceptable sacrifice while being that acceptable sacrifice, by which propitiation of the Father is accomplished and the remission of the sins becomes possible. This once-for-all sacrifice is mystically perpetual because the God who enacted it dwells in eternity. As creatures, Christians not only owe sacrifice to the Creator, but are moved to worshipful thanksgiving in response to this ineffably glorious mystery in memory of Calvary’s historical event.

This is not merely nostalgia or a ritually memorialized history, however. Rather, the Mass involves participation in this once-for-all-yet-perpetual sacrifice of Calvary in the non-bloody re-presentation of its mystery. Thus, at once, there is thanksgiving for God’s saving act in history and there is thanksgiving for the opportunity to participate in that ongoing sacrifice in the present, in the particular celebration of the Mass. Therefore,

⁷⁹³ JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 116.

⁷⁹⁴ See *ibid.*, 115-116.

thanksgiving becomes cyclic, turning back upon itself, feeding and fueling itself in a sense. For what was consummated in the past is still being consummated in the present and the Christian worshiper has the ability to participate in that supernatural consummation in the natural present until the end of time. “Therefore, [the Mass] is at the same time a thanksgiving and demands of us such a thanksgiving. [...] Thus, in the most ancient tradition the *Eucharistia* appears at the same time as another more exalted form of the profession of faith.”⁷⁹⁵ The act of the Mass is indeed the ultimate enactment of the profession of faith, for the *lex orandi/lex credendi* correlation is perfectly united in it.

Jungmann further express the significance of thanksgiving as he writes:

The prayer ushered in with the Preface is the prayer of the Church, her Great Prayer. It is an attempt to create with human words a worthy framework and more especially a fitting [channel] for the holy mystery which will be accomplished in our midst and which we are privileged to present to God.⁷⁹⁶

That prayer to which Jungmann refers is, of course, the core of the Roman Canon that carries out the Lord’s command: Do this in memory of me. All Eucharistic Prayer formularies do precisely this by some formal act. In the West, this thanksgiving is presented in the Eucharistic Prayer prior to the Canon. Once the consecration has taken place, the prayers of the Mass move appropriately and swiftly to prayers of offering the consecrated elements.⁷⁹⁷ Therefore the place of stating the reason for thanksgiving and expressing it belongs where it can stand in its own glory, not “after the transubstantiation, but rather before the words of consecration, for the consecration can be inserted suitably only in a space filled by the thankful remembrance of the Lord.”⁷⁹⁸

⁷⁹⁵ JUNGMAN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 117.

⁷⁹⁶ Ibid., vol. 2, 115.

⁷⁹⁷ See *ibid.*, 116.

⁷⁹⁸ Ibid.

In the Mass of the West, the Eucharistic Preface is essential because, from but a cursory reading of the Western Eucharistic Canon, it is clear that it does not contain the element of thanksgiving. The essential theme of thanksgiving depends solely upon the Preface. Without the Preface, the Eucharistic Canon is incomplete. It is an inexorable part of the entirety of the prayer.⁷⁹⁹

The texts of the Roman Canon are so ancient that it appears that they always depended upon a Preface, which included congregational participation and a number of sensorial, vocal, musical and physical acts before the priest celebrant entered an intense state of prayer peculiar to his office: consecration and ordination in utter quiet.⁸⁰⁰ For this reason, Bruylants will term the Eucharistic Preface a “prologue.” He states, “In the same way that the Johannine prologue proposes to us the optics under which the Apostle will present to us the person of Christ, so the Preface determines the attitude of soul in which we will participate sacramentally in the sacrifice of Christ.”⁸⁰¹

⁷⁹⁹ The Eucharistic Preface of the Latin Church makes logical sense only because of the Canon of the Latin Church into which it segues. The Canon itself is extant in many different manuscripts that are traceable to prototypes that belong to the 5th and 6th centuries. “These manuscripts agree among themselves almost perfectly. There are only insignificant variants, so that we can accordingly speak of an Irish or a Milanese or a Gregorian recension.... [...] In all these traditions, the Canon looks almost exactly as it does today. The *Praefatio communis* is the same. The Sanctus and Benedictus follow it. Then come the *Te igitur* and all the other prayers down to the end, to the *per ipsum et cum ipso*” (JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 301). Hence, the Preface as part of the Roman Canon, making the point of thanksgiving, has been a necessary and essential part of the Eucharistic Prayer in the West for as long as there has been a Eucharistic Prayer.

⁸⁰⁰ The antiquity of the texts that coalesced into the Roman Canon is demonstrated in the verbiage of the *Memento* for the dead following the consecration. Jungmann observes that “its very wording betrays the fact that it is an exceedingly ancient and venerable formula, for we find in it the same expressions that are found on the old epitaphs in the catacombs” (JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 301).

⁸⁰¹ “Le terme qui nous paraît le plus approprié pour désigner le rôle que la préface joue au début de canon, est celui de prologue, dans le sens où ce mot est employé pour l’évangile de Saint Jean. De même que celui-ci nous propose l’optique sous laquelle l’apôtre va nous présenter la personne du Christ, ainsi la préface détermine l’attitude d’âme dans laquelle nous allons participer sacramentellement au sacrifice du Christ” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 115).

3.4 – Structure of the Eucharistic Preface

The structure of the Eucharistic Preface is ancient, retained intact from the oldest manuscripts to the present. Even in its lengthiest form, the Preface has always been relatively brief. Nonetheless, many distinct actions take place within it.

The text of the Eucharistic Preface is extremely dense.⁸⁰² With the exception of the *Praefatio communis*, the Eucharistic Preface typically comprises eight distinct parts, each pouring itself into the next: a three-fold unvarying dialogue, a three-fold variable core defining the particular point of thanksgiving and an unvarying two-fold chant.⁸⁰³

1. Salutation/*Salutatio* (unvarying)
2. Exhortation/*Exhortatio* (unvarying)
3. Invitation/*Invitatio* (unvarying)
4. Protocol (limited variations)
5. Embolism (multiple variations)
6. Eschatocol/*Eschatol* (limited variations)⁸⁰⁴

⁸⁰² The *Praefatio communis* or Common Preface, used in *omnibus Missis qua praefationem propriam non habeant* from ancient times and currently in the EF, contains no embolism and thus serves as a framework of the Preface of the Mass from the earliest sources, eventually canonized in MR/1570 (see JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 301). The Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary contains a Eucharistic Preface for nearly every Mass, quite consistently using the frame of the *Praefatio communis*. Though it lacks a specific embolism, it is not without value as a Preface of the Roman Canon. Jungsmann observes, “Without descending to prosaic banality, [the *Praefatio communis*] embraces only the barest outline of the prayer of thanks. The reason for giving thanks is no longer expounded but is included in the fact that the thanksgiving is offered *per Christum Dominum nostrum*. The reason is thus presented in the fact that the vast distance separating man from God has been bridged, that we have the access and the trusty password: ‘through Christ our Lord’” (JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 124). Parsch, on the other hand, does not see the same value in the *Praefatio communis*. He states, “The [embolism] is omitted in the Common Preface, since this Preface from its very purpose has no particular mystery on which to base its thanksgiving; and the [protocol] is omitted in the Preface of the Apostles, which begins immediately with a petition” (P. PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, St. Louis, MO/London, Herder, 1940, 214). For further study of the euchological structure of the Latin Eucharistic Preface, see A.M. TRIACCA, “La strutturazione euchologica dei Prefazi,” in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 86 (1972), 238-276.

⁸⁰³ Expanded from WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 419. Ward and Johnson describe the Preface as having a five-part structure. Their examination combines the first three elements into a single “introductory dialogue” and combines the final two elements into a single “concluding acclamation” (see WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” in *Notitiae*, 23 [1987], 419).

⁸⁰⁴ The term *eschatocol* is used by some, particularly those most quoted in the field and thus its use is adopted here. For example, see WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 419. The term *eschatol*, however is frequently used by other experts. For an example, see MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 365.

7. *Sanctus* (unvarying)
8. *Benedictus* (unvarying)

During the celebration of the Mass, worshippers become aware that something of incredible significance is about to take place. There is noticeable movement in the sanctuary, possibly the entrance of a thurifer with smoking incense and even acolytes with candles. There is bodily movement in the nave through changes in posture. There is a multiplicity of gestures by the celebrant. There is dialogue between celebrant and congregation, vocally by all or vicariously through the server(s), recitation and/or chant noticeably aloud in an ancient stirring melody; there is often the ringing of bells. Through the many swift and vivid sensorial presentations, the point is made that something of the utmost importance is about to take place and activity in the prefrontal cortex of the brain increases. Focus upon the altar, attention and concentration are demanded by the mind itself through the promptings of the senses. Yet all of this is accomplished in a brief period and with few words.⁸⁰⁵

With the opening dialogue, the intensity of the Preface begins to disclose itself.⁸⁰⁶ The rich and ancient exchange begins with the *Salutatio* which indeed comprises the very first words of the Eucharistic Prayer: The celebrant speaks to all present with the greeting-blessing-wish: *Dominus vobiscum*. (The Lord [be] with you). Those present, together or vicariously, respond to the celebrant in the singular in a way that at once accepts that which

⁸⁰⁵ Marx notes: “[... T]he Roman Preface has the advantage of brevity. The pastoral importance of this feature should not be underestimated” (MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 364).

⁸⁰⁶ Of this, Parsch notes, “The Preface begins with the acclamations, which are examples of the spontaneous exclamations so frequent in the public life of ancient peoples. In our civilization such spontaneous outbursts of expression are almost entirely unknown” (PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 215).

was offered by the celebrant and yet is a greeting-blessing-wish of its own in return: *Et cum spiritu tuo*. (And [the same] with thy spirit.)⁸⁰⁷

In the *Exhortatio*, the celebrant insists of those present a particular spiritual posture when he commands, *Sursum corda!* (Up with the hearts!) The congregants, strictly the baptized faithful at this point in the Mass, respond with enthusiastic obedience, *Habemus ad Dominum!* (We have, unto the Lord.)⁸⁰⁸

With the *Invitatio*, the celebrant calls out an invitation to join into precisely that which is to follow, the great act of thanksgiving, when he chants *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro!* (Let us give thanks to the Lord our God!) The faithful voice their consent and assent with an enthusiastic affirmative response, *Dignum et iustum est!* (It is fitting and just!).⁸⁰⁹

With the end of this dialogue, the threefold core of the Preface begins with the Protocol, variable but limited in the number of forms it takes.⁸¹⁰ Most familiar are the ancient texts which begin, *Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutare* (Truly it is fitting and just, right and salutary) and frequently concludes with *Domine, sanctae Pater, omnipotens aeternae Deus* (Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God).⁸¹¹

⁸⁰⁷ Parsch punctuates the meaning of this brief and common dialogue, stating, “The *Dominus vobiscum* at the beginning of the Preface is not only the usual greeting of the priest to the people, but also a declaration that the Emmanuel has indeed come among us” (PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 215).

⁸⁰⁸ Parsch notes that it “is found for the first time in the Canon of Hippolytus. It is quite true, therefore, that these acclamations have been in use in the Roman liturgy since about A.D. 200. The *Sursum corda* calls attention to the sublimity of the action about to take place in the Canon” (PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 215).

⁸⁰⁹ Parsch observes that the *Gratias agamus* phrase is “no doubt an invitation to the actual celebration of the Eucharist: Let us celebrate the Eucharist (*Eucharistomen*)” (ibid., 216).

⁸¹⁰ There are four basic Protocols, each of which begins with “Protocol 1” and builds by adding one phrase upon another until “Protocol 4” consists of all of them combined in order: Protocol 1 alone reads: *Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutare*. To this, Protocol 2 adds: *nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere*, to which Protocol 3 adds: *Domine, sanctae Pater, omnipotens aeternae Deus* and to which finally Protocol 4 adds: *per Christum Dominum nostrum*. This order is retained from historical sources and allows for some variation (see WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 509).

⁸¹¹ Parsch notes that these repetitions of what are essentially synonyms, i.e., *dignum, iustum, aequum, salutare* in the one phrase as well as to a lesser degree with *Domine, Pater, Deus* and *sanctae, omnipotens, aeternae* “are intended to be poetic amplifications” (PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 216). Of the Protocol, Jungmann states: “Every Roman Preface begins [...] with a declaration of the propriety, we might even say

The variable Embolism which follows is the core that defines and declares the specific matter of thanksgiving attached to this particular day, place and feast. The Embolism identifies the Preface, gives it a title⁸¹² and grounds this particular celebration of the Mass with a degree of specificity. Its position casts the forthcoming Canon in a particular light.

The final element of the three-fold core of the Preface is the Eschatocol, variable within a certain number of possibilities. It is identifiable by the Latin linguistic custom of connecting the following to the previous. The most frequent used is *Et ideo* or some iteration thereof.⁸¹³ While there is a limited number of eschatocols, each formulary ends on an open note, requiring the next element of the Preface to follow immediately. The lengthiest form of *Eschatocol* is as follows: *Et ideo cum Angelis et Archangelis, cum Thronis et Dominationibus, cumque omni militia caelestis exercitus, hymnum gloriae tuae canimus, sine fine dicentes...*⁸¹⁴

The Eschatocol, as the name intimates, draws one to the eschaton while yet remaining in the present, by drawing together the specific celebration of the Mass with the particular reason for thanksgiving stated in the Embolism pronounced by these earthly creatures joined with the unending thanksgiving of the heavenly creatures in the eternal heavenly

the obligation, of giving thanks: *Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutare*. This phrasing is not to be found in the *Eucharistia* of Hippolytus. But it is the reiteration of the yet more ancient response to the priest's *Gratias agamus: Dignum et iustum est*. In nearly all the liturgies this or similar presumption of the people's acclamation has prevailed.... [...] Thus, the priest, too, declares that what the congregation offers up to God is simply a service due. Regarding the content of this service, only the cardinal thought is expressed: it is gratitude, but gratitude which embraces all the powers of our soul, gratitude measured by that love we owe to God - with our whole heart and our whole soul and all our strength - gratitude that must in essence be paid always and everywhere" (JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 125-126).

⁸¹² Removing the specific embolism would revert it to the *Praefatio communis*; replacing it would make it no longer the Preface that it is entitled.

⁸¹³ Literally, *id + eo*: "This for this" or "And therefore" or "And for that reason."

⁸¹⁴ "And for that reason [just stated], with Angels and Archangels, with Thrones and Dominions, and with all the multitude of the heavenly army, we sing the hymn of your glory without end, declaring...." For the origin of this theme, see Hebrews 12:22ff; Galatians 4:26; Ephesians 1:21ff; I Peter 3:22, Ephesians 1:10 as well as references in the Hebrew Scriptures to the effort of joining to the angelic world in praising God, particularly in Psalms: 102:20ff; 148:2ff, etc.

liturgy in which they are engaged. Moments before Heaven drops down upon the altar like dewfall, the image is presented of the earthly being swept upward to heaven. As Jungmann states, “In ancient Christendom a favorite way of representing the salvation which is ours in Christ was to show that it associates us with the blessed spirits of heaven and that by its means we are able to take the place of the fallen angels.”⁸¹⁵

Having been joined to the heavenly choirs, the open-ended form of the Eschatocol leads into the appropriate response of the celebrant and faithful. The *Sanctus*, first of the two-fold chants, issues forth as the celebrant and congregants assume to themselves the chant adapted from the ancient and Holy Scripture of Isaiah 6:3,⁸¹⁶ the hymn of the angels in the vision the prophet beheld:⁸¹⁷ *Sanctus sanctus sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth! Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua. Hosanna in excelsis!*⁸¹⁸ “The community of the redeemed, the Church here on earth, joins with the angelic choirs in heaven to adore the eternal and all-holy God. We are thus made aware of the dignity to which we have been raised, we are made to realize that we are already *cives sanctarum et domestici Dei*.”⁸¹⁹

The *Sanctus* appears to have been present in the earliest sources. The fact that is absent in the manuscripts attributed to Hippolytus is likely an exception due to personal

⁸¹⁵ JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 126. Parsch’s somewhat allegorical description is noteworthy, particularly as it expresses the profound importance of the Eschatocol: “The third part of the Preface, remarkable for its magnificent cadences, forms the transition into the chant of the angelic choir. Those who understand Latin will remark its buoyant rhythm and euphony resounds with expressions descriptive of the adoration and awe of the angelic hosts; each choir is pictured in a different attitude of reverence and homage; the angels are praising, the dominations adore, the powers tremble, the seraphim are jubilant in their praising, and from them we might learn the awe and reverence due to God. In overwhelming humility, we, the poor children of earth, associate ourselves with these celestial choirs; round about us, as we bow to adore, may be heard the soft rustling of angels’ wings” (PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 217-218).

⁸¹⁶ “Et clamabant alter ad alterum et dicebant: sanctus Dominus. Exercituum plena est omnis terra gloria eius.”

⁸¹⁷ See PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 219.

⁸¹⁸ Parsch remarks, “[...] It might be said, that the Eucharistic canticle is interrupted by these two chants. Probably because of these chants, it came about that the remainder of the canon was recited secretly...” (PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 218).

⁸¹⁹ JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 302-303.

preference. The fact that it existed ostensibly everywhere else from antiquity is, according to Jungmann, a fortuitous development.⁸²⁰

The final element of this multi-part grand act of Eucharistic Preface is the *Benedictus*: *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini! Hosanna in excelsis!* These words are a direct reflection of the acclamation cheered by our Lord's disciples at the time of his triumphal entry into Jerusalem as described in Matthew 21:9.⁸²¹ With this in mind, Parsch observes, "Similarly, at the beginning of the Canon, the liturgy receives the Lord entering into the mystery of the Mass."⁸²² No doubt there is the genius connection to Revelation 7:9 with the vision of the new creation, the redeemed clothed in white, such as would be the newly baptized, also waving palm branches as did those who welcomed the Lord in his triumphal entry.⁸²³

A working example of a parsed Eucharistic Preface brings to light the brevity and clarity of the Roman style Eucharistic Preface. The *Praefatio de Ascensione Domini*⁸²⁴ from MR/1962 combines the lengthiest Protocol with a concise Embolism and the most common Eschatocol:⁸²⁵

⁸²⁰ See JUNGMAN, *The Early Liturgy*, 302-303.

⁸²¹ Matthew 21:9: "The crowds preceding him and those following kept crying out and saying, 'Hosanna to the Son of David; blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest heaven'" (New American Bible with Revised New Testament, Iowa Falls, IO, World Bible Publishers, 1986).

⁸²² PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 219. Additionally, Parsch observes, "The words *hosanna* and *Sabaoth* have come down to us from the primitive Church of Palestine and were not translated because a peculiar meaning has in the course of time become associated with these words. The *Hosanna in excelsis* is cognate to the *Gloria in excelsis*" (ibid.).

⁸²³ PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 219. It may appear incongruous that the *Benedictus*, prior to the climactic consecration of the elements and their transubstantiation, is not praising the coming of the Lord but the very presence of the Lord. To this observation, Parsch responds, "The ancient liturgy did not wait for the actual moment of the Consecration but looked on the entire canticle (our Canon) as the Consecration prayer, in which the mystery was accomplished" (ibid.).

⁸²⁴ This appears in the MR/2008 as *Praefatio II de Ascensione Domini*, albeit with a modified eschatol: "Quaproppter, profusis paschalibus gaudiis, totus in orbe terrarum mundus exultat. Sed et supernae virtutes atque angelicae potestates hymnum gloriae tuae concinunt, sine fine dicentes...."

⁸²⁵ In the rubrics of MR/1962 and long beforehand, the *Secreta* is prayed at the Offertory by the celebrant in a whisper until the final words *Per omnia saecula saeculorum*, to which all respond Amen. Then, without hesitation, the *Dominus vobiscum* of the Preface takes place. Consequently, the *Per omnia*/Amen frequently

Salutatio: Dominus vobiscum. *Response:* Et cum spiritu tuo.

Exhortatio: Sursum corda. *Response:* Habemus ad Dominum.

Invitatio: Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro. *Response:* Dignum et iustum est.

Protocol: Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine, sancte Pater, omnipotens aeternae Deus: per Christum Dominum nostrum.

Embolism: Qui post resurrectionem suam omnibus discipulis suis manifestus apparuit, et ipsis cernentibus est elevatus in caelum, ut nos divinitatis suae tribueret esse participes.⁸²⁶

Eschatocol: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archangelis, cum Thronis et Dominationibus, cumque omni militia caelestis exercitus, hymnum gloriae tuae canimus, sine fine dicentes:

Sanctus: Sanctus sanctus sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua. Hosanna in excelsis.

Benedictus: Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna in excelsis.

In few but intense words, this sample Embolism describes the specific point of thanksgiving offered at the Mass of this feast: The Savior arose and appeared to his followers who, as witnesses to his post-resurrection presence among them, then witnessed his ascension into heaven. The purpose of his glorious acts was to raise finite sinful humanity in need of salvation into participation with his infinite sinless divinity. This Embolism exists as an ongoing part of and in conjunction with Eastertide. It has truly “customized” the Roman Canon for both the Easter Season and the feast of the Ascension, precluding the need for a different anaphora.

3.5 – The Eucharistic Preface in the pre-Tridentine Era

As demonstrated, the Eucharistic Preface assumed the form of a prayer of praise and thanksgiving “to the heavenly Father for the benefits of the creation and redemption. In the first centuries of the Church, these benefits were mentioned at great length [...] (The

appear in hand Missals and catechetical publications on the Mass as belonging to the *Praefatio*. In scholarly works, however, is it not treated so. Connecting the concluding dialogue of the *Secreta* to the *Praefatio* seems rather to be a function of the rubrics and/or publishers. It sweeps the action of the Offertory immediately into the Eucharistic Prayer.

⁸²⁶ “Who, after his resurrection, appeared to all his disciples and, while they looked on, was taken up into heaven, that he might grant unto us to be sharers in his own divinity. And therefore....” For another example, see MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 376.

Apostolic Constitutions contains examples of this) and in the beginning, the entire chant was the free composition of the celebrant, only gradually being brought down to a set form.”⁸²⁷ The celebrant of the Mass was in a position to determine the theme and tone of the offering of the Holy Eucharist by the words he chose to use.⁸²⁸

This must have resulted in a tremendous number of such compositions.⁸²⁹ Once these began to take written form, they come to us in the patrimony of the existing *Libelli* of the Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary, containing 267 Eucharistic Prefaces, one for each Mass formulary,⁸³⁰ and fifty-four in the *Gelasianum Vetus*.⁸³¹

In the span of time from the third to the sixth centuries, some significant changes occurred.⁸³² Particularly as the calendar developed, the principle of thanksgiving would take on changes depending upon the celebrated occasion. The Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary’s plethora of Eucharistic Prefaces stands as testimony to this.⁸³³

A significant reference to the changeable Embolism inserted into the Eucharistic Prayer for major feasts is found in the writings of Pope Vigilius in 538:⁸³⁴

As to the arrangement of prayers for the celebration of Mass, we make no difference for any time, any feast, but we consecrate always in the same manner the gifts offered to God. In order to celebrate the feasts of Easter, the Ascension of the Lord, the Epiphany and the

⁸²⁷ PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 212-213.

⁸²⁸ MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 352.

⁸²⁹ See C. VOGEL, *Introduction aux Sources de l’Histoire du Culte Chrétien au Moyen Âge*, Spoleto, 1965, 20.

⁸³⁰ BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 112-113. See also JUNGMAN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 118, wherein he corroborates this number. BRUYLANTS does the same, stating, “En effet, bien qu’amputé d’un gros quart en son début, ce document ne compte pas moins de 267 préfaces...” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 112-113). See also JUNGMAN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. I, 62, 118, and BOUYER, *Eucharist*, 362. See also E. PALAZZO, *A History of the Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. M. BEAUMONT, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1998, 38-42.

⁸³¹ See JUNGMAN, *The Early Liturgy*, 302.

⁸³² JUNGMAN, *The Early Liturgy*, 302.

⁸³³ See *ibid.* This is true of the orations as well.

⁸³⁴ See M. METZGER, “History of the Eucharistic Liturgy in Rome,” 117.

Saints of God, we add distinct paragraphs proper to those days, through which we commemorate the holy solemnity or the Saints whose anniversaries we celebrate.⁸³⁵

Because of its changeability, there has always been a danger that the theme of thanksgiving may somehow be lost or become obscured in the Preface and so it happened over the course of time.⁸³⁶ Not that all these texts were somehow unorthodox; rather, they were digressions from the point at hand.

The Eucharistic Preface began to be seen as an introduction. It was then, Bouyer believes, that the Preface began to become “only a Preface, in the ordinary sense of the word, an appetizer and not the very principle of all that will follow. Thus, many medieval Prefaces will glorify God for all sorts of secondary motives but will let vanish the great vision of the redeeming mystery of creation, lost and saved, which is the proper object of the Eucharist.”⁸³⁷

As time passed, it came to be common that more attention was paid to these digressions than to the thanksgiving itself and thus the Embolism became detached from its purpose. “A reform was bound to come sooner or later. A certain improvement is already to be noticed in [*Gelasianum Vetus*], where special Prefaces are found only in the *proprium de tempore* and on a very few feasts of Saints; there are fifty-four Prefaces in all.”⁸³⁸ Thus the

⁸³⁵ *PL*, 1844-1864, vol. 69, col. 18, English translation in M. METZGER, “History of the Eucharistic Liturgy in Rome,” 117-118. It is interesting to see the term “Mass” (“*Ordinem quoque precum in celebritate missarum...*”) already in the early sixth century understood as the term for the Sacred Synaxis.

⁸³⁶ See JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 302. For instance, in celebration of Martyrs, salvation in Christ as expressed in the glory of the Martyr’s death should be clear. However, sometimes, hagiographical elements entered, obscuring the point of the Preface (see *ibid.*).

⁸³⁷ “[... S]’est effacé à ce point que le exprimait le dessein n’a plus paru qu’une préface, dans le sens banal du mot, un hors-d’œuvre, et non pas le principe même de tout ce qui va suivre. Ainsi, nombre de préfaces médiévales glorifieront Dieu pour toutes sortes de motifs secondaires, mais laisseront s’évanouir la grande vision du mystère rédempteur de la création, perdue et sauvée, qui est l’objet propre de l’Eucharistie” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 97-98). Jungmann concurs with this time frame (see JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. II, 103).

⁸³⁸ JUNGSMANN, *The Early Liturgy*, 302. Even in ancient times, matters could get out of control. Jungmann describes the fate of the content of the Preface: “In the course of centuries, however, the custom of constantly reshaping the prayer of thanks, along with the effort to say something new for each occasion, must have resulted in the formation of many a version that touched only the periphery of the theme peculiar to the

pendulum began to swing and later reform would result in a change from overabundance to paucity of Prefaces.⁸³⁹

By the time of the exchange between Adrian I and Charlemagne mentioned above, there were likely fourteen Eucharistic Prefaces, including the *Praefatio communis*. This in turn was a significant reduction from the fifty-four Prefaces found in the *Gelasianum Vetus*, a number already considered restrictive in comparison to the 276 provided in the Veronese/Leonine. Of the fourteen Prefaces remaining, those for extraordinary occasions and two for feasts of Saints were discontinued in Frankish territory. Thus, the formerly large corpus of Eucharistic Prefaces in the West was reduced to seven. In later centuries in that same Frankish territory Prefaces were added for the celebration of the feasts of the Holy Cross and of the Holy Trinity as well as for the season of Lent. Not including the *Praefatio communis*, the number of Prefaces increased to nine.

It was more than simply an unwieldy number of compositions, however, that was at issue. Most problematic was, as mentioned above, that the substance of the Preface was frequently lost, gutting it as it were of its very *raison d'être* and function, leaving few that were true to their purpose. Bouyer comments on this remarkable devolution, stating, “Even at a very early date, we find in Roman or Romano-Frankish books (as well as in the Gallican or Mozarabic books ...) formulas which have little (or nothing) to do with the

prayer. Traces of such a tendency can be found even in the oldest examples. And those centrifugal forces must have been all the more powerful when every festal ceremony not only gave occasion for an updated version but seemed to demand a new theme, one more consonant with the feast itself. This was the case from the very start in the liturgies of the West and especially in the Latin liturgy of Rome” (JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 118).

⁸³⁹ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 303.

traditional Eucharist. [...] And, only too often, the result was that the Eucharist turned into a moralizing didacticism.”⁸⁴⁰

Research finds exemplary Preface texts in the old sources, wherein the beauty of thanksgiving is expressed. Other texts emphasize the primary theme of *Eucharistia* itself.⁸⁴¹ For whatever causes, however, maintaining these themes in the Preface, necessary for it to maintain its purpose, was not necessarily the concern of all the ancient writers. This becomes apparent rather quickly upon inspection of the sources.⁸⁴²

Even at the time of the Veronese/Leonine sacramentary, with its multiplicity of formulations, the Preface is often left wanting. Some of these formulations must have been quite humorous when viewed by an outside party, for example when the Preface is used as a tirade against objectionable adversaries, sometimes by name! Jungmann adds wryly, “Such curiosities as these must lead sooner or later to a reaction.”⁸⁴³

⁸⁴⁰ BOUYER, *Eucharist*, 363-364, English translation in MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 359. Bruylants observes that while we lack direct evidence of the situation of the Roman Mass prior to the Gregorian period, “It is, however, agreed that an indirect witness of this period may be seen in the ancient Gelasian [sacramentary] in its proper Roman part. However, this document already contains only 56 Prefaces in total.” “On s’accorde cependant à voir dans le Gélisien ancien, en sa partie proprement romaine, un témoin indirect de cette époque. Or, ce document ne comporte déjà plus que 56 préfaces au total” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 113).

⁸⁴¹ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 122. Other Prefaces comprised catechesis rather than thanksgiving. Bruylants notes the Prefaces of Lent. He observes that the one appearing in *MR/1962* is little less than a treatment of fasting and leaving “absolutely nothing to suspect of the great paschal mystery unfolding at this crucial moment in the liturgical year.” “... ne laisse absolument rien soupçonner du grand mystère pascal qui se déroule à ce moment capital de l’année liturgique” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 116).

⁸⁴² See BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 115.

⁸⁴³ JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 119. Bruylants finds multiple examples of this digression from the theme of thanksgiving in ancient sources of Prefaces of Martyrs. He states, “Very quickly, in many cases, the hagiographic element took precedence and the Preface turned resolutely to the panegyric. In this regard, the endless Mozarabic compositions are frequently quoted. But the phenomenon is not reserved for non-Roman liturgies, and here also we find examples from the [Veronese/Leonine] collection.” He adds of his findings that “there is no satire or diatribe that has not managed to slip into the Preface.” “Très vite, en de nombreux cas, l’élément hagiographique prit le pas et la préface tourna résolument au panégyrique. On cite souvent, à ce propos, les interminables compositions mozarabes. Mais le phénomène n’est pas réservé aux liturgies non romaines, et ici également, nous en trouvons des exemples dès la collection de Vérone. [...] ... il n’y a pas jusqu’à la satire ou la diatribe qui n’ait réussi à se glisser dans la préface” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 116).

Marx observes, “Consequently, one observes throughout the history of the Roman Preface a back-and-forth struggle between those who would rein in the worst abuses and those who would not be content with a meager selection of Prefaces. Thus, the Gregorian Sacramentary imposed on much of the Christian West by Charlemagne contained a mere fourteen Prefaces....”⁸⁴⁴ The tension, then, was between texts of high quality and orthodoxy that were true to their purpose and the banal that did not fit this description. There were those who wanted more Eucharistic Prefaces available, regardless of their content and quality and those who wanted no other Prefaces except those of high quality, even if that meant there were few.

As use of the Roman Mass in Frankish territories began to overwhelm that of the Gallican, the resulting lack of choice of Eucharistic Prefaces was particularly regretted. For some period, the situation was remedied by supplementation. These regional sacramentaries contained at least 73 Prefaces and some contained more than 300.⁸⁴⁵ Ward and Johnson recognize that in the face of this, it is not surprising that there was some authoritative response.

The connivances of canonist Burchard of Worms (965-1025)⁸⁴⁶ created a juridical situation that would, in essence, remain a reality in the vast majority of the Latin Church for the better part of a millennium. Burchard added a Preface *de Sanctissima Trinitate* to

⁸⁴⁴ MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 359-360. Bruylants adds that of those remaining fourteen, eight of them are for the Temporal Cycle and were assumed into *MR/1570*; they remain in *MR/1962*. “Dans la rédaction grégorienne, qui parvint en Gaule dans la seconde moitié du 8^e siècle, il n’en reste plus que 14, dont 8 pour le temporal, qui ont été retenues par le missel romain actuel” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 113).

⁸⁴⁵ See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 416. The revisions resulting in the Gregorian “*Hadrianum*” inserted 333 texts.

⁸⁴⁶ See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 416.

the existing eight. Wishing to give juridical credence to that new total of nine,⁸⁴⁷ this turbulent Teuton apparently penned a “pseudo-decretal,” attributing it to Pelagius II (579-590), who predated Burchard himself by some four centuries, and slipped it into his copy of the *Corpus iuris canonici*.⁸⁴⁸ He then held it forth as having been longstanding ecclesiastical law. This group of nine Eucharistic Prefaces was then accepted as licit. To these nine, the Preface for the Blessed Virgin Mary was added, as prescribed at the Synod of Piacenza (1095) by Urban II (1088-1099).⁸⁴⁹

Bouyer accepts the corpus of Prefaces left as a legacy of Burchard and justifies the choices therein as texts that successfully synthesize the proper themes of thanksgiving and eliminate the common devolutions. He states, “The most remarkable in this respect is undoubtedly that of Epiphany: *Quia cum Unigenitus tuus in substantia nostrae mortalitatis apparuit, nova nos immortalitatis suae luce reparavit*. We cannot hope for a more perfect fusion of the two fundamental themes of light and life in a formula of pithy density.”⁸⁵⁰

⁸⁴⁷ Bruylants adds, “About the same time, however, the Preface of the Blessed Virgin was added to the group thus constituted. This state of affairs was sanctioned by the Missal of Pius V and it was necessary to wait until the beginning of [the 20th] century to see the Church subject the narrow collection of its Prefaces to revision.” “Vers le même moment cependant, la préface de la sainte Vierge vint s’ajouter au groupe ainsi constitué. Cet état de choses fut sanctionné par le missel de Pie V et il fallait attendre le début [du 20^e] siècle pour voir l’Eglise soumettre à révision la collection étriquée de ses préfaces” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 113).

⁸⁴⁸ See BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 113. It should be noted that there is not irrefutable evidence that the decretal was a forgery. Regardless of its origin, scholars see some good behind this. Bouyer sees the wisdom in what was allegedly accomplished by Burchard and the later addition of the Preface for the Blessed Virgin as “justified.” The few Prefaces left by Burchard were chosen because they continued to retain the significance of the Preface and, at least for the most part, “refocused on *opus redemptionis*” (see BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 98).

⁸⁴⁹ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 119-120. The text was an earlier composition, estimated from about the year 850, from the *Gregorianum*. See also B. CAPELLE, “The Origins of the Roman Preface of the Virgin,” in *Review of Ecclesiastical History*, 38 (1942), 46-47; B. BOTTE, *The Ordinary of the Mass*, Paris/Louvain, Cerf/Mont Césaire, 1953, 25, and A.G. MARTIMORT, *L’église en prière*, Paris, Desclée, 1961, 388-389.

⁸⁵⁰ “La plus remarquable à cet égard est sans doute celle de l’Epiphanie: *Quia cum Unigenitus tuus in substantia nostrae mortalitatis apparuit, nova nos immortalitatis suae luce reparavit*. On ne saurait souhaiter fusion plus parfaite des deux thèmes fondamentaux de la lumière et de la vie dans une formule d’une densité lapidaire” (BOUYER, *La préface et le sanctus*, 101-102).

This number of texts was generally, but not entirely, accepted in the Latin Church. Those who were satisfied may have been so if for no other reason than obedience to what was believed to be a genuine sixth century papal decree.⁸⁵¹ Other Churches were dissatisfied with the scarcity of Prefaces. Bruylants discovers, for example:

[... T]he Church of Gaul was not resigned to this movement of impoverishment, and from the Merovingian period (ca. 450-750) documents attest a return to the primitive abundance. The Gelasians of the eighth century, in their oldest writing, represented by the manuscripts of Gellone and Angoulême, made up the number of Prefaces beyond 200, drawing largely on the ancient Roman documents, such as the [Veronese/Leonine] collection and perhaps others....⁸⁵²

The effort in the Carolingian era (ca. 750-900) to standardize the Mass in line with that of Rome augmented the selection with at least a hundred Prefaces by the work of Alcuin.⁸⁵³ Even up to and beyond the eleventh century, Missals from the Rhineland and from France contained Prefaces for each Mass formulary. Others, without going to such an extent, supplement the small selection with other compositions, especially for important local feasts.⁸⁵⁴

Regardless of regional augmentations, the collection of Eucharistic Prefaces set forth by Burchard was repeated and upheld by liturgical commentators. The corpus of eleven

⁸⁵¹ The *libelli* of the Veronese/Leonine Sacramentary contain about 267 texts of Eucharistic Prefaces and the *Gelasianum Vetus* contains about 54. The Hadrianum sent from Rome to Charlemagne, however, contained only 14, 8 of which were for the Temporal Cycle. This would appear to indicate that Rome was tending to severe restriction to the Prefaces, the number of which, or likely rather, the quality of which, had become out of hand (see WARD and JOHNSON, "Sources of the Roman Missal," 415-416).

⁸⁵² "[... L]'Église de Gaule ne s'était pas résignée à ce mouvement d'appauvrissement, et dès l'époque mérovingienne les documents attestent un retour à l'abondance primitive. Les Gélasiens du 8e siècle, dans leur rédaction la plus ancienne, représentée par les manuscrits de Gellone et d'Angoulême, ont fait remonter le nombre des préfaces au-delà de 200, en puisant d'ailleurs largement dans les anciens documents romains, telle la collection de Vérone et d'autres peut-être..." (BRUYLANTS, "Les préfaces du Missel Romain," 113).

⁸⁵³ The Fulda Sacramentary dating to the tenth century contains well more than 300 (see BRUYLANTS, "Les préfaces du Missel Romain," 113-114).

⁸⁵⁴ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 120-121.

Prefaces (nine core texts, the *Praefatio communis* and that of the Blessed Virgin Mary) would endure for nearly eight hundred years.⁸⁵⁵

3.6 – Post-Tridentine Reform of the Eucharistic Preface

On 4 December 1563, when the Fathers of the Council of Trent remanded reform of the Missal to work outside of the Council,⁸⁵⁶ they were well-aware that the revisers of the Missal would have to address the orthodoxy and usefulness of the many widely circulated Eucharistic Prefaces that did not belong to the long-static corpus of eleven Prefaces. The texts were great in number but did not necessarily serve the purpose of a Preface or contain language that reflected orthodoxy. The Reformers could have modified these texts to conform with doctrine, “but this would not completely solve the problem since the thanks expressed would usually lack a proper object.”⁸⁵⁷

The Tridentine Reformers had been tasked with a revision of the Mass not simply for the sake of revision; they were facing many more aberrations than simply those of the Preface. By that time, the Mass throughout the West had been greatly romanized. As we have seen, this was not only due to Charlemagne but also to St. Francis of Assisi who preferred the simplicity of the Roman Mass over those of others and thus adopted them in his communities wherever they were founded. In spite of widespread romanization, and

⁸⁵⁵ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 120-121. Research reveals the absence of proper Sunday Prefaces in the medieval corpus of Prefaces. In the newer *Gelasianum* as well as in the supplement created by Alcuin, however, such Prefaces appear; they are appropriate to the theme at hand and consistent with the function of the Preface. They were not present in the post-Burchard corpus of Prefaces. However, in the period following Pentecost, many formularies devolve at worst into an oration-like sense of petition or at best a praise of God’s goodness in the most general terms (see *ibid.*, vol. 2, 121-122).

⁸⁵⁶ *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 255.

⁸⁵⁷ MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 355-356. There remained that most ancient *Praefatio communis* but, as mentioned above, it was but a framework lacking an embolism. For centuries, this was the Preface used on weekdays and even non-festival Sundays. It was not until 1759 that the Preface de *Sanctissima Trinitate* was prescribed for use on non-festival Sundays of the year (see *ibid.* and cf. R.C.D. JASPER and G.J. CUMING, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd rev. ed., New York, NY, Pueblo Publishing Company, 1987, 35).

general acceptance of the limited number of Prefaces, there were yet a plethora of texts used in various regional and diocesan missals, many of dubious quality. Additionally, there were heterodox texts circulating, some of which may have found their way into unwitting usage by those who held to orthodoxy. The Church desired to assert her faith with clarity and in purity, in the face of ever surfacing and resurfacing doctrinal deviations.⁸⁵⁸

Taken within this broader view, the post-Tridentine Reformers were presented with a daunting task that needed to be accomplished with some haste. This requires some reflection.

For the task to be accomplished, it was too much to examine and compare all the texts used in all the various Mass books in use throughout the Latin Church. There was not time for liturgical archaeology nor was it likely a concern. Experts appointed by the Pope would instead draw upon known, historical and orthodox sources, using the Prefaces in Roman usage as the standard against which to judge others. This is reflected in the words of Pius V in *Quo primum*.⁸⁵⁹

At that point in our Church's history as well, the modern form of seminary preparation of clerics did not yet exist and would not take form until after the Council of Trent.⁸⁶⁰ This meant there some clerics were not trained in orthodoxy and orthopraxis.

⁸⁵⁸ BRUYLANTS, "Les préfaces du Missel Romain," 116.

⁸⁵⁹ See *Quo primum*, §2.

⁸⁶⁰ This is not to say that there was absolutely no training of clerics. Rather, the manner of seminary formation and curriculum as it came to be known in the Latin Church over the last centuries did not exist. However, there were centuries when qualification for priestly ordination comprised a knowledge of observing the rubrics and reading the Latin texts correctly, focused on the "how" of the celebration. Over the period of many centuries, awakening of the "what" of the celebration took place. Schooling in the Latin language took on importance so that the meaning of the texts was understood. Some urban schools, such as those attached to cathedrals and monasteries, developed positions of professors and theologians to teach potential clerics the content of what it is that they would be celebrating. Charlemagne began requiring examinations to be passed prior to ordination. This was still some 800 years prior to the requirements imposed at the time of the Council of Trent. For details surrounding this and for a thorough exposition on the history of clerical training and formation, see M. NOBEL, *Die wissenschaftliche Ausbildung der Priesterkandidaten in der lateinischen Kirche unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Partikulargesetzgebung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*,

Many were enamored of the Protestant propositions and adopted them. Those who remained faithful wondered about the orthodoxy of the texts they possessed. These circumstances created uncertainty in the clergy and faithful alike.

The Missal that was being prepared in the post-Tridentine reform was intended to be imposed on the entire Latin Church to assure orthodoxy, accomplish uniformity and reflect unity. This imposition placed responsibility upon those preparing it to be cognizant of the situation of those who would be required to receive it. For instance, a financial requirement would be placed upon those required to adopt the new universal Missal. The resulting volume should not be cost-prohibitive. Consideration had to be given to the fact that Latin was not the vernacular language of those who would use the Missal, even if some had been well-schooled in the language, coupled with a possible lack of education; additional texts would impose a burden. With these concerns in mind, the Missal needed to be compact, containing neither options nor extraneous material.

It appears then that the approach employed by the post-Trent Reformers when approaching the Eucharistic Prefaces was that the texts in Roman use had come from more widely used sources venerated from antiquity for their brevity, simplicity, clarity and orthodoxy, with a minimal number necessary to fulfill their purpose. However, we are aware that consideration was given to other Prefaces in use at the time in various local Churches. Jungmann observes, for instance, “For Saints who were singularly venerated - John the Baptist, Augustine, Jerome, Francis, Roch, Christopher - special Prefaces again came into use, but because of the unhistorical contents, they provoked the antagonism of

Hamburg, Verlag Dr. Kovac, 2008. See in particular pp. 26-27 for the *Capitulare Generale Aquense* required of potential clerics by Charlemagne beginning in 802.

various reforming circles at the time of the Council of Trent, and so most of them had again to be dropped.”⁸⁶¹

Ultimately, the Reformers landed upon the previously authorized number of eleven Prefaces, including the *Praefatio communis*, which had been the corpus for centuries. This was a safe choice that answered the concerns they faced. This “completed the collection of proper Prefaces that would be included in the *Missale Romanum* of Pius V prepared after the Council of Trent.”⁸⁶² Thus, *MR/1570* contained the following Prefaces: 1. Nativity; 2. Epiphany; 3. Lent; 4. Holy Cross; 5. Easter; 6. Ascension; 7. Holy Spirit; 8. Holy Trinity; 9. Blessed Virgin Mary; 10. Apostles; 11. *Praefatio communis*.⁸⁶³

The *Ordo Missae* itself was going to be Roman; the scripture cycle, ancient; the rubrics precise. The result would be simple, uniform, orthodox and decidedly Roman.⁸⁶⁴ The rite would be simple in execution, verbiage and chant so even the uneducated cleric could offer the most solemn Mass with little training, while retaining Roman precision and elegance. The number of prefaces did not swell the Missal unnecessarily, the texts were known to be orthodox, they did not add the burden of new texts for the celebrant. At the end, there would be one Missal, allowing for manageable use as well as manageable oversight. This new Missal was not a redesign of the Roman Mass; it was not a new Missal in that sense. It was rather a continuation of the most ancient practices as available documentation was able to support.

⁸⁶¹ JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 121. For further treatment of this topic, see H. JEDIN, “Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Römischen Messbuches,” in *Liturgisches Leben*, VI (1939), 43, 46, 55, 60ff.

⁸⁶² See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 359-360.

⁸⁶³ See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 416.

⁸⁶⁴ Looking at the decisions of the post-Tridentine reformers, it seems that they determined an element to be Roman not on account of its origin but on account of its official use in the Mass in Rome.

Consequently, the use of custom, which had been the basis of the local liturgical practice, was supplanted by juridical promulgation and imposition of the reformed *Missale Romanum*, by pontifical decree, upon the entire Latin Church. What had been the numerous rites of the Latin Church had coalesced into a highly romanized Rite. When *MR/1570* was promulgated, a single Roman Rite of liturgical practice was enacted, with bicentenarian exceptions and the invitation for them to adopt the new Missal, which nearly all opted to do. The romanization of Western liturgy was, and only could have been, accomplished by the juridic acts of the Holy See; it was an unmitigated success.

3.7 – The Eucharist Preface from the post-Tridentine Reform to Vatican II

Following the promulgation of *MR/1570*, the corpus of Prefaces did not remain entirely static. In some religious communities and for the sake of the local feasts of certain dioceses, special pre-existing Prefaces were retained or new ones were brought into use.⁸⁶⁵ Additionally, the Church of France added a variety in the eighteenth century.⁸⁶⁶ Therefore, it is clear that the Roman authorities were willing to allow additions under certain circumstances.⁸⁶⁷ Yet one can understand that these exceptions were for specific Churches and feasts that were only of more local interest; the Holy See was not inclined to extend these texts to the entire Latin Church.

⁸⁶⁵ See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 120-121. See also B. OFFERMANN, “Die heutige liturgischen Sonderprüfationen,” in *Theologie und Glaube*, 46 (1956), 204-215.

⁸⁶⁶ See B. OFFERMANN, “Die heutige liturgischen Sonderprüfationen,” 204-215. Cf. JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 121, and *Missale Parisiense*, Paris, 1738.

⁸⁶⁷ These were additions to the Roman texts, not replacements; *MR/1570* remained intact, enriched for local use.

Almost 250 years after the imposition of *MR/1570*, Prefaces were added for St. Joseph and for the deceased in 1919,⁸⁶⁸ for the devotional Masses of Christ the King⁸⁶⁹ and the Sacred Heart⁸⁷⁰ in 1925 and 1928, respectively. A Preface for the ritual Mass of Chrism was added in 1955 amidst the revisions of Holy Week.⁸⁷¹ Enrichment of what had been received from *MR/1570* was accomplished by the addition of these Eucharistic Prefaces, texts which maintained orthodoxy and the proper purpose of thanksgiving.⁸⁷² Still, they numbered few.

The paucity of Prefaces began to be felt universally as an atmosphere of increased interest in worship, particularly in the Roman Mass, began to develop. This took place in an historical context in which literacy had become normative, communication swifter and printed works significantly more accessible. More information, including historical data and discoveries, had become available and disseminated. Consequently, as knowledge increased, so did interest.

Bruylants portrays the general atmosphere of the time when he states:

Since the liturgical renaissance of our time, voices of authority have been raised wishing for a return to greater diversity. As the knowledge and editing of ancient sources became more widespread, efforts were made, mainly by German-speaking authors, to make known, even in the form of spiritual reading, the most beautiful compositions of this rich tradition.⁸⁷³

⁸⁶⁸ CONGREGATION FOR SACRED RITES, Decree prescribing the new Preface for the Mass for the Dead, 9 April 1919, in *AAS*, 11 (1919), 190; CONGREGATION FOR SACRED RITES, Decree prescribing the new Preface for the feast of St. Joseph, 9 April 1919, in *AAS*, 11 (1919), 191.

⁸⁶⁹ PIUS XI, Encyclical letter *Quas primas* on the kingship of Christ, 11 December 1925, in *AAS*, 17 (1925), 593-610, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 36-46, and CONGREGATION FOR SACRED RITES, Decree prescribing the texts for the celebration of the Divine Office and Mass of the feast of Christ the King, 12 December 1925, in *AAS*, 17 (1925), 655-668.

⁸⁷⁰ PIUS XI, Encyclical letter *Miserentissimus Redemptor* on the reparation due to the Sacred Heart, 8 May 1928, in *AAS*, 20 (1928), 165-178, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 47-57, and CONGREGATION FOR SACRED RITES, Decree prescribing the texts for the celebration of the Divine Office and Mass of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 29 January 1929, in *AAS*, 21 (1929), 44-77.

⁸⁷¹ See A. WARD and C. JOHNSON (eds.), *The Prefaces of the Roman Missal: A Source Compendium with Concordance and Indices*, Rome, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1989, 289-294, 11.

⁸⁷² See JUNGSMANN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 121.

⁸⁷³ “Depuis la renaissance liturgique propre à notre époque, des voix autorisées se sont élevées pour souhaiter le retour à une plus grande diversité. À mesure que la connaissance et l’édition des sources anciennes prenaient plus d’ampleur, des efforts ont été faits, principalement par des auteurs de langue allemande, pour faire connaître, fût-ce sous forme de lecture spirituelle, les plus belles compositions de cette

With the increase of availability of historical texts, the lack of Eucharistic Prefaces became visible, and critique of the *status quo* arose. Criticisms included a lack of variety of Eucharistic Prefaces and the lack of a Preface specific to Sundays. There were concerns over the lack of an element of thanksgiving in the Embolism of the Preface *de Sanctissima Trinitate* prescribed for use on Sundays in 1759.⁸⁷⁴ There was similar concern with the lack of an Embolism in the *Praefatio communis*. There was criticism of the general content of the Embolism of the Prefaces for Apostles, Lent, Christmas and Epiphany.

On the eve of the Second Vatican Council, Bouyer strongly promoted reform of the Eucharistic Prefaces. He would go on to castigate any resistance or challenge to the addition of Prefaces to the Missal in France.⁸⁷⁵ He expressed a primary concern of “the problem of the so-called Common Preface and its Sunday substitute, the Preface to the Trinity.”⁸⁷⁶ He likewise directly accused these Prefaces of being incompetent:

[... T]he common Preface, it must be admitted, despite its presence in the oldest manuscripts of the Roman Canon, is only an empty frame. It confines itself to giving end to end the common introduction and conclusion of the Roman Prefaces, but it lacks the essential: the mystery which is the object of the Eucharist. Its emptiness has been so well felt that it has for a long time been substituted for ordinary Sundays with the Preface of the Blessed Trinity. [...] This *delectatio morosa* of a scholastic intoxicated with the rattling of these formulae cannot express Eucharistic joy for the Christian.⁸⁷⁷

riche tradition” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 114). For further reading by and about these voices, see, for example, A. DOLD, *Sursum Corda: Hochgebet aus alten lateinischen Liturgien*, Salzburg, 1954, and J. STRANGFELD, *Das Dankgebet der Kirche*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1952.

⁸⁷⁴ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 416-417.

⁸⁷⁵ Bouyer speaks of the inclusion of new Prefaces as being persecuted by “l’ultramontanisme romantique de Dom Guéranger.” He will further state, “On regrettera cependant qu’un dernier soubresaut du guérangérisme les ait rétrécies à la ‘dimension exiguë’ de la plupart des préfaces romaines. Cette opération de chirurgie esthétique, mieux intentionnée qu’inspirée, rappelle fâcheusement ces curés bricoleurs qui fabriquent des chandeliers antiques ou modernes, suivant les goûts, en vissant directement la coupe d’un candélabre baroque sur son pied” (see BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 103-104).

⁸⁷⁶ “[... L]a problème de la préface dite commune et de son malencontreux substitut actuel, la préface de la Trinité” (ibid., 104).

⁸⁷⁷ “[... L]a préface commune, il faut l’avouer, en dépit de sa présence dans les plus anciens manuscrits du canon romain, n’est qu’un cadre vide. Elle se borne à donner bout à bout l’introduction et la conclusion communes des préfaces romaines, mais il y manque l’essentiel: le mystère qui fait l’objet de l’Eucharistie. On a si bien senti sa vacuité qu’on lui a substitué depuis longtemps, pour les dimanches ordinaires, la préface de la Trinité. [...] Cette *delectatio morosa* d’un scolastique enivré du cliquetis de ses formules ne saurait

Additionally, Bruylants presented criticisms that were not limited to these two Eucharistic Prefaces; he was dissatisfied with every Preface received in *MR/1962*. According to him, the Preface for Lent lacks any direction to the Paschal mystery and simply presents the benefits of fasting. He asserts that the Christmas and Epiphany Prefaces are more speculative and ignore the more specific portrayal of the incarnation of Christ as found in Holy Scripture. He criticizes the Preface of the Apostles as a prayer of supplication that never breaks into thanksgiving, contradicting the very point of the Preface.⁸⁷⁸ He concedes that there is some good to be found in the text of the Preface for Christ the King. “[... It] must be admitted that this Preface, introduced to the Missal in 1925, is a composition that does not lack grandeur or nobility.”⁸⁷⁹

exprimer pour le peuple chrétien l’allégresse Eucharistique. Nous reviendrons sur le grave problème posé par ces deux textes” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 103). As mentioned, the Preface *de Sanctissima Trinitate* was assigned in 1759 to Sundays that did not have their own Preface. The embolism of this Preface received much criticism, typically that it was a mid-to-late fifth century response to various heterodox assertions, finding at its core a statement of doctrine describing the three persons in the substance of the single Godhead in an overly scholastic way and not retaining the character of *eucharistia* essential to the Eucharistic Preface (see BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 116, and A. CHAVESSE, *Le Sacramentaire gelasien [Vaticanus Reginensis 316] Sacramentaire presbyteral en usage dans les titres romains au VIIe siècle*, Bibliothèque de théologie I, Série IV: Histoire de la théologie 1, Tournai, Desclée, 1958, 254-260). Bruylants observes further, “In this way, it occupies a place in the Sunday liturgy which, in spite of its doctrinal value, is manifestly exaggerated and risks begetting habit, even boredom, when the faithful hear it in their local language.” “Par-là, elle occupe dans la liturgie dominicale une place qui, malgré sa valeur doctrinale, est manifestement exagérée et risque d’engendrer l’accoutumance, voire l’ennui, lorsque les fidèles l’entendent dans la langue du pays” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 127). Most importantly, the embolism does not seem to contain thanksgiving as its main impetus. Parsch concurs when he states, “The Trinity Preface, which is one of the most recent, is, however, lacking in poetic sentiment, and bears too clearly the stamp of scholastic theology” (PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 217). Jungmann opines that the contents of the embolism in the Preface of the Blessed Trinity, while orthodox, is a profession of faith rather than a prayer of thanksgiving identifying the purpose of the Preface (see JUNGMAN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 123).

⁸⁷⁸ See BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 119-132. See also MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 360-361. The Preface of the Apostles becomes a prayer of petition and does not move explicitly into thanksgiving. Jungmann calls it “a distortion of the original text” from the Veronese/Leonine source but admits that even in the source, the text “not infrequently takes on the features of a petition” (JUNGMAN, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, 124). For a comparison between the Preface as it appears in *MR/1962* with the modified version appearing in *MR/2008*, see MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 369.

⁸⁷⁹ “[... I]l faut reconnaître que cette préface, introduite au missel en 1925, est une composition qui ne manque pas de grandeur ni de noblesse” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 126).

Parsch is more generous. “The Prefaces for Requiem Masses and for the Feast of Christ the King show that our own time is capable of producing noble and sublime Prefaces. The Requiem Preface is modeled upon the Mozarabic Liturgy.”⁸⁸⁰

In themselves, these were not radical criticisms; each could have been addressed with relative ease. To do so, however, there had to be a methodology, yet different from that of the sixteenth century reforms. The concerns of the post-Tridentine Reformers were not entirely shared by Reformers nearly four centuries later. For instance, the sixteenth century recognition of the need for brevity and simplicity vis-a-vis the cost of production of what would be imposed on the entire Latin Church did not appear to be an acknowledged concern in the twentieth century.⁸⁸¹ The new reforms were not in response to extrinsic threat to the Mass and the faith as the Council of Trent faced; these reforms were coming from within with a goal of enrichment.

Almost immediately prior to the second Vatican Council, four more Prefaces were provided for use throughout the Latin Church. These were: Advent, the Dedication of a Church, the Most Blessed Sacrament and All Saints. Therefore, in addition to the five Prefaces that had been added since the promulgation of *MR/1570*, there were now sixteen Prefaces, including the *Praefatio communis*, in use throughout the Latin Church when the Second Vatican Council began.⁸⁸²

⁸⁸⁰ PARSCH, *The Liturgy of the Mass*, 217.

⁸⁸¹ Though these may have been concerns for those upon whom the product of the reforms would be imposed.

⁸⁸² See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 417, and MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 359-360. However, these latter four Prefaces post-date *MR/1962* and belong to the “interim” Missals, wherein they typically appear as an appendix, though not identified as such.

During the fourth session of the Council, two new Prefaces were planned for the celebration of the Masses of the Holy Ghost.⁸⁸³ There was also a Mass formulary for the Extraordinary Jubilee Year 1965 that included a proper Preface but was not carried into the Roman Missal.⁸⁸⁴ In that same year, approval was granted for the Preface to be translated and used in vernacular languages.⁸⁸⁵

3.8 – The post-Vatican II Reform of the Eucharistic Preface

For some, announcement of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council (1962-1965) brought great hope for liturgical revision. For others, there was a sense of unclarity and instability.

The reform of the Eucharistic Prefaces was not intended to be solely quantitative; the quality was likewise intended to contribute to the overall enrichment of the Roman Mass. “Just as a major innovation was undertaken in the Roman tradition by the introduction of a further three Eucharistic Prayers, the Eucharistic Prayer itself as such was enhanced by the provision of a significantly increased treasury of alternatives in the Preface itself.”

⁸⁸³ “Pendant la quatrième session du Concile, deux nouvelles préfaces furent prévues pour la célébration des messes Votives du Saint-Esprit. [...] La première est un centon, composé à partir de L 635 et 951. La seconde est empruntée à la tradition ambrosienne” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 114, and 14, footnote 10). Cf. A. PAREDI [ed.], *Sacramentarium Bergomense*, Bergamo, Edizioni Moroventa Bergomensia, 1962, no. 768).

⁸⁸⁴ See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 417. “This Preface, from the ‘Mass of the Dedication’ in the Ambrosian Missal, was not subsequently maintained in the Roman Rite.” Cf. BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 114.

⁸⁸⁵ “I have the honor of referring to the request addressed to Pope Paul VI by you on 22 March 1965. In your capacity as President of Consilium, you asked that the Pope kindly grant permission for the vernacular in the Preface of the Mass. It is now my honored task to inform Your Eminence that Pope Paul has graciously directed that the resolution of this matter be left to the decision of each conference of bishops” (SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter, *Ho l’onore* of Cardinal A. Cicognani, informing Cardinal G. Lercaro, president of Consilium, of Pope Paul VI’s concession allowing the Preface at Mass to be in the vernacular, 27 April 1965, in *Notitiae*, 1 [1965], 149, and R. KACZYNSKI [ed.], *Enchiridion Documentorum instaurationis liturgicae*, I [1963-1973], Rome, 1976, §395, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 110, 269). Not two years later, Paul VI would allow experimentation with the vernacular in the Canon of the Mass and in the ordination rites, including the Eucharistic Prefaces (see PAUL VI, Concession, allowing *ad experimentum* use of the vernacular in the canon of the Mass and in ordinations, 31 January 1967, in *Notitiae*, 3 (1967), 154, English translation in *DOL*, doc 117, 278-279, here, 278).

Additionally, it was acknowledged that vernacular translations could become a reality, a matter worthy of great consideration when treating the Latin texts.⁸⁸⁶

“The revision accepted that the authentic function of the Preface as a whole was to give expression to the precise motives of praise and thanksgiving in a particular Eucharistic celebration.”⁸⁸⁷ Therefore, those entrusted with work on the Prefaces decided at the outset that it was going to retain its ancient form and its central theme of thanksgiving, for which the Preface exists.

Bouyer likewise describes a fundamental presupposition at the outset of work:

Despite some breathtaking but fragile theories, all too easily popularized, our Roman canon is one of the rare Eucharistic prayers still in use, the text of which has come down to us almost unchanged since at least St. Ambrose. Using the flexibility which it has preserved for the Preface, we would only have to provide a Preface on days which do not have a proper Preface worthy of being maintained or restored, which brings together the themes, verifiably primitive, [...] so that our Eucharist is fully explicit, and therefore fully pastoral.⁸⁸⁸

Considering the very same, Vagaggini concludes, “As far as we are concerned, this means that the Roman liturgy must retain a Canon with variable Prefaces, and that no single anaphora with a fixed Preface, whether it is on the Eastern pattern or a new composition, will provide a satisfactory solution.”⁸⁸⁹

⁸⁸⁶ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 418.

⁸⁸⁷ Ibid., 419-420. Here, Ward and Johnson reference *GIRM*, no. 55, though which version is unclear. The reference, however, appears in the latest edition: “The main elements of which the Eucharistic Prayer consists may be distinguished from one another in this way: a) The thanksgiving (expressed especially in the Preface), in which the Priest, in the name of the whole of the holy people, glorifies God the Father and gives thanks to him for the whole work of salvation or for some particular aspect of it, according to the varying day, festivity, or time of year” (*GIRM*, nos. 79 and 79a).

⁸⁸⁸ “En dépit de certaines théories époustouflantes mais fragiles, trop facilement vulgarisées, notre canon romain est une des rares prières Eucharistiques toujours en usage dont le texte soit venu jusqu’à nous à peu près inchangé au moins depuis Saint Ambroise. Usant de la souplesse qu’il a gardée pour la préface, nous n’aurions qu’à le pourvoir, aux jours qui n’ont pas une préface propre digne d’être maintenue ou restaurée, d’une préface qui rassemble les thèmes, véritablement primitifs, [...], pour que notre Eucharistie soit pleinement explicite, et pour autant pleinement pastorale” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 105-106).

⁸⁸⁹ VAGAGGINI, *The Canon of the Mass*, 87. This is precisely what was done, however, with the novel creation and introduction of “Eucharistic Prayer IV.”

Ward and Johnson note the need for pastoral consideration as well as the need for constraint in number. “It was decided to increase the number of texts, while respecting in general terms a certain restriction, which for a millennium and a half had in fact been distinctive of the liturgy of Rome, when set, for example against that of Milan.”⁸⁹⁰ The same scholars urge retention of the form and structure of the Preface.⁸⁹¹

They concur that the biblical content of the three-fold opening dialogue and the concluding two-fold acclamation are clear.⁸⁹² “The conciliar reform made no change in the introductory dialogue, nor the acclamation, though both the initial *protocol* and the *eschatocol* were the object of some attention.”⁸⁹³

Ward and Johnson acknowledge that the majority of sources used in the twentieth century reform were the same as those used by the post-Tridentine Reformers:

As previously remarked, one obvious procedure for supplementing the corpus of texts was simply to draw upon the full riches of Latin euchology, in first place as found in the ancient sacramentaries which represented the major contributors to the development of the liturgy of Pius V. Indeed the ancient manuscripts offered a very notable bulk of material as we have seen.⁸⁹⁴

The focus of reform through the eyes of experts Ward and Johnson, despite any other principles at play, is made clear:

It was above all in the case of the Preface that the revisers came to grips with the important operating principle of the liturgical reform which required it to undertake a very attentive restoration of texts to their original function and the restitution of an internal structure appropriate to it. Advances in liturgical history, in biblical studies and in liturgical theology pointed to the need for a reorientation of the Preface⁸⁹⁵ and a serious re-examination of existing texts for the suitability and completeness of their content.⁸⁹⁶

⁸⁹⁰ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 418. The vast collection of Eucharistic Prefaces resulting from the post-Conciliar reform that were entered into the new Roman Missal does not seem to respect “a certain restriction.”

⁸⁹¹ See *ibid.*, 419-420.

⁸⁹² See *ibid.*, 413.

⁸⁹³ *Ibid.*, 419.

⁸⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 418.

⁸⁹⁵ This suggests that the Prefaces in use at the time were improperly oriented.

⁸⁹⁶ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 419.

Guiding the revision of the Eucharistic Prefaces is the principal that they must contain recollection of the *mirabilia Dei*. The texts must be orthodox in their content as well as faithful to their form as received and in keeping with the character of the Roman Mass.⁸⁹⁷

The goal of the Reformers was to enrich the existing collection of Eucharistic Prefaces as received in *MR/1962* as far as they lent themselves. Dumas recalls, “[... B]y their theological content and their literary form, [the Reformers] thus preserved the texts of the current Roman Missal.”⁸⁹⁸

Given the number of texts available in the sources from antiquity, Bouyer states: “We can rightly hope today for a further enlargement of the texts of Prefaces to be used during the ecclesiastical year. It is necessary as well to care not just to introduce more variety, but to offer as complete as possible a vision of the Eucharist for the meditation of the faithful, of the confession in the exultant faith of these ‘wonders of God’ which are like the complementary facets of the unique and inexhaustible ‘mystery of Christ.’”⁸⁹⁹

Bouyer recognized that it was not the task simply to “exhume haphazardly” old and ancient texts simply for the sake of doing so and falling into the banality of antiquarianism, but, he intimates, to return to the very sources and to assess them critically. “Only then,” he states, “will we be able to welcome and understand the texts that have kept its gushing

⁸⁹⁷ Translation by and in MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 363, 365-366. Cf. DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 18, 19; BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 115; A. DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces du Missel Romain,” in *La Maison-Dieu*, 94 (1968), 159-172, 160.

⁸⁹⁸ “Le but des rédacteurs était, pour le moment, d’enrichir un recueil eucharistique déjà existant. Ils ont donc conservé les textes du Missel romain actuel, lorsque ceux-ci se recommandaient par leur contenu théologique et leur forme littéraire” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 160-161).

⁸⁹⁹ “On peut à bon droit souhaiter aujourd’hui un nouvel élargissement des textes de préfaces à utiliser au cours de l’année ecclésiastique. Encore faut-il qu’on se soucie non pas simplement d’y introduire plus de variété, mais bien de proposer à la méditation des fidèles une vision aussi complète que possible de l’Eucharistie, de la confession dans la foi exultante de ces “merveilles de Dieu” qui sont comme les facettes complémentaires de l’unique et inépuisable “mystère du Christ” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 98).

vitality, and to eliminate or correct those who have dangerously weakened it, when they have not totally lost sight of it.⁹⁰⁰

Five essential principles of composition for new Prefaces were approved by Consilium in its seventh and eighth plenary sessions.⁹⁰¹ Most of these seem reasonable and respectful; they will be expanded briefly in section 3.8.2, below.

3.8.1 – Texts Resulting from the Reform and Thereafter

On 23 May 1968, just three years after the Second Vatican Council concluded, three newly composed Eucharistic Prayers along with eight new Prefaces were approved for use throughout the Latin Church.⁹⁰² All of them were later entered into *MR/1969*. “By this publication, the Roman Consilium of Liturgy first wanted to respond to the most urgent needs of pastors by enriching the Roman Missal in one of its especially destitute parts, especially as the Preface, by solemnly opening the Eucharistic prayer, has finally regained its full value since both are proclaimed in living languages.”⁹⁰³

⁹⁰⁰ “Ainsi seulement serons-nous à même d’accueillir et de comprendre les textes qui en ont gardé la vitalité jaillissante, et d’éliminer ou de corriger ceux qui l’ont dangereusement amoindrie, quand ils ne l’ont pas totalement perdue de vue” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 98).

⁹⁰¹ DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 159. Ward and Johnson recall, “In general, some of these principles were applicable to the revision of the euchological texts in general. Seen as a whole, these include “[...] the casting into relief of distinctive physiognomies; the shaping of a distinctive liturgical vocabulary related both to the themes of the celebration and to the authentic function of the Preface; fidelity to a sense of truth in historical allusion and expression of sentiments. Others called for the employment of distinctive considerations” (WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 417).

⁹⁰² “By papal mandate Consilium has therefore prepared three new Eucharistic prayers, supplementing them with an expanded series of Prefaces. As a part of the Eucharistic prayer, these Prefaces bring out in more detail and proclaim the mystery of salvation during the course of the liturgical year” (SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES [CONSILIUM], Decree *Prece Eucharistica*, promulgating three new Eucharistic prayers and eight Prefaces, 23 May 1968, in *Notitiae*, 4 [1968], 156, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 241, 609).

⁹⁰³ “Par cette publication, le Consilium romain de liturgie a voulu d’abord répondre aux besoins les plus urgents des pasteurs en enrichissant le Missel romain dans une de ses parties spécialement indigentes, d’autant plus que la préface, en ouvrant solennellement la prière Eucharistique, a repris enfin toute sa valeur depuis que l’une et l’autre sont proclamées en langue vivante” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 159).

The new collection of Prefaces comprised two for Advent, one for Sundays of Lent, two for Sundays *per annum*, one for the Holy Eucharist,⁹⁰⁴ as well as common Prefaces. The ancient *Praefatio communis* was eliminated.⁹⁰⁵ Rose observes, “Some of the Prefaces, like that for the Sundays *per annum* II, have been taken over without change from the old sacramentaries; others, like the two Prefaces for Advent, are based on old prayers; lastly, others have been composed on the basis of biblical texts; this is the case with Common Preface I.”⁹⁰⁶

Dumas observes, “By employing these new texts for Advent, Lent, Ordinary Sundays, ferials and Masses of the Blessed Sacrament, the Christian assembly will become accustomed to a greater variety and will no longer suffer from a too rigid uniformity of this liturgical element.” Dumas continues, expressing his hope “that the use of these eight samples of the future corpus of Prefaces will give rise to criticisms, observations and suggestions which, transmitted to Consilium, can effectively enlighten the members of the committee responsible to guide the continuation of its work.”⁹⁰⁷

Two of the three newly composed Eucharistic Prayers have their own Prefaces, technically bringing the additional Prefaces promulgated to ten. The Preface to Eucharistic Prayer IV is fixed; the Canon is not prayed without this Preface and this Preface is not used

⁹⁰⁴ This Preface was foreseen for use principally at the Holy Thursday evening Mass of the Lord’s Supper.

⁹⁰⁵ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 416-417.

⁹⁰⁶ A. ROSE (ed.), “The New Prefaces,” in L. SHEPPARD, *The New Liturgy: A Comprehensive Introduction to the New Liturgy as a Whole and to Its Calendar, Order of Mass, Eucharistic Prayers, the Roman Canon, Prefaces and the New Sunday Lectionary*, Glasgow, Robert MacLehose and Company, Ltd., 1970, 244.

⁹⁰⁷ “En employant ces textes nouveaux pour l’Avent, le Carême, les dimanches ordinaires, les fêtes et les messes du Saint-Sacrement, l’assemblée chrétienne s’habituerait donc à une plus grande variété et ne souffrirait plus de l’uniformité trop rigide de ce genre de pièces liturgiques. Enfin, on souhaite que l’utilisation de ces huit échantillons du futur corpus des préfaces suscite des critiques, observations et suggestions qui, transmises au Consilium, puissent éclairer efficacement les membres de la commission compétente pour orienter la suite de son travail” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 159).

elsewhere. There is a particular Preface attached to the canon of Eucharistic Prayer II. However, it may be replaced by another variable Preface by choice of the celebrant. This Preface itself is also available as Common Preface VI allowing it to be used with the Canons of Eucharistic Prayers I and III.⁹⁰⁸

Despite the earlier criticisms some experts had lodged against the Prefaces contained in *MR/1962*, almost all fifteen of them were retained. In fact, nine were left unchanged and two, Epiphany and Apostles, were revised yet remain quite recognizable.⁹⁰⁹ The Prefaces of Easter, Ascension and the Holy Spirit were assigned different Eschatocols.⁹¹⁰ The Preface for the ritual Chrism Mass, the most recently added in 1955, was entirely discarded. Even so, it appears to have inspired the new composition by which it was replaced.⁹¹¹

On 3 April 1969, the new Roman Missal was approved by Paul VI by means of Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, with an effective date for use throughout the Latin Church was 30 November 1969. In this text, Paul VI states, “The Eucharistic prayer has been enriched with a great number of Prefaces – drawn from the early tradition of the Roman Church or recently composed – in order that the different facets of the mystery of salvation will stand out more clearly and that there will be more and richer themes of thanksgiving.”⁹¹²

Some notable additions and adjustments were made following the promulgation of *MR/1969*. For instance, the texts for the Holy Thursday Mass of Chrism were revisited and revised. On 6 March 1970, the SCDW promulgated some altered texts for this Mass

⁹⁰⁸ See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 350. See also WARD and JOHNSON, *Prefaces of the Roman Missal: A Source Compendium*, 289-294, and BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 455-458.

⁹⁰⁹ WARD and JOHNSON, *Prefaces of the Roman Missal: A Source Compendium*, 88-92, 436-440.

⁹¹⁰ See *ibid.*, 176-181, 209-214.

⁹¹¹ See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 27, and WARD and JOHNSON, *Prefaces of the Roman Missal: A Source Compendium*, 166-175.

⁹¹² See PAUL VI, Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, §6.

formulary by means of *Sacra Congregatio pro Clericis*.⁹¹³ Among these texts was a new Eucharistic Preface to replace the one that had been added in 1955. In this communication, the Sacred Congregation states, “The Preface recalls the institution of the ministerial priesthood, over and above the royal priesthood of believers and lists its duties. [...] These few words contain the whole program of pastoral life and personal sanctification for the one who is Christ’s priest and the minister of the Church.”⁹¹⁴

On 24 June 1970, the SCDW issued the instruction *Calendaria particularia* on the creation of particular calendars. The document gives, *inter alia*, specific directives for the composition of Eucharistic Prefaces to accompany the other euchological texts for local observances. The document reiterates the theme necessary for the correct composition of a Eucharistic Preface, stating, “The Preface must express the proper theme of thanksgiving that characterizes the days or seasons to which the Preface belongs. It does not have the literary form of a petition but of praise glorifying God through Christ the Lord because of some particular element in the mystery of salvation.”⁹¹⁵

On 1 November 1974, the SCDW introduced new Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with children and Masses for Reconciliation. Each of these includes proper Preface.⁹¹⁶

⁹¹³ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Publication *Sacra Congregatio pro Clericis* of the text for the renewal of commitment to priestly service, 6 March 1970, in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 86-87, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 315, 787-788.

⁹¹⁴ *Sacra Congregatio pro Clericis*, §10. A study of this Preface would be an interesting pursuit. In contrast to the principles of revision as explored above and those that will follow below, the text is disproportionately lengthy, almost exclusively catechetical, to the point that thanksgiving is diluted, perhaps limited to its first sentences (see *MR/2008usa*, 152). Interesting as well is the Preface for Chrism that it replaced. The text from the 1955 Eucharistic Preface is also quite different from the Prefaces that had been received from *MR/1570* and had been added more recently to it. It is a prayer of supplication and invocation, and a beautiful one to be sure, but it bears little resemblance to the Eucharistic Preface as it has come to be defined (see *MR/2008usa*, 592-593, with musical notation, and 643, plain text).

⁹¹⁵ *Calendaria particularia*, art. 40, c.

⁹¹⁶ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, “Introduction,” in *Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with Children and for Masses of Reconciliation*, 1 November 1974, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1975), 7-12, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 250, 630-334. This document introduces a novelty: “To encourage participation by the children, it is permissible, in keeping with the *Directory for Masses with Children*, to insert special

With the addition of these texts after the promulgation of *MR/1969*, the total number of Eucharistic Prefaces had risen to eighty-four by the time of the promulgation of *MR/1975*. The typical editions of the Missals in authorized use today contains 84 Prefaces in *MR/2008* and sixteen in *MR/1962*. Practically, there may be several more prefaces in regional editions.⁹¹⁷

3.8.2 – Principles and Methodology Used to Revise the Eucharistic Prefaces

Revision of the Eucharistic Prefaces was not intended to be solely quantitative. The Post-Vatican II revisers were interested in texts of high quality to contribute to the overall enrichment of the Roman Mass. The possibility that texts would become translated into the vernacular became a matter of immense importance when treating the Latin texts.⁹¹⁸

The substance of reform became clear when those entrusted with treatment of the Eucharistic Prefaces “came to grips with the important operating principle of the liturgical reform which required it to undertake a very attentive restoration of texts to their original function and the restitution of an internal structure appropriate to it.”⁹¹⁹ Recognized

reasons for giving thanks before the dialogue for the Preface” (SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, “Introduction,” in *Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with Children and for Masses of Reconciliation*, 1 November 1974, in *Notitiae*, 11 [1975], 7-12, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 250, 630-634, here, 633). Cf. SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, *Pueros baptizatos*, Directory for Masses with Children, 1 November 1973, in *AAS*, 66 (1974), 30-46, and in *Notitiae*, 10 (1974), 5-21, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 276, 676-688, here, 681, no. 22.

⁹¹⁷ With so many Eucharistic Prefaces, a difficulty may arise in understanding which of them is to be used under what circumstances. The Sacred Congregation for Rites addresses this: “Query: When is a particular Preface to be regarded as proper? Reply: The problem arises mainly from the possibility of using Eucharistic Prayer IV, which has a fixed Preface and consequently is governed by the rule that it may not be used when a Mass has its own proper Preface (*GIRM*, no. 322 d) Further, the Preface of the season is said on feasts and also during the particular seasons, some of which are quite long, and this raises the question of the meaning of ‘proper Preface.’ A Preface is to be regarded as ‘proper’ in a strict sense in Masses that are celebrated on the very day of a feast or during its octave. In the Proper of Seasons, there is a corresponding Preface, but this is not to be regarded as proper strictly speaking and during the season Eucharistic Prayer IV and Eucharistic Prayer II with their own Prefaces may be used. In votive Masses there is the option to use either the Preface corresponding to the Mass or the Preface of any Eucharistic prayer” (*Notitiae*, 5 [1969], 323, no. 1, English translation in *DOL*, 529, footnote R⁶⁰).

⁹¹⁸ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 418.

⁹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 419.

advances in related disciplines and in biblical studies evoked “the need for a reorientation of the Preface and a serious re-examination of existing texts for the suitability and completeness of their content.”⁹²⁰ The revisers concluded that the substance of the Eucharistic Preface texts must be orthodox and must contain recollection of the *mirabilia Dei*.⁹²¹

The revisers discussed the form and structure of the Preface⁹²² and concurred that the biblical content of the three-fold opening dialogue and the concluding two-fold acclamation are clear.⁹²³ “The conciliar reform made no change in the introductory dialogue, nor the acclamation, though both the initial Protocol and the Eschatocol were the object of some attention.”⁹²⁴ Ultimately, those entrusted with revision decided that the Eucharistic Preface would retain its ancient form as received and in keeping with the character of the Roman Mass.⁹²⁵

Once it was decided that the structure and function of the Preface would remain intact, the nature of the texts was discussed. Of this, Vagaggini concludes, “As far as we are concerned, this means that the Roman liturgy must retain a Canon with variable Prefaces, and that no single anaphora with a fixed Preface, whether it is on the Eastern pattern or a new composition, will provide a satisfactory solution.”⁹²⁶ In a word, the revisers had determined that the Preface would retain its use and flexibility as well as its structure and function.

⁹²⁰ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 419.

⁹²¹ See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 363, 365-366. Cf. DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 18, 19; BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 115; A. DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces du Missel Romain,” in *La Maison-Dieu*, 94 (1968), 159-172, 160.

⁹²² See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 419-420.

⁹²³ See *ibid.*, 413.

⁹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 419.

⁹²⁵ See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces.” Cf. DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 17.

⁹²⁶ VAGAGGINI, *The Canon of the Mass*, 87.

With this in mind, then, the revisers set forth a scope of work. Boyer relates that they decided “we would only have to provide a Preface on days which do not have a proper Preface worthy of being maintained or restored, which brings together the themes, verifiably primitive, [...] so that our Eucharist is fully explicit, and therefore fully pastoral.”⁹²⁷

Ward and Johnson noted a need for constraint in number. “It was decided to increase the number of texts, while respecting in general terms a certain restriction, which for a millennium and a half had in fact been distinctive of the liturgy of Rome, when set, for example against that of Milan.”⁹²⁸

Dumas recalls that the possible number of resulting texts was not so much to be considered as was the broader scope of opportunity that lay before the revisers. Thus, he states that the “it was decided that each time, solemnity or important feast, as well as Masses celebrated on the occasion of the various rites or sacraments (marriage, deceased, etc.), would be provided with its own Preface.”⁹²⁹

Bouyer perceived the addition of more Eucharistic Prefaces as an opportunity with potentially profound spiritual effect. He states hopefully at the time: “We can rightly hope today for a further enlargement of the texts of Prefaces to be used during the ecclesiastical year [...] for the meditation of the faithful, of the confession in the exultant faith of these

⁹²⁷ “En dépit de certaines théories époustouflantes mais fragiles, trop facilement vulgarisées, notre canon romain est une des rares prières eucharistiques toujours en usage dont le texte soit venu jusqu’à nous à peu près inchangé au moins depuis Saint Ambroise. Usant de la souplesse qu’il a gardée pour la préface, nous n’aurions qu’à le pourvoir, aux jours qui n’ont pas une préface propre digne d’être maintenue ou restaurée, d’une préface qui rassemble les thèmes, véritablement primitifs, [...], pour que notre Eucharistie soit pleinement explicite, et pour autant pleinement pastorale” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 105-106).

⁹²⁸ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 418.

⁹²⁹ “[I]l a été décidé que chaque temps, solennité ou fête importante, ainsi que les messes célébrées à l’occasion des divers rites ou sacrements (mariage, défunts, etc.), seraient pourvus d’une préface propre” (ibid.).

‘wonders of God’ which are like the complementary facets of the unique and inexhaustible ‘mystery of Christ.’”⁹³⁰

Once the substance, form and structure and nature of the Eucharistic Prefaces was agreed and the scope of the work acknowledged, the revisers were able to formulate a methodology. Buyer recognized that it was not the task of the revisers to “exhume haphazardly” old and ancient texts for the sake of doing so and falling into the banality of antiquarianism. He intimates, rather, that return to the sources and assessing them critically was essential to the work of revision and reform. “Only then,” he states, “will we be able to welcome and understand the texts that have kept its gushing vitality, and to eliminate or correct those who have dangerously weakened it, when they have not totally lost sight of it.”⁹³¹

When the revisers beheld the plethora of ancient texts, which we will examine briefly below, it became clear that many of those texts could not be used directly as received. The revisers acknowledged that, if they were to accomplish the grand scope of work they had planned, some texts would need to be revised and some new texts would have to be composed. Consequently, five essential principles of composition for new Prefaces were approved by Consilium in its seventh and eighth plenary sessions and became an operating

⁹³⁰ “On peut à bon droit souhaiter aujourd’hui un nouvel élargissement des textes de préfaces à utiliser au cours de l’année ecclésiastique. Encore faut-il qu’on se soucie non pas simplement d’y introduire plus de variété, mais bien de proposer à la méditation des fidèles une vision aussi complète que possible de l’Eucharistie, de la confession dans la foi exultante de ces “merveilles de Dieu” qui sont comme les facettes complémentaires de l’unique et inépuisable “mystère du Christ” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 98).

⁹³¹ “Ainsi seulement serons-nous à même d’accueillir et de comprendre les textes qui en ont gardé la vitalité jaillissante, et d’éliminer ou de corriger ceux qui l’ont dangereusement amoindrie, quand ils ne l’ont pas totalement perdue de vue” (BOUYER, “La préface et le *sanctus*,” 98).

methodology.⁹³² In large part, these principles support and expand the decisions the *Coetus* had already made.

The first principle considers and respects the nature of the Preface as it was intended to exist and function. Dumas summarizes this, stating: “Serving as an introduction⁹³³ to the Eucharistic prayer, it must be essentially a thanksgiving. Therefore, the texts that would be especially deprecatory, narrative or catechetical absolutely do not fit.”⁹³⁴

The second principle considers the subject and substance of the Preface. Thanksgiving, *Eucharistia*, is founded in the element of the mystery being recognized in the particular Temporal or Sanctoral celebration. Therefore, this element must be expressed substantially in the Eucharistic Prefaces. The need for an economy of words and a certain density of the texts is also recognized under this principle. Dumas summarizes, “To be understandable and effective, the presentation of this fact or of this mystery must be rather brief. Also, the motivation of the thanksgiving [...] will rather be like a flash launched on such an important aspect of the festival or the time, whose totality of the liturgical texts will also provide a synthesis more complete.”⁹³⁵

⁹³² DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 159. Ward and Johnson recall, “In general, some of these principles were applicable to the revision of the euchological texts in general. Seen as a whole, these include “[...] the casting into relief of distinctive physiognomies; the shaping of a distinctive liturgical vocabulary related both to the themes of the celebration and to the authentic function of the Preface; fidelity to a sense of truth in historical allusion and expression of sentiments. Others called for the employment of distinctive considerations” (WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 417).

⁹³³ A curious choice of terms that appears contradictory to the more generally recognized definition of the Eucharistic Preface.

⁹³⁴ “Servant d’introduction à la prière Eucharistique, elle doit être essentiellement une action de grâce. Par conséquent, les textes qui seraient surtout déprécatatoires, narratifs ou catéchétiques ne conviennent absolument pas” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 160).

⁹³⁵ “Pour être compréhensible et efficace, l’exposé de ce fait ou de ce mystère doit être assez bref. Aussi la motivation de l’action de grâce ne se développera pas sur l’ensemble du mystère célébré, mais elle sera plutôt comme un flash lancé sur tel aspect important de la fête ou temps, dont la totalité des textes liturgiques fournira par ailleurs une synthèse plus complète” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 160).

The third guiding principle upholds respect for and preservation of the literary genre of the Eucharistic Preface as received. Dumas describes this, stating: “The literary form of the Preface is specifically clean, intermediate between prayer and hymn. It must certainly not be prosaic. It requires, on the contrary, a certain elegance of terms and style to incite the faithful, and first the celebrant, to praise and joy.” He adds that the texts must retain “faithful respect for the flow of Latin.”⁹³⁶

The fourth guiding principle regards the goal of the number of Prefaces to become available in a forthcoming revised Missal. The earlier decision of the revisers was upheld. That is, to add Prefaces for the Temporal and Sanctoral observances, various sacraments and rites, in order to emphasize its importance and to avoid unnecessary duplication in the celebration of the Mass.⁹³⁷

The fifth major guiding principle was the consideration of the sources available, their value and potential use.⁹³⁸ This became the most practically complex principle.

⁹³⁶ “La forme littéraire de la préface est spécifiquement propre, intermédiaire entre la prière et l’hymne. Elle ne doit pas, certes, être prosaïque. Elle exige, au contraire, une certaine élégance des termes et du style pour inciter les fidèles, et d’abord le célébrant, à la louange et à la joie. Pour obtenir un style bien rythmé et faciliter ainsi la tâche des musiciens, la composition des nouvelles préfaces a été spécialement étudiée en vue d’une structure équilibrée (stiques en nombre pair et de longueur alternée) et selon un respect fidèle du cursus latin” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 160).

⁹³⁷ Dumas explains, “Because of the proper function of the Preface and by fidelity to a healthy liturgical tradition, it was decided that each time, solemnity or important feast, as well as Masses celebrated on the occasion of the various rites or sacraments (marriage, deceased, etc.), would be provided with its own Preface. The noticeable increase in the number of Prefaces will have the happy result of completing the form of Masses with a proper text which, at the heart of the Eucharistic liturgy, expresses the precise object of thanksgiving and, secondly, avoid the monotony caused by too-frequent repetition.” “En raison de la fonction propre de la préface et par fidélité à une saine tradition liturgique, il a été décidé que chaque temps, solennité ou fête importante, ainsi que les messes célébrées à l’occasion des divers rites ou sacrements (mariage, défunts, etc.), seraient pourvus d’une préface propre. L’augmentation notable du nombre des préfaces aura pour heureux résultat de compléter le formulaire des messes par un texte propre qui, au cœur de la liturgie Eucharistique, exprime l’objet précis de l’action de grâce; et, en second lieu, d’éviter la monotonie causée par une répétition trop fréquente” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 160).

⁹³⁸ See *ibid.*, 160-161.

3.8.3 – Sources of the Reform and Their Difficulties

The *ressourcement* to which Bouyer refers above would become the core work of the revisers and prove the most challenging. However, they did not reject the texts that had been used by the Church for more than a millennium. Therefore, the revisers wished to retain the existing collection of Eucharistic Prefaces as received in *MR*/1962 as far as they lent themselves. Dumas recalls, “[... B]y their theological content and their literary form, [the Reformers] thus preserved the texts of the current Roman Missal.”⁹³⁹ This collection necessarily included the previously mentioned texts that had been added during the twentieth century.

Additionally, the *Coetus* considered those texts that had been added on the eve of the Second Vatican Council as well as those that had been added in its midst. Noe observes, “This was in recognition and promotion of the growing sense within the Church of the Roman Rite of the pressing ecclesial, spiritual and pastoral need to redress the accidents of history and effect a restoration of the liturgy at its very heart in the Eucharistic Prayer.”⁹⁴⁰

Members of the reforming *Coetus* relied heavily upon the traditional texts. Ward and Johnson acknowledge that most sources consulted in the twentieth century were the same as those used by the post-Tridentine Reformers. These sources “represented the major contributors to the development of the liturgy of Pius V. Indeed the ancient manuscripts offered a very notable bulk of material as we have seen.”⁹⁴¹

⁹³⁹ “Le but des rédacteurs était, pour le moment, d’enrichir un recueil euchologique déjà existant. Ils ont donc conservé les textes du Missel romain actuel, lorsque ceux-ci se recommandaient par leur contenu théologique et leur forme littéraire” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 160-161).

⁹⁴⁰ NOE in “Preface,” to WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 409.

⁹⁴¹ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 418.

The revisers intimate that they became enamored of the traditional texts and came to appreciate the importance of grounding their reform in these texts. Ward and Johnson underscore this:

Research has concentrated largely on certain authors of acknowledged stature such as Leo or Gregory, the very ones that appear to have been heavily involved in the penning of liturgical texts. They were the major point of reference for the revisers, too. We feel it necessary to underline this latter point, since we have in the course of our research been repeatedly surprised at the extent to which the writings of Leo and Gregory were foremost in the minds of those members of *Coetus XVIIIbis* commissioned to contribute to the composition of new Prefaces.⁹⁴²

Non-Roman influences were not to be overlooked. Vagaggini places immense value on these, stating, “this is the case that the treasures of the Roman Prefaces, increased by the finest flowerings of the Gallican, Spanish and Ambrosian traditions, could ever be put aside.”⁹⁴³

Once told, the number of texts available for consideration was astounding. Bruylants recalls that the “abundant and varied choice” of extant texts to study as sources of Eucharistic Prefaces, numbered well more than a thousand. He states, “Many of them are remarkable, and one can only be surprised that they have remained so unused for so long. In addition, the process of centonization which brings together in a new composition valuable elements scattered and admittedly, sometimes drowned in more than banal compositions, opens almost unlimited prospects.”⁹⁴⁴

Given the number of texts under scrutiny, the task of the revisers became complex. As mentioned, the *Coetus* encountered the difficulty that most were not useful for direct adoption. This was particularly true of non-Roman sources, such as texts found in Gallican,

⁹⁴² WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 426.

⁹⁴³ VAGAGGINI, *The Canon of the Mass*, 86-87.

⁹⁴⁴ “Plusieurs d’entre elles sont remarquables, et on ne peut que s’étonner de ce qu’elles soient restées si longtemps inemployées. De plus, le procédé du centon, qui rassemble en une composition nouvelle les éléments de valeur éparpillés et, il faut bien l’avouer, noyés parfois dans des compositions plus que banales, ouvre des perspectives presque illimitées” (BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 366).

Spanish and Ambrosian sources.⁹⁴⁵ In a sense, the twentieth century Reformers encountered similar challenges to those faced by their sixteenth century counterparts. In retrospect, they began to understand the limit placed on the number of Prefaces at the time of the post-Tridentine reforms.⁹⁴⁶

Dumas describes the crux of the difficulty confronting the Reformers when faced with the texts from antiquity, stating:

[... T]heir intention was to choose, among the best texts of the old sacramentaries, those which would best express what a new composition would have difficulty doing and needlessly repeat. But experience proves abundantly that, in the spirit of liturgical reform, very few ancient texts can be used as such. They have therefore been used to the best of their ability, modifying them widely and integrating them into new compositions. For this reason, references to ordinary liturgical sources generally indicate only partial borrowings or implicit citations.”⁹⁴⁷

A further complication the researchers encountered was the entanglement of patristic sources with biblical sources combined with material from other authors.⁹⁴⁸ A practical difficulty of note regards the Protocols. The abbreviations in the ancient texts appear to have been considered standard in their time but not necessarily decipherable centuries later.⁹⁴⁹

⁹⁴⁵ See, WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 418. Ward and Johnson express: “There are three partial exceptions, however. These concern some of the more obvious potential sources for quarrying by the revisers: the texts of the supplements to the Gregorian sacramentary, those of the Ambrosian Missal and those of the French diocesan liturgies of the seventeenth-nineteenth centuries, chiefly the Paris Missal of 1738” (Ibid., 424). In some cases, researchers found similar themes among the sources. Perhaps something found in a newer source, such as the Gregorian Sacramentary was found by another researcher in older source. When this occurred, the revisers returned to the older text for examined. It is these older sources that were finally cited (see *ibid.*).

⁹⁴⁶ See BRUYLANTS, “Les préfaces du Missel Romain,” 420.

⁹⁴⁷ “[... L]eur intention était de choisir, parmi les meilleurs textes des anciens sacramentaires, ceux qui exprimeraient le mieux ce qu’une composition nouvelle aurait difficilement et inutilement répète. Mais l’expérience prouve surabondamment que, dans l’esprit de la réforme liturgique, très rares sont les textes anciens qui peuvent être employés tels quels. On les a donc utilisés du mieux possible, en les modifiant largement et en les intégrant dans des compositions nouvelles. C’est pourquoi les références aux sources liturgiques habituelles n’indiquent généralement que des emprunts partiels ou des citations implicites” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 160-161).

⁹⁴⁸ See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 413 and 426.

⁹⁴⁹ Ward and Johnson explain: “[... W]ith regard to antecedent liturgical texts, even further difficulties arise in this part of our work. One of these is that the protocols are not in themselves an independent liturgical literary genre. It is particularly difficult to trace their exact wording, because of the tendency of manuscripts to abbreviate drastically these opening and concluding formulas. One can often note what appears to be a

Some texts contained elements that are useful and proper to the Preface alongside some that were inadmissible, inconsistent or even unintelligible. The revisers considered that some texts contained Latin turns of phrase that are not translatable, or at least not elegantly so. As a solution, a process of “centonization” would be used “whereby new prayers are composed by stitching together phrases from two or more ancient orations.”⁹⁵⁰

Within this context, it was recognized that care needed to be taken in order that the Roman tradition of the Preface not be abandoned. The revisers had determined to retain a standard of its dense and sober style, following it closely to prevent the possibility of a verbosity that would lend itself to a departure from the purpose of the Preface.⁹⁵¹ Dumas believes that this was accomplished with great care. He recalls that “in all these loans or new compositions, care was taken not to break with the unity of Roman tradition, whose style has both a sobriety and a density that make it the model of any liturgical prayer and a powerful safeguard against prattle....”⁹⁵²

truncated version of a particular formula such as ‘Quem laudant’ or ‘Cui merito,’ without being able to cite the full text. The compilers of critical editions of manuscripts and accompanying analytical tables have also concentrated on the embolism of the Prefaces rather than the protocols, so that research finds very little in the way of helpful instruments de travail to facilitate it” (WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 413-414). This practice remains in use today. For example, the printed conclusion to a prayer in the Roman Missal may be truncated as “Through our Lord...,” with the presumption that the celebrant has committed the remainder of the formula to memory. The ancient authors used abbreviations in their day to save space without a thought that what they were writing would be consulted as significant or even definitive sources centuries later.

⁹⁵⁰ L. PRISTAS, “Theological Principles that Guided the Redaction of the Roman Missal (1970),” in *The Thomist*, 67 (2003), 177. “This is a method that allowed a revival of the ancient euchological treasury by using the best texts so as to present them in a new form in the traditional Roman style.” “C’est un procédé qui a permis de renouveler le trésor euchologique ancien, en utilisant les meilleurs textes pour les présenter sous une forme nouvelle, dans le style romain traditionnel” (A. DUMAS, “Les oraisons du nouveau missel romain,” in *Questions Liturgiques*, 25 [1971], 263-70, here, 268, trans. PRISTAS, in “Theological Principles”).

⁹⁵¹ See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 161.

⁹⁵² “... [D]ans tous ces emprunts ou compositions nouvelles, on a veillé à ne pas rompre avec l’unité de la tradition romaine, dont le style possède à la fois une sobriété et une densité qui en font le modèle de toute prière liturgique et une sauvegarde puissante contre le bavardage qui servirait de véhicule aux “intentions” les plus variées” (DUMAS, “Les nouvelles préfaces,” 161).

The resulting centonized texts were formed from “a mosaic of phrases from the liturgical tradition. Thus, it is often the case that every single phrase in a text is drawn from some antecedent liturgical source.” Ward and Johnson admit that this degree of centonization may result in making their sources unclear. They defend the work, however, stating that a careful study of the texts will reveal the mind of the revisers and the sources they used. They conclude, “The result could perhaps be compared to an “identikit” portrait, where different abstracted features are combined to produce a living resemblance.”⁹⁵³

In other instances, research revealed useful themes for Eucharistic Prefaces, but the extant texts themselves were not useful or that a theme could be developed only from a multiplicity of sources that could not be extracted. These cases resulted in new compositions created by the *Coetus* revisers.⁹⁵⁴

Three main forms of composition for the Prefaces resulted from the work of the *Coetus*:

1. Texts just as found or nearly just as found in the sources consulted, perhaps with minor syntactical or grammatical corrections or updates without change to the substance of the content;
2. Texts created through centonization;
3. New compositions.

The resulting collection of Eucharistic Prefaces contained 81 texts.⁹⁵⁵ The sources for these are as follows: texts in use at the time the *Coetus* began its work, i.e., those contained in *MR/1962* and those added at the time of the Second Vatican Council: 14 (17%); Ancient/Medieval Liturgical Documents: 50 (62%); New Compositions: 17 (21%).⁹⁵⁶

⁹⁵³ WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 423.

⁹⁵⁴ Ward and Johnson explain this process: “When [...] the current Preface is [a] more radical compilation from multiple sources, we have aimed perforce rather at demonstrating a more generic dependence of the text as a whole upon the liturgical tradition. This is especially so since the building up of the revised text was clearly not a mechanical exercise, but a creative process made possible by the revisers grasp of the principles adopted, by their theological instincts and by a very extensive familiarity with the ancient texts” (WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 423-424).

⁹⁵⁵ This does not include the fixed Preface of Eucharistic Prayer IV.

⁹⁵⁶ See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 349-382.

Soon, the texts were translated into vernacular languages, those who had been involved directly in the work of reform and revision of the Prefaces were frustrated by what were likely “dynamic equivalence” renderings of the Latin. The revisers saw these as corruptions and a reversal of the reform they had overseen. Ward and Johnson express their irritation and criticism, stating, “Elements of petition have crept back into texts, or they have become flabby and prolix or show a certain moralizing tendency or have forgotten the need for a true lyricism.”⁹⁵⁷ The composition of the resulting texts demonstrates the principles, methodology and sources used by the revisers of *Coetus XVIIIbis* for revision. The following are prime examples:

The Preface for Advent I contains two phrases from two Prefaces for the Ascension of the Lord found in the Veronese/Leonine sacramentary,⁹⁵⁸ drawing further inspiration from the epistles as well as the Gospel for the theme of the Lord’s return in glory.⁹⁵⁹

The Preface for Advent II for use from 17 to 24 December receives its opening phrase from a Christmas Preface in the Veronese/Leonine sacramentary as well as a formulary turn of phrase from a prayer over the offering found in the same source.⁹⁶⁰ It finds biblical inspiration from the Epistles and the Gospels.⁹⁶¹

The Preface for the Sundays *per annum* II is an example of one that was taken almost verbatim from a sole source, in this case, the seventh century *Gelasianum Vetus*, wherein

⁹⁵⁷ See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 421.

⁹⁵⁸ See ROSE, *The New Prefaces*, 245.

⁹⁵⁹ INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, *The New Eucharistic Prayers and Prefaces*, London, G. Chapman, 1969, 12. See Philipp. 2:6-9; Romans 8:3; Coloss. 1:26; Ephes. 3:9, etc. For Christ’s return in glory, see 1 Tim. 6:14-15; Titus 2:13; Ephes. 1:8-10; Heb. 8:28; See Matt. 24:30; Acts 1:11; Thess. 4:14; Coloss. 3:3-4.”

⁹⁶⁰ ROSE, *The New Prefaces*, 247-248.

⁹⁶¹ ICEL, *The New Eucharistic Prayers and Prefaces*, London, G. Chapman, 1969, 12. See Hebrews 1:1-4; John 1:29, 36; Matt. 3:11.

the text appears as the Preface for the third Sunday after Easter.⁹⁶² Additionally, it receives biblical inspiration from the Epistles and Gospels.⁹⁶³

The Preface of the Most Holy Eucharist leads with two texts found in the non-Roman Ambrosian Sacramentary, the *Sacramentarium Bergomense*.⁹⁶⁴ The text continues with a significantly altered extract from a special insert in the *Communicantes* for Holy Thursday in the same source.⁹⁶⁵ Biblical inspiration is drawn from the Epistles.⁹⁶⁶

Common Preface I is an example of an entirely new composition. It is constituted from “an absolute mosaic of biblical quotations.”⁹⁶⁷

These examples demonstrate as well how the revisers had to grapple with sources. Rarely do these compositions bear a direct relationship with the source text. Marx explains: “Editing, centonization and addition of newly composed material usually played significant roles in the formation of a final text.”⁹⁶⁸ All told, approximately twenty percent of the Eucharistic Prefaces in the new corpus are new compositions, “in the sense that they display no readily identifiable textual relationship with a liturgical antecedent, though some ancient and medieval Prefaces may have offered inspiration.”⁹⁶⁹

⁹⁶² ROSE, *The New Prefaces*, 23.

⁹⁶³ ICEL, *New Eucharistic Prayers and Prefaces*, 12. See the *Gelasianum Vetus*, 549, and John 10:28; Rom. 6:9.

⁹⁶⁴ ROSE, *The New Prefaces*, 254.

⁹⁶⁵ Ibid., 254. The original source and alteration were possibly problematic as they end up each expressing different theological concept from each other.

⁹⁶⁶ See ICEL, *New Eucharistic Prayers and Prefaces*, 12, and PAREDÌ, *Sacramentarium Bergomense*, 1210, 489. See Hebr. 5:6 (7:17); Ephes. 5:2; 1 Cor. 11:23-26.

⁹⁶⁷ See ROSE, *The New Prefaces*, 255-266, and ICEL, *New Eucharistic Prayers and Prefaces*, 12. See Col 1:19, Ep. 1:10, John 1:16, Ph. 2, 6ff, Col. 1:20.

⁹⁶⁸ MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 377-378.

⁹⁶⁹ See MARX, “Revision of the Prefaces,” 377-378.

3.9 – *Quo Magis* Admitting Seven Eucharistic Prefaces for Use in the EF

On 20 February 2020, the CDF decreed *Quo magis* presenting seven Eucharistic Prefaces for optional use in the Extraordinary Form of the Mass.⁹⁷⁰ The decree comprises five brief undesigned paragraphs. The first three include the introduction, *ratio* and substance of the decree. The remainder comprise the conclusion. The accompanying *Nota praevia* comprises seven undesigned paragraphs.

Quo magis begins by contextualizing its subject matter. It does so by establishing itself as a direct and material response of the request of Benedict XVI in CGF for the insertion of some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces into the older Missal.⁹⁷¹

The Prefaces selected by the CDF belong to the Sanctoral Cycle; no texts for the Temporal Cycle are included.⁹⁷² The *Nota praevia* explains the rationale: “[... T]he historical development of the *Corpus Praefationum* of the *Missale Romanum* up until the middle of the 20th Century shows a general movement toward the use of new Prefaces for occasional celebrations rather than for celebrations of the temporal cycle.”⁹⁷³

Three of the newly permitted texts are taken from those previously “approved in other places” and do not appear in the *editio typica* used in the OF.⁹⁷⁴ These have been taken from

⁹⁷⁰ See Appendix III for the texts of *Quo magis* and accompanying *Nota praevia*. See Appendix IV for the complete texts of the Eucharistic Prefaces added to the EF by the CDF. For similar observations on *Quo magis*, published after completion of this section, see A.P. MARCELLO, III, “Canonical Commentary on the New Pontifical Decrees on Saints’ Days and New Prefaces in the Traditional Missal,” at *Rorate Caeli*, 26 March 2020, <https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2020/03/canonical-commentary-on-new-pontifical.html> (11 January 2022).

⁹⁷¹ “*Quo magis altera Ritus Romani forma alteram locupletaret, in Epistula ad universos Ecclesiae latinae Episcopos die VII mensis Iulii a. D. MMVII data, censuit Benedictus PP. XVI aliquot ex novis praefationibus veteri Missali esse inserendas*” (*Quo magis*, §1).

⁹⁷² See *Nota praevia*, *Quo magis*, §3.

⁹⁷³ Ibid.

⁹⁷⁴ See *ibid.*, §4.

French and Belgian Dioceses where they were in use prior to the post-Vatican II liturgical changes:⁹⁷⁵

1. *de Omnibus Sanctis et Sanctis Patronis*;
2. *de Sanctissimo Sacramento*;
3. *de Dedicatione ecclesiae*.

The *Nota praevia* indicates that these three texts, “already in use in some places, will appropriately enrich the celebrations in question with a more suitable eucology than the standard *Praefatio Communis*.”⁹⁷⁶

The remaining four texts are taken from the OF and may be found in *MR/2008usa*. According to the *Nota praevia*, the texts for *de Angelis* and *de Sancto Ioanne Baptista* will give more apt “prominence to liturgical celebrations in honor of certain leading figures in God’s design, as manifested in the history of Salvation....”⁹⁷⁷ The same document states that the Preface *de Martyribus* “will allow to further underline the eminent character of the gift of martyrdom among the other witnesses of *Sequela Christi*.”⁹⁷⁸

In the case of the Preface *de Nuptiis*, the CDF offers some note on the origins of the text. The *Nota praevia* indicates that “special note should be taken of the Preface *de Nuptiis*, which together with the long Nuptial Blessing still in use in Masses *pro Sponsis*, is to be found – with minor variations – in early Sacramentaries such as the *Gelasianum Vetus* or the *Gregorianum*. This ancient Preface, already existing in the *Forma ordinaria*, may therefore now be used in the *Forma extraordinaria* as well.”⁹⁷⁹

⁹⁷⁵ *Nota praevia*, *Quo magis*, §5.

⁹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, §6.

⁹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

In order to bring them into conformity, Eschatocols that differed in these Prefaces received one adopted from *MR/1962*.⁹⁸⁰ In doing so, *Quo magis* sets a standard for the consistent adaptation of texts.

The *Nota praevia* reiterates that use of these seven Prefaces is *ad libitum* and exhorts the celebrant “to make use of good pastoral common sense in this regard.”⁹⁸¹ Additionally, *Quo magis* “does not cancel any eventual concessions of proper Prefaces granted in the past, and therefore in those particular cases where there already exists, on the basis of preceding permissions, and for the same liturgical circumstance, a different particular Preface, one may choose between that Preface and the newly approved text.”⁹⁸²

Apart from the Preface *de Nuptiis*, sources for these additional Prefaces are not divulged clearly. The Decree states that they are “drawn from old and new sources.”⁹⁸³ There is no reference to the origins of the three Prefaces taken from French and Belgian Dioceses. As for sources of the remaining four Prefaces, the *Nota praevia* simply states that “for the most part their central section, known as the ‘embolism,’ appear in ancient liturgical sources.”⁹⁸⁴

This simple decree presents seven additional Eucharistic Prefaces that may be used in the EF *ad libitum* at the discretion of the celebrant. Perhaps most important for use in this project, the document sets a standard by which texts of Prefaces may be altered so that they may be brought into congruence with the language operative in *MR/1962*.

⁹⁸⁰ *Nota praevia, Quo magis*, §6. The texts have been published and are included below in Appendix III. However, no source references are provided with the texts.

⁹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, §7.

⁹⁸² *Ibid.* This proviso indicates that there are locations celebrating the EF with Eucharistic Prefaces that are external to *MR/1962*, particular to the place.

⁹⁸³ *Quo magis*, §2.

⁹⁸⁴ *Nota praevia, Quo magis*, §5.

3.10 – Presentation of Proposed Eucharistic Prefaces for Use in the EF

Reflection upon the preceding research and the principles of revision uncovered therein has resulted in the selection of Eucharistic Prefaces from *MR/2008* that may be well-suited for insertion into *MR/1962*. The texts were chosen based upon many principles shared by the revisers that undertook the Eucharistic Prefaces in the post-Conciliar periods of the sixteenth and twentieth centuries. As such, their selection represents application of these principles to a new purpose. These are presented below in Appendix V.

Not unlike the proposals offered in the preceding chapter and in Appendix II, acceptance of proposed additional Eucharistic Prefaces belongs only to the Holy See. Similarly, then, if this were to form genuine proposal to higher authority, a different route would be taken than if these were matters pertaining to the OF. In decrees *Quo magis* and *Cum sanctissima*, the CDF was indicated as the authority to make changes to the EF. This included both the use of additional Mass texts as well as modifying the source texts, as necessary. Matters pertaining to the *Forma extraordinaria* are, at this writing, addressed by the CDWDS, the dicastery with the competencies that had been held by the CDF that in turn had been assigned the competencies of the former PCED.⁹⁸⁵

It would seem, then, that a proposal for additional Eucharistic Prefaces would be directed to the CDWDS. It would be consistent that the proposal would originate with the episcopal conference if it were requested as part of local adaptation of the EF. If the proposal included insertion of additional texts into *MR/1962* with assigned use rather than *ad libitum* use, it would seem that the CDWDS would become involved in some way. An in-depth investigation into this question would make a useful contribution.

⁹⁸⁵ See *TC*, Art. 7.

Conclusion

The development of the Eucharistic Preface is much less complex than that of the Roman Calendar or even that of the pathway to mutual enrichment itself. This lack of complexity indicates that this unique Western element has retained a cardinal role from the earliest recorded times of Western divine worship. Despite the vagaries the Eucharistic Preface has experienced across the many centuries, it has retained its unique form.

The Eucharistic Preface is a fascinating and unique aspect of the Mass of the Latin Church: to fulfill its purpose, it must change; to retain its fundamental nature, it must remain unchanged.

From the earliest times, the aspect of the Eucharistic Preface that must change experienced deterioration, aberration or even complete loss of focus. Nonetheless, its unchanging parts have retained their structure and content. Likewise, it has always retained its place in the liturgy, even with the most corrupted Embolisms, presenting a theme of some kind to “customize” the unique Canon of the Western Eucharistic Prayer. The inexorable link between the partially changing Preface and unchanging Canon creates a Eucharistic Prayer unique in the family of Churches that comprise the Catholic Church. While others possess multiple texts to express the whole of salvation history, the West relies on a stable Canon with Prefaces to adjust the celebration to a unique point of thanksgiving within that grand economy.

In the post-Tridentine reforms of the Missal, revisers considered the many sources available to them that contained texts of Eucharistic Prefaces. In the interests of retaining orthodoxy of substance and an efficient Missal, these revisers adopted the traditional

number and texts of Prefaces that had been inherited and in use for several centuries. These became canonized in *MR/1570*.

Once the entire Mass was entered into the realm of ecclesiastical law at the level of the highest authority by means of Apostolic Constitution *Quo primum*, the Eucharistic Prefaces, as a substantial aspect of the Mass, were assumed under the same auspices. The Holy See, therefore, decreed what the Preface texts would be and how they would be used. Since then, the same structure of authority over the Mass has continued.

In the post-Vatican II liturgical reforms, the Holy See again appointed revisors to study the Eucharistic Prefaces. The fruit of their work was codified in *MR/1969* by means of Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* in 1969.

These latter Reformers approached their work with enthusiastic respect, dedication and diligence. With few exceptions, the texts that emerged from their work maintained the standards set by the properly formed Prefaces that preceded them and held closely to the best traditions of composition available in the somewhat limited recorded history of the Mass of the Latin Church. A criticism is that there may be so many Prefaces that they may never become familiar and that some remain unused.

During a period of dubious, although approved, translations, suspicions were raised regarding the quality and content of some of the Eucharistic Preface texts in the OF. When consulting the Latin texts and more faithful English translations of them, however, it becomes clear that they are undoubtedly orthodox, beautifully composed and contextually appropriate. Several of them are stylistically and historically consistent with those received in *MR/1962*, some of which are proposed below for insertion into the EF.

The additional Eucharistic Prefaces provided by *Quo magis* and the provisions it grants are welcomed and useful. Not unlike its sister decree, *Cum sanctissima*, *Quo magis* sets standards that direct future development in mutual enrichment between the liturgical Forms of the one Roman Rite. Concomitant with decree *Quo magis*, this likewise landmark effort effecting substantial mutual enrichment under the pontificate of Francis underscores his respect for the desire of Benedict XVI and his determination to make it come into being.

CHAPTER IV

SYNTHESIS AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION

Introduction

Chapters II and III address Benedict XVI's desire for two material acts of mutual enrichment from the Ordinary Form to the Extraordinary Form: the addition of recently canonized Saints to the calendar and addition of some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces. When referring to the converse, that is, enrichment of the Ordinary Form by the Extraordinary Form, Benedict XVI chose not to present material acts or methods by which to accomplish it. Instead, he presented the conceptual vision "that celebration of the Mass according to the Missal of Paul VI will be able to demonstrate, more powerfully than has been the case hitherto, the sacrality which attracts many people to the former usage."⁹⁸⁶ In context, he presents this vision at the time he made the EF broadly available and foresees it existing alongside the OF. It would seem, then, that the first stages of mutual enrichment are mutual acquaintance and propinquity.

The instant chapter begins by acknowledging the need for liturgical reconciliation, brought to universal attention by Popes John Paul II, Benedict XVI and Francis. The role of the diocesan bishop as primary reconciler will be explored.

This chapter will consider the principal goals of the liturgical movement, the fruit of which is both the *MR/1962* and the *MR/2008*. Historical development of this movement will be examined as far as it has found substantial expression in the juridic documents of the Holy See from the time the movement was acknowledged in them as such.

A key decision of Consilium, the body charged with enacting the liturgical reforms

⁹⁸⁶ *CGF*, §9.

required by *SC*, will be discussed vis-à-vis its influence upon later liturgical reform. The considerations herein will not be focused primarily upon what Consilium should or should not have done but rather what was done, illuminating the influence its decision imparted upon the major works of reform it accomplished. Understanding the goals sought in the twentieth century will inform goal setting for twenty-first century mutual enrichment.

Several juridic matters will be explored. Among these, the more recent acts of the CDF and earlier acts of the PCED will be examined in search of a methodology that might inform future acts of mutual enrichment. Francis' more recent *motu proprio Traditionis custodes* and its clarifying *Responsa ad dubia* will be examined in order to discern their influence upon ritual celebration and thus upon mutual liturgical enrichment. Furthermore, tools provided in the law by which liturgical changes may become recognized will be presented.

The authority of a celebrant to make liturgical changes in the name of mutual enrichment will be explored in light of c. 846, §1. With goals and the law in mind, the chapter will explore possibilities for licit mutual enrichment that may present themselves to the individual celebrant, arising passively or sought actively.

Possessing goals, the law and specific possibilities for mutual enrichment, principles against which specific elements for mutual enrichment may be compared will be presented. These principles include balance, benefit and unitarity with what is Roman, while respecting organic development.

Key perhaps to the chapter and the project overall is a section that identifies distinct kinds of mutual enrichment. That is, liturgical elements will be categorized according to the authority required for their enactment. According to the *natura res*, this section will include some degree of speculation.

The chapter concludes with a practical example of how to apply the goals and principles that have been presented. This includes rhetorical questions to be applied to specific elements that one might consider enacting as a matter of liturgical enrichment.

4.1 – Liturgical Reconciliation

Popes John Paul II, Benedict XVI and Francis each have made calls for liturgical reconciliation. That is, for internal resolution to liturgical matters that may have become divisive in some way. Their exhortations always at least intimate a need for the virtue of charity, manifested as love for God, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and each other. Though each Pontiff may have had differing notions of how this reconciliation would or should take place, paramount concern for the Mass as the very heart of the Church and of every believer is shared by all of them.

4.1.1 – John Paul II, Benedict XVI and Francis on Liturgical Reconciliation

From roughly the time of Pius X to the present, the Pontiffs have enacted degrees of what may be called liturgical adjustment. Such actions inevitably cause division, at least initially, creating a need for reconciliation. The faithful, when faced with such situations, should be able to turn to the symbol of ecclesiastical unity, the Holy Father, for reconciliation.

Throughout his papacy, John Paul II made the plea for liturgical reconciliation by promoting liturgical understanding and cultivating respect for the sacred. A fine example is his address to a group of bishops from the United States of America on *ad limina* visit in 1988 when he presented liturgical reconciliation as a particular challenge:

The challenge now is to move beyond whatever misunderstandings there have been and to reach the proper point of balance, especially by entering more deeply into the contemplative dimension of worship, which includes the sense of awe, reverence and adoration which are fundamental attitudes in our relationship with God. This will happen only if we recognize that the liturgy has dimensions both local and universal, time-bound

and eternal, horizontal and vertical, subjective and objective. It is precisely these tensions which give to Catholic worship its distinctive character.⁹⁸⁷

John Paul did not satisfy himself merely with critical words. Rather, his pontificate acted toward liturgical reconciliation by granting exceptions in *Quattuor abhinc annos* and *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*. From these acts, it may be interpreted that John Paul's idea of liturgical reconciliation included allowing plurality of worship and liberalizing permission to offer what has since become known as the Extraordinary Form.

Benedict XVI continued the legacy of John Paul II and expanded upon it, fostering acceptance of the need for reconciliation and how to achieve it.⁹⁸⁸ In recognition of the desires of the faithful, Benedict XVI exhorted all to be mindful of the fact that such reconciliation may be achieved only through humility, patience and charity, as acts of faith with their root in prayer and sacrament. Benedict XVI, particularly in *Sacramentum caritatis*, *SP* and *CGF*, stresses love for the Church, love for the Church's liturgies and love above all for the Church's unity, all of which are possible only with love of God and neighbor. This love is not a "call" or "invitation," but rather a command from the Lord himself to which we have freely assented and toward which we are privileged to work. God himself manifested this will when he prayed: "That they may be one as we are one."⁹⁸⁹

⁹⁸⁷ JOHN PAUL II, Address to the Bishops of the Episcopal Conference of the United States of America (Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana and Alaska), 9 October 1988, art. 3, available at http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/speeches/1998/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19981009_ad-limina-usa-2.html (11 January 2022).

⁹⁸⁸ Francis has not left the texts of the Missal untouched conceptually or specifically. For instance, he approved the previously mentioned decrees of the CDF enacting substantial mutual enrichment of the Mass. Likewise, as mentioned, he has inscribed new Saints into the General Roman Calendar. Additionally, he extended the addition of the name of St. Joseph to each Eucharistic Canon as John XXIII had enacted for the only Canon at the time (see CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, *Paternas vices*, 1 May 2013, available in Latin at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20130501_san-giuseppe_lt.html [11 January 2022]).

⁹⁸⁹ See John 17:21.

To highlight the need for “interior reconciliation in the heart of the Church,”⁹⁹⁰ Benedict XVI candidly acknowledged before the bishops of the Latin Church the divisions of the past and how they came into being:

Looking back over the past, to the divisions which in the course of the centuries have rent the Body of Christ, one continually has the impression that, at critical moments when divisions were coming about, not enough was done by the Church’s leaders to maintain or regain reconciliation and unity. One has the impression that omissions on the part of the Church have had their share of blame for the fact that these divisions were able to harden. This glance at the past imposes an obligation on us today: to make every effort to enable for all those who truly desire unity to remain in that unity or to attain it anew.⁹⁹¹

Benedict foresaw elimination of the wall as it were between different liturgical usage in the Latin Church as necessary to begin internal liturgical reconciliation. This is a recognition that segregation of liturgical use necessarily includes segregations of persons. While perhaps deemed necessary along the pathway from the post-Conciliar liturgical reforms, Benedict’s pontificate no longer found this approach defensible or virtuous.

Only from this love may reconciliation and mutual understanding arise. Without mutual understanding, there can be no mutual enrichment, for one will always hold the other suspect and thus somehow threatening and unwelcomed. In the vision of Benedict XVI, every aspect of the discussion of mutual enrichment is linked to the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist itself. When dialogue and those engaged in it are filled Eucharistically, there is no room for conflict. In fact, there is no opportunity for it.

Bux identifies that the Holy Father’s desire is not a maudlin dream “but a recovery of the apostolic tradition and of the spirit of discipline. The proper interior disposition for participating in the liturgy is one of veneration and receptivity.”⁹⁹²

⁹⁹⁰ *CGF*, §10.

⁹⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹² BUX, *Benedict XVI's Reform*, 92.

Because one of the main goals, if not the fundamental vision,⁹⁹³ intimated in *SP* and *CGF* is the Church's internal liturgical reconciliation, Benedict XVI proposes that both Forms become mutually acquainted. In this way, the two come to know each other, coexist in harmony and mutual enrichment. Bux explains:

[...]he intention of the *motu proprio* is that everyone in the Church look at the old rite, indeed, that priests may celebrate it and the faithful participate in it. A Christian of the East who goes to church can attend the rite of Chrysostom or of Basil, according to the liturgical time. Analogously, Catholic dioceses should not limit themselves to waiting for requests but should offer the possibility.⁹⁹⁴

In the broader vision of Benedict, it appears that mutual enrichment is dependent upon the Forms becoming propinquitous with the hope that they will enjoying peaceful coexistence and experience a natural mutual enrichment. From Benedict's words and acts, it may be interpreted that he believed, like John Paul II, that liturgical reconciliation may be found in allowing plurality of worship and liberalizing celebration of and access to the *usus antiquior*.

Francis, in his letter accompanying *Traditionis custodes*, states: "I am saddened by abuses in the celebration of the liturgy on all sides. In common with Benedict XVI, I deplore the fact that 'in many places the prescriptions of the new Missal are not observed in celebration, but indeed come to be interpreted as an authorization for or even a requirement of creativity, which leads to almost unbearable distortions'."⁹⁹⁵ By adopting Benedict's words as his own, enhanced by his own emotional vocabulary, Francis expresses

⁹⁹³ A subjective reading of *SP* and *CGF* may find that this internal liturgical reconciliation, by frequent intimation, is the ultimate desire of their author.

⁹⁹⁴ BUX, *Benedict XVI's Reform*, 86. Bux states as well: "The riches of the two [Forms] must be held together. The old Mass belongs to the *regula fidei* as its extraordinary and not exceptional expression alongside the ordinary and normal expression.... The authority of the Council must not be eroded, and the liturgical reform must not be put in question either by those who are most attached to the old form codified in the 1962 Missal or by those who prefer the 1970 Missal. It is obvious that what is ordinary is not equal to what is extraordinary, but it would be strange if we were to live only from the first and had no need of the second, just as the ferial is ordinary and the feast is extraordinary" (ibid.).

⁹⁹⁵ *Come già*, §6; cf. *CGF*, §6.

a desire for abuses “on all sides” to come to an end. This is a clear call from Francis for liturgical reconciliation and an expression that accomplishment of it is of great concern to him.

In *Come già*, Francis recognizes the same difficulty in the celebration of the Mass that his predecessors had encountered and acknowledged. Simply put, interpreting the actions of liturgical reform “as an authorization for or even a requirement of creativity” renders distortion within the celebration of the Mass that cries out for the justice of reconciliation.

Francis’ concern for the sacred Mass liturgy, for mutual liturgical enrichment and for liturgical reconciliation is not limited to the texts of *TC*. *Traditionis custodes* should not be viewed within a vacuum. It must be noted that it is only the pontificate of Francis that took substantial action in the matter of mutual liturgical enrichment. From a juridico-legislative perspective, the acts of *Cum sanctissimae* and *Quo magis* by the CDF under Francis, affecting the content of GRC/1960 and the very texts of *MR*/1962 are no less than momentous.

While Francis’ call and desire for liturgical reconciliation is unquestionable, his idea of how that may be enacted is less clear than it is with John Paul II and Benedict XVI. On the one hand, Francis’ pontificate is the one that effected major and substantial change to the *MR*/1962, accomplishing mutual enrichment from the OF to the EF. On the other hand, it is also his pontificate that has issued severe restrictions upon celebration of the very Form he enriched.

These acts may not be so dichotomous as they appear *prima facie*. This is because Francis has not abrogated *MR*/1962, nor has he altered the celebration of the ritual

according to *MR/1962*, apart from mandating the vernacular reading of Sacred Scripture. This mandate itself merely concretizes and expands a suggestion of Benedict XVI in *SP*.⁹⁹⁶

One of the ends hoped to be achieved in the instant project is to help in the reduction of internal disorder and abuse by creating a means by which it may be discerned what may and may not be changed licitly in the Mass of either Form, without resorting to individual whim or arbitrariness. This would become an aide in remediating internal liturgical division, carrying out the wishes of the post-Conciliar Pontiffs.

4.1.2 – The Diocesan Bishop as Reconciler, Moderator and Facilitator

Sacrosanctum Concilium describes one role of the diocesan bishop as regulator of the sacred liturgy to the degree that the law permits.⁹⁹⁷ This regulatory role, frequently referred to as “moderator,” is not clarified, presumably so as not to encumber juridical determinations that would follow once episcopal conferences were established. The episcopal conferences now possess some authority over liturgical matters within their respective territories. If in the past the diocesan bishop was perceived to be the local enforcer of the liturgical norms promulgated by the Holy See, his role today may be seen as the local enforcer of the norms of both the Holy See and his respective episcopal conference.⁹⁹⁸ What autonomous liturgical authority is remanded to the diocesan bishop, however, is expressed in the law in unequivocal terms.⁹⁹⁹

⁹⁹⁶ See *SP*, art. 6.

⁹⁹⁷ *SC*, no. 22, no. 1; cf. *CIC/83*, c. 838, §1.

⁹⁹⁸ This sense is expressed in *CIC/83*, c. 392: §1. Since he must protect the unity of the universal Church, a bishop is bound to promote the common discipline of the whole Church and therefore to urge the observance of all ecclesiastical laws. §2. He is to exercise vigilance so that abuses do not creep into ecclesiastical discipline, especially regarding the ministry of the word, the celebration of the sacraments and sacramentals, the worship of God and the veneration of the saints, and the administration of goods.

⁹⁹⁹ *CIC/83*, c. 455 asserts the authority, autonomy and competence of the diocesan bishop. That is, unless universal law requires or the Apostolic See mandates a general decree from an episcopal conference (see §1), “the competence of each diocesan bishop remains intact, nor is a conference or its president able to act in the name of all the bishops unless each and every bishop has given consent” (§4). While the 1983 *Code* does not assign specific liturgical competencies to the diocesan bishop, the *GIRM* enumerates the following: “It is to

Benedict XVI approaches the diocesan bishop with profound and even enthusiastic respect, interpreting the authority residing in the diocesan bishop in a deeply personal way.¹⁰⁰⁰ Reading *CGF* together with *SP* reveals particular sensitivity and respect for as well as treatment of the role of the bishop within his local Church. These documents present the role of the bishop in an invigorated way, not only as the conceptual moderator but as facilitator and reconciler of souls. The Pontiff accentuates the role of the bishop as local unifier of the People of God. Commenting on the bishop's role as moderator in the context of these papal documents, Aillet states, "The role of the bishop as moderator of the liturgy within his diocese is greatly emphasized - that is to say, his jurisdiction, with his capacity to authorize things or to forbid them or even to take disciplinary actions."¹⁰⁰¹

Presenting the bishop as competent authority in both law and example, Bux recognizes that Benedict XVI has located this role within the more general faculty of facilitation:

In regard to the bishop's authority, nothing is taken away: he must oversee and moderate. In this case, the term "moderator" is quite meaningful. But the role must be performed "in full harmony, however, with all that has been laid down by the new norms of the *motu proprio*." We might say that this moderation consists in facilitating the mutual enrichment....¹⁰⁰²

The role of the bishop, then, as moderator, is enunciated by his role to facilitate the reconciliation promoted in *SP* and *CGF*. The role of the bishop is key in bringing about

[the diocesan bishop] that in this Instruction is entrusted the regulating of the discipline of concelebration (cf. nos. 202, 374) and the establishing of norms regarding the function of serving the priest at the altar (cf. no. 107), the distribution of Holy Communion under both kinds (cf. no. 283) and the construction and ordering of churches (cf. no. 291)" (*GIRM/2008usa*, no. 387).

¹⁰⁰⁰ See *CGF*, §§13-17. In *TC*, Francis implicitly expresses no less respect for the authority of the diocesan bishop by shifting governance of the EF to him. In *Come già*, he goes as far as asking the bishops to embrace *TC* "as a form of participation in the solicitude for the whole Church proper to the bishops" (*Come già*, §11).

¹⁰⁰¹ AILLET, *The Old Mass and the New*, 52, with reference to *Sacramentum caritatis*, §39. Commentary by Marc Marie Max Aillet (1957-) is particularly helpful in reflecting upon the statements addressed to bishops. Aillet himself was appointed bishop by Benedict XVI, consecrated and installed as bishop of Bayonne, France, on 30 November 2008, after the promulgation of *SP*. As a bishop, Aillet has worked within the atmosphere created by *SP* and *CGF*.

¹⁰⁰² BUX, *Benedict XVI's Reform*, 80, referring to *CGF*, §§13-14.

reconciliation based upon mutual exposure of the Forms, which necessitates their coexistence within the bishop's circumscription. In this way, the bishop's moderation exemplifies and promotes liturgical respect. Bux interprets this by recognizing that "at the end of [CGF] it says that those who celebrate with the old Missal should also celebrate with the new. It is not a command but a suggestion; respect for both uses, however, is obligatory."¹⁰⁰³ He continues, "Consequently, those who celebrate according to the old use must avoid delegitimizing the new use, and vice versa."¹⁰⁰⁴

Glendinning summarizes the role of local ecclesiastical authority in liturgical matters by synthesizing his authority as bishop and his expanded role as facilitator of liturgical reconciliation:

[...]he role of the competent ecclesiastical authority is not to obstruct genuine ecclesiastical reform, pertaining to the liturgy or otherwise, but to ensure that such adaptations are tested, developed, and carefully evaluated before they are given concrete juridical expression or, as the case may be, express reprobation.¹⁰⁰⁵

The Pontiff acknowledges that some perceived the liberalization of liturgical ritual promoted in *SP* as a diminution of the authority of the Second Vatican Council, calling its liturgical reform into question.¹⁰⁰⁶ In response to this, the Pontiff states simply, "This fear is unfounded."¹⁰⁰⁷ It would appear he might expect bishops to refer to his response when faced with the same misperception.

Having made these acknowledgements, Benedict XVI makes explicit appeal to the role of the bishop and identifies him as local reconciler. He calls upon his brother bishops to right the way ahead in local context, again calling upon virtue to prevail. He states, "It is

¹⁰⁰³ BUX, *Benedict XVI's Reform*, 80.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁵ GLENDINNING, "Participatio Actuosa," 27. Cf. HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 131.

¹⁰⁰⁶ CGF, §4.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ibid., §5.

true that there have been exaggerations and at times social aspects unduly linked to the attitude of the faithful attached to the ancient Latin liturgical tradition. Your charity and pastoral prudence will be an incentive and guide for improving these.”¹⁰⁰⁸

Rather than simply present an ideal, the Holy Father seeks to facilitate the role of the bishop. He acknowledges that the responsibility of the diocesan bishop to grant permissions for the celebration of the former “Indult Masses” have made him appear as bringing about division by having to make the choice to permit or not. Making these grants may have been a burden to the bishop and an obstacle to reconciliation. To enable the diocesan bishop to foster unity less encumbered, the Holy Father relieves him of this responsibility, stating, “The present Norms are also meant to free Bishops from constantly having to evaluate anew how they are to respond to various situations.”¹⁰⁰⁹

Benedict offers bishops a posture to adopt in order to enact reconciliation and a way ahead, stating, “Let us generously open our hearts and make room for everything that the faith itself allows.”¹⁰¹⁰ So that the open heart is rightly directed in the faith and that virtue reigns in all such matters, the Holy Father adds, “I entrust these norms to the powerful intercession of Mary, Mother of the Church....”¹⁰¹¹

This respect for the role of local ecclesiastical authority highlights the Pope’s appreciation of what takes place in local Churches. He reveals his confidence that what

¹⁰⁰⁸ *CGF*, §9.

¹⁰⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, §7. This could be interpreted negatively as a limitation placed upon the diocesan bishop’s discretionary authority to regulate the Extraordinary Form. Benedict XVI, however, states his intention positively as the removal of a burden upon the diocesan bishop. In *Traditionis custodes*, Francis takes a different approach by withdrawing the universal faculty granted by Benedict XVI and restoring the competency to the diocesan bishop to determine the celebration of the EF in his diocese by granting the faculty locally. While the diocesan bishop is no longer relieved of the burden, the competencies granted to him remain an expression of the esteem Francis has for diocesan bishops and the principle of subsidiarity.

¹⁰¹⁰ *Ibid.*, §10.

¹⁰¹¹ *Ibid.*, §15.

occurs locally is of utmost importance and value. This redounds to his desire for liturgical reconciliation, which must begin organically in local communities and can never be imposed. Such development hinges greatly upon how the diocesan bishop makes use of the capacities of his office of shepherd.

Additionally, Francis has expressed his respect for the authority of the diocesan bishop in a renewed sense of subsidiarity. For instance, he states, “It is not advisable for the Pope to take the place of local Bishops in the discernment of every issue which arises in their territory. In this sense, I am conscious of the need to promote a sound ‘decentralization.’”¹⁰¹² In recent years, this has come into being indirectly with the empowerment of conferences of bishops. For example, by means of the provisions of *Magnum principium*¹⁰¹³ mentioned above, regarding the Holy See’s confirmation of liturgical translations provided by episcopal conferences, previously requiring its approval. Furthermore, the provisions of *Competentias quasdam decernere*¹⁰¹⁴ similarly modify several canons to require the Holy See’s confirmation of acts of the episcopal conference that had previously required its approval.

¹⁰¹² FRANCIS, Apostolic exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium*, on the proclamation of the Gospel in today’s world, 24 November 2013, in *AAS*, 105 (2013), 1019-1137, here, no. 16, 1027, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html (18 March 2022).

¹⁰¹³ See especially the *Note* and *Comment* provided by the CDWDS accompanying apostolic letter motu proprio *Magnum principium*, cited above. English translation available at <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2017/09/09/170909a.html> (18 March 2022).

¹⁰¹⁴ FRANCIS, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Competentias quasdam decernere*, introducing changes to the *Code of Canon Law* and the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, 11 February 2022, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/motu_proprio/documents/20220211-motu-proprio-assegnare-alcune-competenze.html (18 March 2022).

4.2 – Goals and Principles of Liturgical Reform

Whitehead states that “Vatican Council II’s decision to reform the entire liturgy of the Catholic Church proved to be a vast and complex enterprise which is not completed yet.”¹⁰¹⁵ Indeed, the liturgical movement continues, as it has for more than a century and a half. It is part of the fabric of the life of the Church and will continue to be so, though its intensity may wax and wane.

This “enterprise, which is not completed yet,” requires some historical context in which to situate liturgical development. Understanding historical goals and principles will inform those of the present and future so that cohesion and consistency may be applied to liturgical enrichment.

4.2.1 – Goals and Principles of the Liturgical Movement in Juridical Sources

The liturgical movement, as it is popularly called, is not a single perceptible organization. Rather, it originates from an increase in awareness of and interest in the Mass that began in the late nineteenth century.¹⁰¹⁶ Because it began at the level of the faithful and religious, one may call it part of organic development.

Renewed interest in the Mass continued to intensify throughout the twentieth century; the Second Vatican Council exerted tremendous and enduring influence upon it. Among other things, this movement always included a fervent desire for heightened participation

¹⁰¹⁵ K. WHITEHEAD, *Mass Misunderstandings: The Mixed Legacy of the Vatican II Liturgical Reforms*, South Bend, IN, St. Augustine’s Press, 2009, 231.

¹⁰¹⁶ The beginnings of the movement are frequently traced to the nineteenth century French Benedictine Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875) and his works produced from the monastery at Solesmes, France. Several fine histories of the beginning and development of the liturgical movement are readily available. For an example from the midst of the movement, see P. MARX, *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1957. A recent brief survey is provided by T. KOCIK, *Singing His Song: A Short Introduction to the Liturgical Movement*, Hong Kong, Chorabooks, 2019. A broad treatment is given in A. 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. For a more localized history, see K. PECKLERS, *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America 1926-1955*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1998.

in the Mass by the faithful. The movement itself took tangible form in the revisions to the ceremonies of Holy Week in 1955 and the revisions to the *Missale Romanum* resulting in *MR/1962 editio typica* and its emendations in 1965 and 1967. Many agree that *MR/1969* and its revisions up to and including *MR/2008* continued the work of the liturgical movement.

This section explores matters of the liturgical movement that found their way into juridical documents of the Holy See. These official documents express a desire for liturgical awareness, understanding and enrichment. Most pronounced in these documents is recognition of the desire for heightened participation by the laity present at any celebration of the Mass. This desire is the ribbon threaded through and between the juridic documents pertaining to the liturgy. What began as a vision, acknowledged at first modestly in the writings of the Pontiffs, was expanded over time until it became a goal.¹⁰¹⁷

4.2.1.1 - Pius X (1903-14), Benedict XV (1914-22) Pius XI (1922-39)

The Holy See was not blind to the desires of the faithful or deaf to the pleas of worshippers and scholars coming from diverse places. The papacies of Pius X, Benedict XV and Pius XI acknowledged this movement; their declarations began part of what would become a significantly broader evolution.

The first juridical acknowledgment of the desires of the liturgical movement was made manifest during the papacy of Pius X. In 1903, he issued *motu proprio Tra le sollecitudini*, on the restoration of sacred music in the worship of the Church, in which he addresses participation by the faithful:

¹⁰¹⁷ For a thorough treatment of the juridical documentation tracing the movement for active participation by the congregation in the Mass, whence the timeline presented herein is taken, see C.J. GLENDINNING, “The Role of the Competent Ecclesiastical Authority in the Promotion of *Participatio Actiosa* prior to the Second Vatican Council” (=GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actiosa*”), in *Questions Liturgiques*, 95 (2014), 8-27.

It being our ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit restored in every respect and be preserved by all the faithful, we deem it necessary to provide before everything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for the object of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is the active participation in the holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church.¹⁰¹⁸

This is the first time “active participation” of the faithful in the Mass is mentioned in such official documentation by the Holy See. Though the term is not defined therein, the concept will continue to evolve by various means and with expanding breadth and come to have a definition.

Benedict XV, successor to Pius X, did not issue directives on specific matters regarding the sacred Mass. Significantly, though, this Pontiff completed and promulgated the *Code of Canon Law* begun by his sainted predecessor.

As is likewise true of the current *Code*, *CIC/17* does not define how liturgical rites are to be celebrated.¹⁰¹⁹ Nonetheless, it contains several liturgical considerations that affect lay participation.¹⁰²⁰ One of these is particularly worthy of comment.

¹⁰¹⁸ PIUS X, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Tra le sollecitudini* on the restoration of sacred music, 22 November 1903, in *ASS*, 36 (1903-1904), 329-339, English translation in R. SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy: A Documentation, 1903-1965*, New York, NY, Herder and Herder, 1966, 3-10. The original promulgated text is in Italian, although a Latin text was also published in *ASS*, 36 (1903-1904), 387-395, here, Introductory Paragraph 2. As we shall see, the twentieth-century Pontiffs referred to the participation of the laity via documents that were particularly focused on liturgical music. This makes sense in context when considering that the Council of Trent described the Solemn Mass, always sung, as normative. Furthermore, the Catholic Encyclopedia explains, “This high Mass is the norm; it is only in the complete rite with deacon and subdeacon that the ceremonies can be understood. Thus, the rubrics of the Ordinary of the Mass always suppose that the Mass is high” (“Liturgy of the Mass,” in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, available at <https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09790b.htm> [7 July 2022]).

¹⁰¹⁹ See *CIC/17*, c. 2. The same is true of *CIC/83*, c. 2.

¹⁰²⁰ For a concise treatment of this, see GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actiosa*,” 8-27, wherein he cites several examples. For instance, the ritual for adult baptism (cf. Tit. II, c. 4, no. 51) recommended that the neophyte receive the Holy Eucharist when convenient. The *Code* promulgated by Benedict XV in *CIC/17* c. 753, §2, made it obligatory for the adult neophyte to receive Holy Communion immediately upon baptism, apart from grave and urgent reasons. At the time of the promulgation of the new *Code*, the celebration of the Mass could begin no sooner than twenty minutes before dawn and could end no later than twenty minutes after noon. *CIC/17* c. 821 extended the beginning time to no sooner than one full hour prior to dawn and the ending time to no later than one full hour after noon. Additionally, see H.A. AYRINHAC, *Legislation on the Sacraments in the New Code of Canon Law*, New York, NY/London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1928, 123. At that same time, the pre-Communion fast for the infirm confined to bed for a month or longer as provided by Pius X allowed the individual to receive the Holy Eucharist once or twice a month (see SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL, Decree *Post editum* modifying the fast for the infirm, 7 December 1906, in *AAS*, 39 [1906], 794-795). *CIC/17* c. 858, §2 extended the provision so that such persons could receive the

It is stated in *CIC/1917*, c. 813, that it is not acceptable for a priest to offer Mass without at least one individual to make the responses. In the case that a male is unavailable to do so, a female may make the responses, but from a distance, that is, not serving in the sanctuary.¹⁰²¹ As highly regarded as the role of server is, when presented with the choice between having a server and having a member of the faithful to make the responses to the priest, the law grants precedence to the responder. Thus, it was codified in law that there must always be a member of the faithful to participate by making the responses.

This requirement of *CIC/17* was so important that only the Apostolic See could dispense from the requirement to have a responder during the Mass. This is because the responder acts on behalf of the congregation. This mode of active participation by the faithful, though vicarious, became a matter of codified law. It is evident, then, that the notion of liturgical participation was not something unknown in law nor was it held in low esteem. Within the broader vision of the liturgical movement, the contribution by the papacy of Benedict XV, therefore, is not insignificant.

Due in part to this provision of law, the liturgical movement does not appear to have questioned the Church's appreciation of the intrinsic value of congregational participation. Rather, the mode in which it was enacted received heightened awareness and was found wanting. Not only was there a desire for those congregated to participate directly in the

Holy Eucharist once or twice a week. The new *Code* also provided that medicine and liquids could be ingested prior to receiving the Holy Eucharist in these situations. Others were bound by the rule of a strict fast from all food and drink, including water, from midnight of the day one was to receive the Holy Eucharist (see *CIC/17*, c. 858, §1, and J. HUELS, "Participating by the Faithful in the Liturgy, 1903-1962," in *The Jurist*, 48, no. 2 [1988], 608–663, here, 617, footnote 25).

¹⁰²¹ *CIC/17*, c. 813: §1. Sacerdos Missam ne celebret sine ministro qui eidem inserviat et respondeat. §2. Minister Missae inserviens ne sit mulier, nisi, deficiente viro, iusta de causa, eaque lege ut mulier ex longinquo respondeat nec ullo pacto ad altare accedat.

sacred rites, but there arose understanding that this active participation was an historical mark of authentic cultic practice in the Mass of the Latin Church.

In 1928, Pius XI continued building upon the theme of active participation by the faithful with apostolic constitution *Divini cultus* on Gregorian Chant and sacred music.¹⁰²²

In it, the Pontiff expanded and presented a more potent endorsement by stating:

In order that the faithful may more actively participate in divine worship, let them be made once more to sing the Gregorian chant, as far as it belongs to them to take part in it. It is most important that when the faithful assist at the sacred ceremonies, or when pious sodalities take part with the clergy in a procession, they should not be merely detached and silent spectators, but filled with a deep sense of the beauty of the liturgy, should sing alternately with the clergy or the choir, as it is prescribed. If this is done, then it will no longer happen that people either make no answer at all to the public prayers – whether in the language of the liturgy or in the vernacular – or at best utter responses in a low and subdued manner.¹⁰²³

This forceful statement by Pius XI begins the evolutionary transition from the conceptual to the specific by circumscribing the meaning of active participation by the laity; it begins to take on a definition. The Pontiff describes participation that is at once an internal posture and external act: being “filled with a deep sense of the beauty of the liturgy” and “singing alternately with the clergy or the choir.” If this is the case, then it was no longer possible for celebrant, congregation and choir to be occupied with different activities as symphonic; they were to coordinate so they could worship in a way that was synchronous.

As a means of promoting this very action, this same document introduces the *Missa dialogata*, a means of promoting active participation of the faithful by employing their actual vocal responses, replacing their vicarious responses.¹⁰²⁴ The practice had a difficult

¹⁰²² See GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 11.

¹⁰²³ PIUS XI, Apostolic constitution *Divini cultus* on Gregorian chant and sacred music, 20 December 1928, in *AAS*, 21 (1928), 33-41, here, art. 9, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 58-63. This constitution was promulgated in recognition of the twenty-fifth anniversary of *Tra le sollecitudini*.

¹⁰²⁴ See GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 11. As demonstrated above, the *Missa dialogata* was already an encoded juridic requirement, though modally different.

start and did not initially find widespread use.¹⁰²⁵ Nonetheless, “The use of the dialogue Mass will evolve rather significantly under Pius XII.”¹⁰²⁶

Furthermore, Pius XI created a *Sectio historica* of the Congregation for Sacred Rites in 1930 for the work of liturgical reform. His successor would make significant use of this body during his pontificate.¹⁰²⁷

4.2.1.2 – Pius XII (1939-1958)

The pontificate of Pius XII had profound impact on the liturgical movement. In 1947, he promulgated encyclical letter *Mediator Dei*, described as the first such document dedicated exclusively to the sacred liturgies of the Church.¹⁰²⁸ The *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica* of 1948¹⁰²⁹ would become a guide and basis for discussing matters of

¹⁰²⁵ As appealing as the concept of a dialogue Mass appeared to be, it brought about a rather peculiar set of difficulties in execution. For the congregation, when and how to respond proved to be confusing and cumbersome. For the celebrant, the confused or out-of-time responses by the congregation were distracting and disruptive to his ritual actions. Knowledge of this widespread sense of awkwardness elicited an equally peculiar private response from the Congregation for Sacred Rites: “Things that are in themselves licit are sometimes not expedient, owing to difficulties which may easily arise, as in this case, especially on account of the disturbances which the priests who celebrate and the people who assist may experience, to the disadvantage of the sacred action and of the Rubrics. Hence it is well to retain the common usage, as we have several times replied in similar cases” (CONGREGATION FOR SACRED RITES, Private response concerning the celebration of a dialogue Mass, 4 August 1922, in *AAS*, 14 [1922], 505, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 1, 199). Earlier rescripts can be found with analysis by I. HANSSENS, in *Periodica*, 25 (1936), 57-89, English translation of rescripts available in *CLD*, vol. 1, 198-199.

¹⁰²⁶ GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actiosa*,” 12.

¹⁰²⁷ There was no official announcement of the commission at the time of its creation. See A. BUGNINI, “Pius XII et liturgia,” in *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 72 (1958), 377. See also “Promemoria sull’origine della Commissione Pontificia per la Riforma Liturgica e sul lavoro da essa compiuto negli anni 1948-1953,” in N. GIAMPIETRO, *Il Card. Ferdinando Antonelli e gli sviluppi della riforma liturgica dal 1948-1970*, Rome, Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1998, 274-277.

¹⁰²⁸ It would be Pius XII who attributed broader or more profound meaning to *Tra le sollecitudini*, by stating, “Three characteristics of which Our predecessor Pius X spoke should adorn all liturgical services: sacredness, which abhors any profane influence; nobility, which true and genuine arts should serve and foster; and universality, which, while safeguarding local and legitimate custom, reveals the catholic unity of the Church” (*Mediator Dei*, 188, providing general reference to Apostolic Letter *motu proprio Tra le sollecitudini*, 22 November 1903).

¹⁰²⁹ CONGREGATION OF SACRED RITES, *SECTIO HISTORICA, Memoria sulla riforma liturgica*, no. 71, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1948; IDEM, *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica. Supplemento II: Annotazioni all’ ‘memoria,’* no. 76, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1950; IDEM, *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica. Supplemento III: Materiale storica, agiografico, liturgico per la riforma del calendario*, no. 79, Rome, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1951; IDEM, *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica. Supplemento IV: Consultazione dell’episcopato intorno alla riforma del Breviario Romano (1956-1957), Risultati e deduzioni*, no. 97, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1957. All these documents have been reproduced in C. BRAGA (ed.),

comprehensive liturgical reform. The 1958 instruction, *De musica sacra*, issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites,¹⁰³⁰ significantly broadened participation by the faithful.

4.2.1.2.1 – *Mediator Dei*, 1947

Seen as a sort of manifesto of the liturgical movement, *Mediator Dei* acknowledges liturgical scholarship and increased liturgical interest while praising the work of those involved. It presents a duty of the faithful “to participate in the liturgical rites according to their station.”¹⁰³¹

By virtue of this, Pius XII moved active participation in the Mass from the level of a concept to some degree of practical application. He identifies it as a duty of the faithful to participate in the Mass, each according to role. Deeper within the document, Pius XII does not hesitate to identify criticisms of the liturgical movement and acknowledge that it is not without abuses or excesses.¹⁰³² As such, the document seeks to approve and foster the right and reasonable contributions made by the liturgical movement and encourage its work while unhesitatingly calling for abuses to be curbed and corrected.¹⁰³³

La riforma liturgica di Pio XII: Documenti -I. La “Memoria sulla riforma liturgica,” Rome, CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 2003.

¹⁰³⁰ CONGREGATION FOR SACRED RITES, instruction *De musica sacra* on sacred music and liturgy, 3 September 1958, in *AAS*, 50 (1958), 630-663, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 255-282.

¹⁰³¹ *Mediator Dei*, no. 5.

¹⁰³² Glendinning notes: “The abuses Pius XII identifies explicitly in *Mediator Dei* include ‘the temerity and daring of those who introduce novel liturgical practices or call for the revival of obsolete rites out of harmony with prevailing laws and rubrics’ (no. 90). Also worthy of mention are ‘those who make use of the vernacular in the celebration of the august Eucharistic sacrifice; those who transfer certain feast days – which have been appointed and established after mature deliberation – to other dates; those, finally, who delete from the prayer books approved for public use the sacred texts of the Old Testament, deeming them little suited and inopportune for modern times’ (no. 90). For additional concerns characteristic of the time, see *La Maison-Dieu*, 7 (1946), 97-114; *CLD*, vol. 3, 350-352” (GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 13, footnote 12).

¹⁰³³ Huels notes that the corrective aspect is only part of a greater effort on the part of the Pontiff to “reassert complete papal authority over the liturgy” (HUELS, *Participation by the Faithful in the Liturgy*, 618). Glendinning continues, stating, “Echoing the prescriptions of the 1917 Code, *Mediator Dei* strongly affirms the Holy See’s ‘prerogative to commend and approve whatever is done properly, and to check or censure any aberration from the path of truth and rectitude’ (no. 9). [...] and affirms that the sovereign pontiff alone enjoys the right to recognize and establish any practice touching on the worship of God, including the introduction, approval, or modification of liturgical rites (see *CIC/17*, c. 1257)” (GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 14). Furthermore, “*Sacrosanctum Concilium* will derogate from c. 1257 of the 1917 *Code of Canon*

The value of active participation by the faithful is asserted without ambiguity in

Mediator Dei:

[...] All the faithful should be aware that to participate in the Eucharistic sacrifice is their chief duty and supreme dignity, and that not in an inert and negligent fashion, giving way to distractions and day-dreaming, but with such earnestness and concentration that they may be united as closely as possible with the High Priest [...] and together with him and through him let them make their oblation, and in union with him let them offer up themselves.¹⁰³⁴

While repeating the notion of duty on the part of the faithful, the Pontiff approves and encourages the ideal “of getting the Christian people to take part more easily and more fruitfully in the Mass, strive to make them familiar with the Roman Missal, so that the faithful, united with the priest, may pray together in the very words and sentiments of the Church.”¹⁰³⁵ Pius XII reiterates the charge of his predecessor by encouraging the faithful to sing the liturgical chant and hymnody in keeping with the rules and rubrics of the Mass.¹⁰³⁶ Herein as well, the *Missa dialogata* is further encouraged.

Pius XII uses the opportunity to acknowledge that some may be unable to follow along with the Missal or unable to understand the rites and formulas of the Mass. In what may appear jarring to contemporary liturgical sensibilities, the Pontiff recommends that such persons occupy themselves with other activities during the Mass. Of this, Grillo observes:

It is interesting to note that the concept to the *participation of the faithful* in *Mediator Dei* is essentially related not to the *rite* but to one's *state of mind* (cf. no. 81). And so those who have difficulty understanding the liturgical rites or who do not feel like participating in the Eucharistic sacrifice “can adopt some other method which proves easier for certain people; for instance, they can lovingly meditate on the mysteries of Jesus Christ or perform other exercises of piety or recite prayers which, though they differ from the

Law, as expressed in *Mediator Dei*. No longer does the Apostolic See exercise exclusive competence to order the sacred liturgy and to approve liturgical books but, ‘as the law determines,’ this competency also belongs to the bishops and the competent territorial bodies of bishops. The 1983 *Code of Canon Law* reflects this change of law in c. 838” (ibid., 14, footnote 15).

¹⁰³⁴ *Mediator Dei*, no. 80.

¹⁰³⁵ Ibid., no. 105.

¹⁰³⁶ See ibid., nos. 105, 191, 194.

sacred rites, are still essentially in harmony with them.”¹⁰³⁷ This explicit counsel of *participative parallelism* does not foresee the novelty *Sacrosanctum Concilium* would introduce, making *ritual form* and *active participation* inseparable. It is precisely this difference that the Council sought to recover and authoritatively propose.¹⁰³⁸

Pius XII also takes the opportunity to offer a negative directive in the document by admonishing a methodology that would grant value to liturgical matters strictly based upon their existence from antiquity. He defines this antiquarianism as “the restoration of all the ancient rites and ceremonies indiscriminately.”¹⁰³⁹

While in part reflective of a context that has now passed, *Mediator Dei* became an illuminating and energizing thrust for the liturgical movement and would provide foundation for a number of texts issued from the Second Vatican Council.¹⁰⁴⁰ Huels will observe that with *Mediator Dei*, “the liturgical movement that had been confined to a small but growing number of enthusiasts now found many of its objectives gaining formal acceptance and endorsement by the Apostolic See.”¹⁰⁴¹

4.2.1.2.2 - Memoria sulla riforma liturgica, 1948

Pius XII engaged the previously mentioned *Sectio historica* of the Congregation for Sacred Rites with the task of preparing for comprehensive liturgical reform, the work for which it had been instituted by Pius XI in 1930. The *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica* that

¹⁰³⁷ *Mediator Dei*, no. 108.

¹⁰³⁸ A. GRILLO, *Beyond Pius V: Conflicting Interpretations of the Liturgical Reform*, Collegeville, MN, Liturgical Press, 2013, 23-24, footnote 22.

¹⁰³⁹ *Ibid.*, 61. Glendinning notes: “*Mediator Dei* provides the following examples: ‘Thus, to cite some instances, one would be straying from the straight path were he to wish the altar restored to its primitive table form; were he to want black excluded as a color for the liturgical vestments; were he to forbid the use of sacred images and statues in churches; were he to order the crucifix so designed that the divine Redeemer’s body bear no trace of his cruel sufferings; and lastly, were he to disdain and reject polyphonic music or singing in parts, even where it conforms to regulations issued by the Holy See’ (no. 62). Ironically, some of what Pius XII had in mind is now considered normative, while the forms of liturgical worship before the Second Vatican Council – precisely what Pius XII was defending – are considered by some as representative of a new form of exaggerated antiquarianism” (GLEDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 15, footnote 16).

¹⁰⁴⁰ See GLEDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 16.

¹⁰⁴¹ HUELS, *Participation by the Faithful in the Liturgy*, 620-621. However, some of the anathemas of *Mediator Dei* were embraced in the post-Vatican II reform, as noted by Glendinning, above.

the *Sectio historica* produced became the body's *instrumentum laboris*, envisioned as a guide and basis for discussion of matters of liturgical reform that could be augmented and adapted as deemed useful.¹⁰⁴² As a consequence of additional consultation, four supplements were added to the *Memoria*.

From the time of its creation, the *Memoria* proposed a nine-phased¹⁰⁴³ general reform of the entire liturgy and all principal liturgical books of the Latin Church.¹⁰⁴⁴ It did so by identifying “three foundational principles for the reform of the liturgy. These principles would find comparable, though expanded, expression in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.”¹⁰⁴⁵

The first Principle of the *Memoria* states that there must be a balance between conservation and innovation.¹⁰⁴⁶ The second states that the cult of the Saints (*dulia*) must be subordinated to the cult of the Divine (*latría*).¹⁰⁴⁷ The third Principle states that, because the Mass is a unitary and organic complex, reform of it must be unitary and organic.¹⁰⁴⁸

Prior to the project being taken over by the Conciliar Liturgical Commission, this compendium was utilized by a special commission appointed 28 May 1948 entrusted with management of the general restoration of the liturgy. This special commission operated for twelve years, holding eighty-two meetings and operating in absolute secrecy

¹⁰⁴² See GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actiosa*,” 17.

¹⁰⁴³ BRAGA, *La “Memoria sulla riforma liturgica,”* 19-20.

¹⁰⁴⁴ GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actiosa*,” 19.

¹⁰⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 17. For a graphic presentation comparing the documents, see also, 18-19.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Primo principio: Si devono equilibrare le opposte pretese della tendenza conservatrice e della tendenza innovatrice. This principle is illuminated and addressed in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 23.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Secondo principio: Dato che la liturgia è, per natura sua, eminentemente latreutica, il culto di *dulia* dev’essere subordinato a quello di *latría*; conseguentemente, nel Calendario liturgico, il ‘Temporale’ e il ‘Feriale’ devono predominare sul ‘Santoriale.’ Consequently, it was proposed that revision of the liturgical calendar must result in the subordination of the Sanctoral Cycle to the Temporal Cycle. This principle is restated in substance in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 106.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Terzo principio: Dato che la liturgia è un complesso unitario e organico, conviene che la riforma sia anche unitaria ed organica. This principle is found among the statements of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, nos. 21 and 23.

until it was assumed into the Conciliar Preparatory Commission.¹⁰⁴⁹ Among several goals accomplished, three were of particular significance:

1. Restoration of the Easter Vigil and a reform of the Order of Holy Week in 1955;
2. Simplification of the rubrics for the Breviary and Missal in 1955;
3. Preparation of an instruction on sacred music and its use within the Mass in 1958.¹⁰⁵⁰

Even after the commission's dissolution, its work served as the basis for a number of legislative developments during the pontificate of John XXIII. Similarly, the *Memoria* and its supplements were distributed to all members and experts of the Conciliar Liturgical Commission.¹⁰⁵¹

4.2.1.2.3 - *De musica sacra*, 1958

The 1958 instruction *De musica sacra*,¹⁰⁵² issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites, created a tipping point in the evolution of understanding active participation of the faithful, moving “from mere toleration of the laity's involvement in the liturgy to a practical promotion of their active participation.”¹⁰⁵³ The document states that the Mass by its nature requires that the faithful should participate.¹⁰⁵⁴ It describes an evolution of the *Missa dialogata* by means of three levels of active participation in each of two grades of Mass.¹⁰⁵⁵

¹⁰⁴⁹ The minutes of each of these meetings have been reproduced as an appendix in GIAMPIETRO, *Il Card. Ferdinando Antonelli*, 278-388. An English translation is also available in N. GIAMPIETRO, *The Development of the Liturgical Reform as Seen by Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli from 1947 to 1970*, Fort Collins, CO, Roman Catholic Books, 2009, 205-316.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Cf. GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 19-20. See P. PRÉTOT, “La réforme de la semaine sainte sous Pie XII (1951-1956),” in *Questions liturgiques*, 93 (2012), 196-217.

¹⁰⁵¹ GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 19-20, and GIAMPIETRO, *The Development of the Liturgical Reform*, 30.

¹⁰⁵² CONGREGATION FOR SACRED RITES, instruction *De musica sacra* on sacred music and liturgy, 3 September 1958, in *AAS*, 50 (1958), 630-663, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 255-282.

¹⁰⁵³ GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 20.

¹⁰⁵⁴ *De musica sacra*, 22.

¹⁰⁵⁵ These grades of Dialogue Mass belong to the Sung/High Mass (see *De musica sacra*, 25a-25c) and Read/Low Mass (see *ibid.*, 29-31), making a total of six variations.

The document encourages religious hymnody in the vernacular additional to but not replacing the assigned liturgical texts.¹⁰⁵⁶ For the convenience of the faithful, the vernacular Gospel and Epistle were permitted by a lector at read, but not sung, Masses.¹⁰⁵⁷

These changes required the celebrant to do more than simply pronounce words and make gestures, “saying the black and doing the red,” as it were. He was charged with being fully conscious of what he is doing, acting intelligibly and accessibly in such a way that his liturgical actions and deliberate presence are recognizable by the faithful congregated.¹⁰⁵⁸

4.2.1.3 - John XXIII (1958-1963)

In 1960, John XXIII promulgated *Rubricarum instructum*,¹⁰⁵⁹ which introduced a new *Code of Rubrics* for the celebration of the Mass and Divine Office. Rather than restating or illuminating the importance of active participation of the faithful, the new *Code of Rubrics* directs the receiver to *De musica sacra*.¹⁰⁶⁰

Innovative in the text of the new *Code of Rubrics* is its departure from strictly juridic terminology and inclusion of explanations for the rubrics themselves.¹⁰⁶¹ Likewise, “exhortative, rather than prescriptive language is employed in a number of articles.¹⁰⁶²

¹⁰⁵⁶ *De musica sacra*, 14a, 33.

¹⁰⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 14c. These readings by a lector, including the Holy Gospel, take place as a duplication of what the priest had read or was reading. There is no mention of any version or level of approval of vernacular translation(s) to be used.

¹⁰⁵⁸ This rather revolutionary principle will be expressed anew in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 21.

¹⁰⁵⁹ JOHN XXIII, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Rubricarum instructum* approving a new code of rubrics, 25 July 1960, in *AAS*, 52 (1960), 593-595, English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy*, 305-307.

¹⁰⁶⁰ See *Rubricarum instructum*, 272.

¹⁰⁶¹ Richstatter provides the examples of nos. 270, 142, 145, 147. He also identifies a provision for local adaptation. See RICHSTATTER, *Liturgical Law*, 52-53.

¹⁰⁶² Richstatter provides the following examples: no. 142: praestat ut ... (it is better that ...); no. 143: sufficit ut ... (it is sufficient to ...); no. 144: ... anticipare licet (... may be anticipated); no. 145: ... quod convenienter servatur (... which it is fitting to observe); no. 147: ... valde opportune ... ob iustum causam ... per rationabile tempus protrahitur ... (... it is most fitting that ... for a just cause ... for a reasonable length of time ...). See RICHSTATTER, *Liturgical Law*, 52.

Although ‘facultative’ rubrics existed in pre-Conciliar liturgical rites, these were quite rare.¹⁰⁶³ Conciliar and post-Conciliar documents will expand this practice, necessitating a careful analysis of the various literary forms employed.”¹⁰⁶⁴

Easily overlooked in the new *Code of Rubrics* is a provision enabling the conference of bishops to make local adaptations to the Mass. In mission countries, where a prescribed liturgical color conflicts with the established and ancient interpretation of the local population, “the faculty is given to the episcopal conference of that region, or of a larger territory if that is expedient, to substitute another, more fitting color for the unsuitable color. This is not to be done, however, without consulting the Sacred Congregation of Rites.”¹⁰⁶⁵

Glendinning observes that this provision is important to note for two reasons:

[T]his provision predates the actual establishment of conferences of bishops – at least in universal law. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* will follow a similar pattern by assigning various competencies to ‘territorial bodies of bishops’ – again before such structures are even anticipated in the law itself. [...] Secondly, it is an early example of a provision in *universal law*, not a concession by means of a singular administrative act, which anticipates modifications for the purposes of effective inculturation of the Gospel message. Of course, this matter will receive considerable attention in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (nos. 37-40) and other post-conciliar documents. [...] We see the beginnings of this, in a very nascent form, in the 1960 code of rubrics.¹⁰⁶⁶

As demonstrated, promotion of the active participation of the faithful in the Mass was a goal sought for nearly a century prior to the Second Vatican Council developed in an evolutionary manner. In the earlier days of the liturgical movement, participation of the

¹⁰⁶³ RICHSTATTER, *Liturgical Law*, xxviii. Richstatter discusses a distinction between “prescriptive” rubrics, which bind under sin, and “directive” rubrics, which do not, “but appeal to a filial spirit of obedience and a sense of good order” (ibid., xxix). McManus, among others, finds difficulty with this distinction: “It must be insisted that it is almost impossible to find rubrics in the liturgical books which are merely directive, that is, which give a direction or command while leaving complete liberty of action” (McMANUS, *The Congregation of Sacred Rites*, 136).

¹⁰⁶⁴ GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 23-24. For an example of this, see J. M. HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 233-237.

¹⁰⁶⁵ *Codex rubricarum*, no. 117.

¹⁰⁶⁶ GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 24.

faithful was described as devout attention to the rites according to one's ability to do so, even by means of parallel participation. When vocal participation by the congregation was first introduced by means of the *Missa dialogata*, it was found to be cumbersome. With some time and practice, it became tolerated, then encouraged and ultimately codified as normative in the Conciliar and post-Conciliar reforms.¹⁰⁶⁷

4.2.1.4 - Paul VI (1963-1978)

It would be an irresponsible understatement to describe liturgico-juridical development during the pontificate of Paul VI as merely significant. The most influential document arising from his era was *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. It did not exist without context, however, nor did it constitute the final word. Several weighty documents on implementation of the principles of the Constitution were promulgated over the course of the following decades, though most of them within the pontificate of Paul VI.

4.2.1.5 - *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 1963

In the sequence of juridic documents contributing to the evolution of the reform of the Sacred Liturgy and promoting the principle of active participation by the faithful, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* becomes a natural successor; a logical procession from what had preceded it. The document substantially continues, expands and advances the pattern and trajectory set by the principles contained in its predecessor documents. Its distinguishing characteristic lies in the fact that it emanates from an Ecumenical Council. Like the documents of the Ecumenical Council of Trent, *SC* demands liturgical reform while

¹⁰⁶⁷ GLENDINNING, "*Participatio Actiosa*," 25. Glendinning will point out a matter that should not be overlooked, stating, "When examining the promotion of the active participation of the faithful in the liturgy, it took nearly a half a century to move from where active participation was merely tolerated to where it is actively promoted and encouraged. Rarely does the ecclesiastical authority serve as the principal catalyst for liturgical reform. It responds either to grant its approval or reprobate perceived abuses" (ibid., 26).

remanding actualization to yet-to-be-created post-Conciliar bodies. Unlike Trent, this Constitution provides, *inter alia*, goals for reform.

Several principles may be identified in the Constitution on the Liturgy. By their verbiage, these appear as uncompromising demands placed by the Council Fathers upon those who would be entrusted with the forthcoming liturgical reform.¹⁰⁶⁸ Those of specific interest to this chapter are treated below.

The primary objective of reform set forth in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy is to achieve participation by the faithful in the Mass: “In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy, this full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else....”¹⁰⁶⁹ This goal will be found as a thread continuing throughout many demands and goals set forth in *SC*.

This participation is to be given such value because it is the faithful’s “right and duty by reason of their baptism.”¹⁰⁷⁰ *SC* adds that an effort to achieve this end is futile “unless the pastors themselves, in the first place, become thoroughly imbued with the spirit and

¹⁰⁶⁸ Coincidentally, the structure of this subsection is paralleled roughly by J. Fessio who treats this with more detail in an article at IgnatiusInsight.com. See J. FESSIO, “The Mass of Vatican II,” on *Ignatius Insight*, (not dated), at http://www.ignatiusinsight.com/features2005/fessio_massv2_1_jan05.asp (11 January 2022). The text is not dated, but a note attached to it indicates: “This essay appeared in the September/October 2000 issue of *Catholic Dossier* and is based on a lecture on the liturgy given by Father Fessio in May 1999.”

¹⁰⁶⁹ *SC*, no. 14. Reading these important documents in their entirety and in chronological order, the term “full” becomes less mysterious. The term appears to have been employed in order to incorporate earlier notions of participation by the faithful that included one’s interior disposition. Thus, it appears that “full” refers to participation by one’s mind and soul whereas “active” refers to one’s external disposition. Full and active, then, coalesce to incorporate the entire person. The language of historically preceding documents becomes familiar as the overall theme, particularly when references are made to “all the people,” “right,” “duty” and the like. *SC*, no. 14, states: “Valde cupit Mater Ecclesia ut fideles universi ad plenam illam, consciam atque actuosam liturgicarum celebrationum participationem ducantur, quae ab ipsius Liturgiae natura postulator....” “Conscientious as well as active” seems a good compromise to the usual English translation of “fully conscious and active.” Perhaps a better translation would be “fully aware and engaged.” The terms *consciam* and *actuosam* have been drawn proximate to each other by Benedict XVI, cited above (see *Sacramentum caritatis*, 52). The term *plenam* is likewise drawn closer to “conscientious” and “active” as these dispositions are interior to the worshipper who desires to become one with the sacrifice, thus requiring the individual’s conscientious attention and a highly activated mental state.

¹⁰⁷⁰ *SC*, no. 14

power of the liturgy, and undertake to give instruction about it. A prime need, therefore, is that attention be directed, first of all, to the liturgical instruction of the clergy.”¹⁰⁷¹

Facilitating participation by the faithful is identified as a responsibility of the celebrating clergy. Echoing and transmitting the principle set forth in the groundbreaking *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica*, SC entreats pastors to “realize that, when the liturgy is celebrated, something more is required than the mere observation of the laws governing valid and licit celebration; it is their duty also to ensure that the faithful take part fully aware of what they are doing, actively engaged in the rite, and enriched by its effects.”¹⁰⁷² Additionally, pastors are to teach the faithful unrelentingly to take part in the entire Mass, which essentially includes both the Word and the Eucharist.¹⁰⁷³

Participation of the faithful is demanded in liturgical music. The Constitution directs composers not to be occupied only with creating compositions suitable for large choirs. Rather, they must also create works that may be executed by small choirs while allowing for the active participation of the entire congregation.¹⁰⁷⁴

Within the great treasure of sacred music, Gregorian Chant is especially suited to the Roman Mass and thus should be given pride of place therein.¹⁰⁷⁵ Because, by nature, Gregorian Chant can be quite easy to learn, this request is congruous with the goal of increased participation by the faithful.

The Constitution instructs that Latin is to be preserved in the sacred rites of the Latin Church.¹⁰⁷⁶ While “a suitable place” in the Mass may be found for the vernacular languages,

¹⁰⁷¹ SC, no. 14.

¹⁰⁷² Ibid., no. 21.

¹⁰⁷³ See *ibid.*, no. 56.

¹⁰⁷⁴ See *ibid.*, no. 121.

¹⁰⁷⁵ See *ibid.*, no. 116.

¹⁰⁷⁶ See *ibid.*, no. 36, 1°.

it should be ensured that the faithful are able to say or sing at least the *Ordo Missae* in Latin.¹⁰⁷⁷

The Constitution lends an urgency to the reform. It states, “The liturgical books are to be revised as soon as possible; experts are to be employed on the task, and bishops are to be consulted from various parts of the world.”¹⁰⁷⁸

The demands set forth are clear and momentous; the ideals whence they come are mighty. They represent the ideals of the liturgical movement present in prior juridic documents and understood by the Council Fathers as worthy of most serious attention by an ecumenical council.¹⁰⁷⁹ Whitehead places this monumental document in historical context, stating that *SC* “must accordingly now be considered a permanent part of the Church’s long and rich heritage.”¹⁰⁸⁰ Ultimately, however, the goal of *SC* is set forth clearly by its own statement: “Full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else.”¹⁰⁸¹

4.2.1.6 - Instructions on the Implementation of Liturgical Reform

As significant as it is, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* only demanded liturgical reform and renewal; the work of creating and then enacting reform followed it. The reforms of the post-Conciliar period were revolutionary at the time: they were Roman by a definition that had been applied in the Church previously and they were imposed with a rigor and degree of authority not previously wrought on a universal scale. Never had the liturgy known such narrow circumscription or such strict control.

¹⁰⁷⁷ See *SC*, no. 54.

¹⁰⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 25.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Upon reflection, it is reasonable to conclude that all of these have been promoted successfully as principles. When considered similarly for their success as goals, the conclusions number perhaps as many as there are persons to draw them.

¹⁰⁸⁰ WHITEHEAD, *Mass Misunderstandings*, 239-240.

¹⁰⁸¹ *SC*, no. 14.

Myriad instructive, corrective, enhancing and advancing documents followed *SC*. These subsequent juridical texts reveal how the Constitution was received, interpreted and implemented as well as what advanced subsequently because of it.

From 1964 to 2001 no fewer than five *Instructions on the Implementation of Sacrosanctum Concilium* were promulgated.¹⁰⁸² The first three, *Inter oecumenici* of 1965, *Tres abhinc annos* of 1967 and *Liturgicae instaurationes* of 1970, appeared during the pontificate of Paul VI. These juridic documents essentially describe and present the swift and sweeping changes to the Mass. Each is presented as authentic and ongoing interpretation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. While what each enacted inevitably caused controversy, each was promulgated by its respective competent source; the authenticity and juridic authority of each is indisputable.

Inter oecumenici of 1965 presents a new set of norms for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, the other sacraments, sacramentals and the Divine Office. *Inter alia*, the document reasserts the authority of the Church in liturgical matters, forbidding anyone to act on them by individual initiative.¹⁰⁸³ By the determination of territorial ecclesiastical authority and confirmation by the Holy See, vernacular languages could be permitted for all the scriptures and intervening chants, the Prayer of the Faithful, the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*,

¹⁰⁸² SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES (CONSILIIUM), Instruction *Inter Oecumenici* (First) on the Orderly Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy beginning first Sunday of Lent, 7 March 1965, 26 September 1964, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 877-900. SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Instruction *Tres abhinc annos* (Second) on the Orderly Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy, 4 May 1967, in *AAS*, 59 (1967), 442-448. CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction, *Liturgicae instaurationes* (Third) on the Orderly Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy, 5 September 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 692-704. CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Instruction *Varietates legitimae* on the inculturation of the Sacred Liturgy (Fourth) for the Right Application of the Conciliar Constitution on the Liturgy, 29 March 1994, in *AAS*, 87 (1995), 288-314. IDEM, Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam* on the use of vernacular languages in the publication of the books of the Roman liturgy, (Fifth) instruction on the proper implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, 28 March 2001, in *AAS*, 93 (2001), 685-726.

¹⁰⁸³ *Inter Oecumenici*, 20.

Credo, Sanctus-Benedictus, Agnus Dei, the antiphons, acclamations, greeting and dialogue formularies, the *Ecce Agnus Dei, Domine, non sum dignus, Corpus Christi* at the distribution of Holy Communion and the Lord's Prayer along with its introduction and embolism. Altar Missals containing the vernacular could be published but with the Latin text alongside.¹⁰⁸⁴

Pastors were charged with the obligation to see to it that the faithful knew how to sing with simple melodies or recite the parts of the *Ordo* proper to them in Latin. Permission for the use of vernacular languages for the texts the celebrant sings or recites alone, however, was to be granted exclusively by the Holy See.¹⁰⁸⁵ There is a preference for centrally located, freestanding altars that may be circumambulated and fit for Mass celebration behind it, facing against the people.¹⁰⁸⁶

Tres abhinc annos of 1967 introduced further significant changes to the Mass. These changes include expanded options for formularies and allowance for a second Collect under certain circumstances.¹⁰⁸⁷ Most genuflections, kisses and signations are eliminated.¹⁰⁸⁸ Regarding changes to vesture, the document states, "The maniple is no longer required."¹⁰⁸⁹ Competent territorial authority is granted the permission to authorize use of vernacular languages in the Eucharistic Canon.¹⁰⁹⁰

¹⁰⁸⁴ See *Inter Oecumenici*, 57, a-c.

¹⁰⁸⁵ See *ibid.*, 58. The charge for the faithful to know the *Ordo* in Latin reflects the same charge given by *SC*. However, it was the very elements of the *Ordo* that were first permitted in the vernacular.

¹⁰⁸⁶ See *ibid.*, 91.

¹⁰⁸⁷ See *Tres abhinc annos*, 4. Article 4b allows as a second Collect, *inter alia*, "the prayer for the anniversary of the priest's own ordination (*Codex rubricarum*, nos. 451-452)."

¹⁰⁸⁸ See *Tres abhinc annos*, 7-16.

¹⁰⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁰⁹⁰ See *ibid.*, 28, a. What became *CIC*/1983 c. 838, §3 affirmed this. It was subrogated by Francis by means of *Magnum principium*. Canon 838, §3, now reads: "It pertains to the Episcopal Conferences to faithfully prepare versions of the liturgical books in vernacular languages, suitably accommodated within defined limits, and to approve and publish the liturgical books for the regions for which they are responsible after the confirmation of the Apostolic See." The 1983 *Code* states further in c. 928: "The Eucharistic celebration is to be carried out in the Latin language or in another language provided that the liturgical texts

Liturgicae instaurationes of 3 September 1970 is focused primarily on clarification of the liturgical changes that had taken place. It decries the practice of introducing adaptations, changes or other matters on the personal initiative of the celebrant.¹⁰⁹¹ Females continue to be barred from service at the altar wherever the Mass is offered but are allowed other liturgical roles.¹⁰⁹²

Nine months later, *Instructione de Constitutione* was promulgated. In part, it treated the use of vernacular languages in the Mass. It stated that episcopal conferences should “settle on a definite date when translations ... may or must be put into use in whole or in part. From the date on which the translated texts become obligatory for celebrations in the vernacular, only the revised form of the Mass and the Liturgy of the Hours will be allowed, even for those who continue to use Latin.”¹⁰⁹³ As Chiron observes regarding admission of vernacular languages into the Mass, “In a little over a year, the Congregation for Divine Worship had moved from possibility to obligation.”¹⁰⁹⁴

The fourth and fifth instructions, *Varietates legitimae* of 1994 on inculturation of the sacred liturgy and *Liturgiam authenticam* of 2001 on the use of vernacular translations, were promulgated under John Paul II. The former will be treated briefly below. These documents bear the same indisputable authenticity and juridic authority as their predecessor Instructions. These latter Instructions are as much corrective as directive, reflecting experience with liturgical changes accrued over the intervening years.

have been legitimately approved.” See FRANCIS, apostolic letter motu proprio *Magnum principium* by which canon 838 of the Code of Canon Law is modified, 9 September 2017, in *AAS*, 109 (2017), 967-970, English translation available at <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2017/09/09/170909a.html> (18 January 2022).

¹⁰⁹¹ See *Liturgicae instaurationes*, 1.

¹⁰⁹² See *ibid.*, 7.

¹⁰⁹³ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁰⁹⁴ CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 149.

4.2.1.7 - John Paul II (1978-2005) and Benedict XVI (2005-2013)

Due to their placement in history, the papacies of John Paul II and Benedict XVI found themselves with the responsibility of promoting understanding and acceptance of the post-Conciliar liturgical changes enacted juridically under Paul VI.¹⁰⁹⁵ It fell to the lengthy pontificate of John Paul II to address abuses in the liturgy and at the same time promote acceptance of a properly understood liturgical reform. His documents pertaining to the sacred Mass are largely corrective and bear a somewhat lugubrious tone in their attempt to bring about internal liturgical reconciliation.

John Paul issued apostolic letters *Vicesimus Quintus Annus*¹⁰⁹⁶ and *Spiritus et sponsa*¹⁰⁹⁷ on the twenty-fifth and fortieth anniversaries of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* in 1988 and 2003, respectively, and encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, also in 2003. In response to the Pontiff's request to do so, the CDWDS issued instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum* in 2004. Following the 2005 Synod of Bishops, Benedict XVI issued the post-synodal exhortation *Sacramentum caritatis*.

In *Vicesimus Quintus Annus* of 1988, John Paul II wrote that “the vast majority of the pastors and the Christian people have accepted the liturgical reform in a spirit of obedience and indeed joyful fervor.”¹⁰⁹⁸ He spoke similarly in *Spiritus et sponsa* of 2003.¹⁰⁹⁹ These

¹⁰⁹⁵ Often overlooked, Pope John Paul I was the first post-conciliar pontiff to be entrusted with this weighty and complicated task. Though his pontificate was too brief to engage in these matters, he did, in fact, accept the charge to do so. He deserves honorable mention.

¹⁰⁹⁶ JOHN PAUL II, Apostolic letter *Vicesimus quintus annus* on the twenty-fifth anniversary of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 4 December 1988, in *AAS*, 81 (1989), 897-918, English translation in *Origins*, 19 (1989-1990), 17, 19-25.

¹⁰⁹⁷ JOHN PAUL II, Apostolic letter *Spiritus et sponsa* on the fortieth anniversary of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 04 December 2003, in *AAS*, 96 (2004), 419-427, English translation at https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/2003/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_20031204_spiritus-et-sponsa.html (7 July 2022).

¹⁰⁹⁸ *Vicesimus Quintus Annus*, no. 12.

¹⁰⁹⁹ See *Spiritus et sponsa*, no. 6.

statements essentially comprise the Pontiff's positive statements in those documents. It appears that there were many more practices to be corrected than commended at the time.

In April of 2003, just eight months prior to *Spiritus et sponsa*, John Paul II issued encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*. In it, he expressed hope that his words therein would “banish the dark clouds of unacceptable doctrine and practice so that the Eucharist will continue to shine forth in all its radiance.”¹¹⁰⁰ The Holy Father states somberly:

I consider it my duty, therefore, to appeal urgently that the liturgical norms for the celebration of the Eucharist be observed with great fidelity. These norms are a concrete expression of the authentically ecclesial nature of the Eucharist; this is their deepest meaning. Liturgy is never anyone's private property, be it of the celebrant or of the community in which the mysteries are celebrated. [...] Our time, too, calls for a renewed awareness and appreciation of liturgical norms as a reflection of, and a witness to, the one universal Church made present in every celebration of the Eucharist. Priests who faithfully celebrate Mass according to the liturgical norms, and communities which conform to those norms, quietly but eloquently demonstrate their love for the Church.¹¹⁰¹

The Pontiff presents the intrinsic meaning of liturgical norms as the expression of what is authentically ecclesial. In order to expound upon the meaning of liturgical norms, he asked the competent dicasteries of the Roman Curia to prepare a document that would accomplish that and include juridic prescriptions. He concludes with gravity, “No one is permitted to undervalue the mystery entrusted to our hands: it is too great for anyone to feel free to treat it lightly and with disregard for its sacredness and its universality.”¹¹⁰²

Within a year of his request, the CDWDS issued instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum*.¹¹⁰³ Whitehead describes the instruction as one “in which the Church's rules for the celebration and reception of the great sacrament of the Eucharist were strongly

¹¹⁰⁰ *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, no. 10.

¹¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, no. 52.

¹¹⁰² *Ibid.*, no. 10.

¹¹⁰³ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum* on certain matters to be observed or to be avoided regarding the Most Holy Eucharist, 25 March 2004, in *AAS*, 96 (2004), 549-601.

reiterated and reaffirmed.”¹¹⁰⁴ While observing that there was nothing novel about the norms contained in the instruction, he comments:

However, the fact that the Church was reiterating them once again in this Instruction, and at the highest level, indicated that they were still not being universally followed. In such a situation, it was therefore certainly important that the Church should again remind everyone of these existing rules.¹¹⁰⁵

Five years later, in response to the 2005 Synod of Bishops, Benedict XVI issued the post-synodal exhortation *Sacramentum caritatis* on the Holy Eucharist as source and summit of the life of the Church. The document is a tempered examination of liturgical reform. Treatment of it is marked by a maturity of understanding gleaned from the experience and observation of the post-Conciliar liturgical reform as well as its acceptance and implementation over the prior decades. This maturity of understanding is made evident by the description of how active participation had come to be understood. Presumably reflecting the mind of the Synod Fathers, the Pontiff states:

The Second Vatican Council rightly emphasized the active, full and fruitful participation of the entire people of God in the eucharistic celebration. [...] Yet we must not overlook the fact that some misunderstanding has occasionally arisen concerning the precise meaning of this participation. It should be made clear that the word participation does not refer to mere external activity during the celebration. In fact, the active participation called for by the Council must be understood in more substantial terms, on the basis of a greater awareness of the mystery being celebrated and its relationship to daily life.¹¹⁰⁶

With a clarified, or at least updated, understanding, the notion of active participation by the faithful is brought to full circle. “Active” is not defined solely as physical activity but rather elevated awareness of the mystery taking place at the Mass, which leads the worshiper to desire to make active expression in some way and to some degree. Coupled with the deep concern of John Paul II for the norm of law, the work of elevating awareness

¹¹⁰⁴ WHITEHEAD, *Mass Misunderstandings*, 236.

¹¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 236-237.

¹¹⁰⁶ *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 52.

of the sacrality of the Mass is largely contingent upon the way the celebrant himself is conscientiously involved in offering the Mass according to liturgical norms.

Following exploration of the development of the liturgical movement through a juridical lens, it may be summarized that the following goals were established and remain operative in ongoing liturgical renewal:

1. The umbrella under which enrichment between the Forms must operate is the same as that of any liturgical goal of good will: the greater honor and glory of God and the salvation of souls in the act of perfect worship,¹¹⁰⁷ participation in which is the sacred duty and most precious obligation of the *Christifideles*.
2. Active participation by the faithful must be promoted and preserved.
3. Reconciliation of liturgy and thus that of the faithful must be before our eyes always.
4. The immediate material goal is the sacralization of the mystery of the Holy Sacrifice when celebrated according to the Ordinary Form.

4.2.2 – The Fundamental Goal of Consilium and Its Results

Sacrosanctum Concilium presented principles of and goals for liturgical reform but did not propose a methodology to be employed to achieve them. The *periti* of Consilium were left with a great task and equally great latitude in determining how it would be accomplished. How they chose to proceed will inform an understanding of the goals of reform and sheds light upon mutual enrichment in its contemporary context.¹¹⁰⁸

The approach Consilium chose to use involved pinpointing a time in history when, by their estimation, divine worship in Rome consisted purely of elements of Roman origin. They decided that such a liturgy would have existed in Rome prior to the Carolingian

¹¹⁰⁷ Necessarily never a perfect act of worship, however.

¹¹⁰⁸ For a comprehensive examination of Consilium and the approaches to reform they utilized, see C. KAPPES, “Chronology, Organization Competencies and Composition of the *Consilium ad exsequendam constitutionem de sacra liturgia*,” paper written for the Commissio ad LaREAM, Pontificium Athenaeum S. Anselmi de Urbe, 2009, and by the same author, The ‘Missa Normativa’ of 1967: Its History and Principles as Applied to the Liturgy of the Mass, Doctoral Dissertation (SLD), Pontificium Athenaeum S. Anselmi de Urbe, 2012.

reforms. As mentioned, these reforms had resulted in the enrichment of the Roman Mass by inculturation of local practices into the Missal as it made its way around the Churches in the West and back to Rome. This fundamental decision should be born in mind as subsequent acts of Concilium unfold.

Once this historical point of reference and departure was in place, determinations were made regarding what should constitute the ideal reformed Roman Mass of the twentieth century. Kappes identifies that the most important development in the intellectual posture of Consilium lies in these assumptions:

This [Carolingian] period was commonly accepted as a time of Gallicanization of the Roman liturgy in the Frankish empire. According to this theory, during a long and complex history, [generally treated in Chapter II, above] the authentic rituals of the Roman rite were mixed or replaced with texts and ceremonial from the Gallican Church, especially after the 8th to 9th centuries. The Consilium Fathers, perhaps reflecting recent trends in Western liturgiology, often valued only those rites of the Mass that could be found in Rome's patristic and ancient liturgy as it was celebrated in the city of Rome before the Gallican period of liturgical creativity in the Roman rite.¹¹⁰⁹

Some of the rites offered by the Church in the pre-Carolingian era are described with detail in the multiple medieval remnants of papal ceremonial booklets known collectively as *Ordines Romani*, spanning from ca. 650 to at least the mid-fifteenth century. The *Ordo primus*, or *Ordines I*, became the foundation upon which Consilium would base its overall vision of reform in contrast to the Carolingian reforms:¹¹¹⁰

The Consilium proposed the foundation of a universal rite of Mass should be constructed along the lines of the ancient Roman Orders (*Ordines Romani*). In particular *Ordo primus* was seen as a truly authentic ceremonial text, describing the pristine praxis of the liturgy in Rome by the Pontiffs and clergy as far back as the 8th century. Therefore, these authentic Roman texts were to be the inspiration and measure of the new Mass to be created by the Consilium.¹¹¹¹

¹¹⁰⁹ KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 66.

¹¹¹⁰ See *ibid.*, 67, and also M. FRANCIS, "Liturgical Inculturation: The State of the Question," in *Liturgical Ministry*, 6 (1997), 101. For texts of these *Ordines*, see M. ANDRIEU (ed.), *Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge 2. Les Textes (Ordines I-XIII)*, Spicilegium sacrum lovaniense administration, Louvain, 1971, 67-108.

¹¹¹¹ KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 38. See M. BARBA, *La riforma conciliare dell' "Ordo Missae." Il percorso storico-redazionale dei riti d'ingresso, di offertorio e di comunione*, Rome, Edizioni Liturgiche, 2008, 143. This position on liturgical reform does not rest well with later liturgical scholarship. For instance,

[... B]oth [Consilium's] publications and records of their audiences record their general consensus; namely that the good of the Church seemed to them to demand an attempt to return the liturgy back to the *vigor* that it enjoyed at the end of the patristic age and the early Middle Ages. This period was exemplified by the vocal *participation* and diversity of functioning liturgical ministries. (Emphasis in original.)¹¹¹²

This determination created a redefinition. At the time of the post-Tridentine codifications of the Mass, the rite promulgated as “Roman” was that which was and had been in use in the diocese or the city of Rome since the time of Gregory I (ca. 540-604). Once Consilium asserted that the *Ordines* was determined to be of pure Roman use, they changed the definition of “Roman” from that which is “practiced in Rome” to that which is of “Roman origin” dating from the 8th century.

This idealization and subsequent redefinition of what constituted Roman liturgy became the standard by which the value of elements that had been inculturated into the Missal were judged. Consilium “often judged harshly and evaluated negatively” elements that had entered the Roman Mass after the eighth century.¹¹¹³ Elements that the members of Consilium did not judge to be of Roman origin, based upon the contents of the *Ordines*, “were judged to have a corrupting effect on the spirit or ethos of the original Roman liturgy in the writings of many notable scholars of the time.”¹¹¹⁴ They thus placed upon themselves the explicit task to remove Gallican “accretions” and “encrustations,” choosing to do so by returning to what they deemed to be a pre-Gallican ritual and use it as the basic structure.¹¹¹⁵

Cyrille Vogel remarks, “[N]othing survives of the Roman Liturgy of the first five centuries. Undoubtedly there must have been considerable liturgical activity, but we have no way of evaluating either its extent or its results” (C. VOGEL, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. W. STOREY and N. K. RASMUSSEN, Washington, DC, The Pastoral Press, 1986, 37). See KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 66, footnote 157.

¹¹¹² KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 39.

¹¹¹³ See KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 66-67. See also CONSILIUM, “Schema no. 170: De Missale no. 23. Memorandum sull’attività del Coetus X ‘De ordine missae,’” in BARBA, *La riforma conciliare*, 400-401.

¹¹¹⁴ KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 67.

¹¹¹⁵ See *ibid.*

With the texts of *Ordines I* determined to be representative of a pristine and unadulterated Roman liturgy, it was used as a lens through which to view *MR/1962*. Once this was done, the elements contained therein not corresponding to those in the *Ordines* were deemed “accretions” gathered from later Gallican and Frankish influence and eliminated.¹¹¹⁶

According to the liturgiology available at the time, it was accepted that most private prayers and demonstrative gestures extant in the Mass arising after the Patristic Era to the present in the *MR/1962* were “foreign” accretions that needed to be purged to achieve a purely Roman ritual. This includes by common estimation all the pre- and post-Mass rituals, preparatory rites, prayers offered privately by the celebrant, personal preparatory prayers offered by the celebrant, genuflections and signs of the cross, among other elements, including the whole of the Offertory Rite.

Furthermore, in an effort to depart from the several different grades of celebration of the Mass, such as *Missa solemnis*, *Missa cantata* and low Mass, pontifical solemn and pontifical low Masses, Consilium sought to develop what it called a *Missa normativa*.¹¹¹⁷ This rite, as Kappes will describe it, was to be created on a “workbench,” something Consilium recognized had never been done before.¹¹¹⁸

Kappes summarizes this complex goal:

Some *periti* argued that the only way to reinvigorate the liturgy was to engineer the Mass to be perfectly disposed for continued change and adaptation according to time and

¹¹¹⁶ Fortescue observes of the non-Roman influences within the Mass: “If one may venture a criticism of these additions from an aesthetic point of view, it is that they are exceedingly happy. The old Roman rite, despite its dignity and archaic simplicity, had the disadvantage of being dull. The Eastern and Gallican rites are too florid for our taste and too lengthy. The few non-Roman elements in our Mass take nothing from its dignity and yet give it enough variety and reticent emotion to make it most beautiful” (FORTESCUE, *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy*, London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1937, 184).

¹¹¹⁷ Additionally, Bugnini recalls, “The Mass was called ‘normative’ because, while there would always be several forms of celebration, this was the one that was to serve as the norm or standard for the others” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 343).

¹¹¹⁸ See KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 38.

circumstances.¹¹¹⁹ This concept of continual change was seen as being clearly obedient to the wishes of the Council. The Consilium *periti*'s task was to reanimate organic development in the liturgy by creating something that was, in itself, fluid and even somewhat amorphous so that it could be reshaped and changed according to time, place, or culture. This also meant that the core of the Mass rite was not based on an inviolable and rigid ritual, but on a Mass rite inherently disposed to *adaptability*. This allows the rite to easily adopt or reject certain parts, rubrics, or ceremonies with sufficient facility to meet the pastoral needs of a particular people or region. However, there was also recognition that this should be done while preserving the basic underlying skeleton of the Roman liturgy.¹¹²⁰

The Consilium members worked diligently and swiftly. Headed by Cardinal Lercaro with his faithful Annibale Bugnini at his side, Consilium set to work on reform of the Mass of the Latin Church soon after they received their mandate to do so through the apostolic letter *Sacram Liturgiam* of 25 January 1964. By the time of the sixth plenary session of Consilium, 18-26 October 1965, a full proposal of a new *Ordo Missae* had been prepared and presented to Paul VI. It was an *Ordo* stripped of Gallican and Frankish influence and was in keeping with the *Ordines I*. Two experimental celebrations of this rite took place exclusively before the members of Consilium.¹¹²¹

Paul VI expressed his concern over the reformed *Ordo*. Through Cardinal Cicognani, Secretary of State, he addressed Cardinal Lercaro three times by letter requesting prudence and reminding him that the Holy See reserved to itself decisions involving changes to the celebration of the rite of the divine sacrifice.¹¹²²

On 20 June 1966, a revised draft of the new *Ordo* was presented by Cardinal Lercaro to Paul VI. After reflection, the Pontiff requested two significant modifications. The first was that the Roman Canon would remain intact. He proposed that two or three additional canons should be composed or taken from existing texts to be used at defined times of the

¹¹¹⁹ See M. FRANCIS, "Liturgical Inculturation: The State of the Question," in *Liturgical Ministry*, 6 (1997), 101.

¹¹²⁰ KAPPES, *Missa normativa*, 39.

¹¹²¹ See BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 151-152, 342-346, and CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 127.

¹¹²² See *ibid.*, 152, footnote 30, for the full texts of these letters. The mode and substance of these communications intimates a strong apprehension toward the proposed rite.

year. Additionally, he wished the *Kyrie* to be retained only in the absence of the *Gloria*. When the *Gloria* is used, he wished the *Kyrie* to be replaced with a different prayer of a penitential nature.¹¹²³

A subcommission of Consilium was appointed to prepare three new Eucharistic Canons. All the resulting texts were new compositions. According to Bugnini the text that became Eucharistic Prayer IV was rushed in composition and was done as “a kind of forced labor.”¹¹²⁴ Eucharistic Prayer II, said to have been inspired by that of St. Hippolytus,¹¹²⁵ was similarly composed. Bouyer assisted Botte and recalls that it had to be composed within a period of twenty-four hours, being completed at the last minute on the terrace of a Roman café. The resulting text was only loosely based on the Hippolytus source.¹¹²⁶

Eventually, a new *Ordo Missae* was presented as the proposed *Missa Normativa* at the 1967 Synod of Bishops. Paul VI was unable to attend its celebration. Response to it by the bishops was mixed but generally negative. Only 93 of the 187 bishop voters approved; the

¹¹²³ See *ibid.*, 163, 346, and CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 128. None of this quite came into being. The Roman Canon was altered at its core when the words of consecration were changed. Additionally, some portions were made optional. The additional Eucharistic Canons are presented for equal use along with the Roman Canon, with certain exceptions attached to Eucharistic Prayer IV. The request regarding the *Kyrie* did not materialize. By means of such interventions and the consequential changes they effected, the final revised *Ordo Missae* retained or innovated several Gallican elements as well as introduced some novelties making it a mélange of sources, existing texts, innovations and novelties.

¹¹²⁴ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 163, and CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 128.

¹¹²⁵ “The authenticity of the anaphora of Saint Hippolytus and its relevance to the Roman tradition is no longer a matter of scholarly consensus” (CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 128, editorial footnote).

¹¹²⁶ In his typical tone, Bouyer recalls composing the text: “Between the indiscriminately archeologizing fanatics who wanted to banish the *Sanctus* and the intercessions from the Eucharistic Prayer by taking Hippolytus’s Eucharist as is, and the others who wouldn’t have cared less about his alleged Apostolic tradition and wanted a slapdash Mass, Dom Botte and I were commissioned to patch up its text with a view to inserting these elements, which are certainly quite ancient – by the next morning! Luckily, I discovered, if not in a text by Hippolytus himself certainly in one of his style, a felicitous formula on the Holy Ghost that could provide a transition of the *Vere Sanctus* type to the short epiclesis. For his part, Botte produced an intercession worthier of Paul Reboux’s ‘In the manner of...’ than of his actual scholarship. Still, I cannot reread that improbable composition without recalling the Trastevere café terrace where we had to put the finishing touches to our assignment in order to show up with it at the Bronze Gate by the time our masters had set!” (L. BOUYER, *The Memoirs of Louis Bouyer, From Youth and Conversion to Vatican II, the Liturgical Reform and After*, trans. J. PEPINO, Kettering, OH, Angelico Press, 2015, 221-222, and cf. CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 128, footnote 5).

proposed *Ordo* was rejected.¹¹²⁷ One of the common observations was that “the entire schema needs to be enriched, especially with signs of the cross, genuflections and bows, in accordance with the desires and taste of many peoples.”¹¹²⁸

On 4 January 1968, Paul VI requested of Bugnini that three new experimental versions of an *Ordo* for Mass be celebrated in his presence. When these took place, they included changes subsequent to the earlier *Missa normativa* and involved varying grades of solemnity.¹¹²⁹

In a follow-up meeting with Bugnini on 22 January 1968, Paul VI offered several requests. Among them were that the Offertory be given greater prominence. Additionally, he asked that the words *mysterium fidei*, removed from the consecration of the chalice, be retained, but placed after the consecration as an acclamation by the celebrant and repeated by the congregation.¹¹³⁰ He requested that the three-fold *Agnus Dei* be retained and that the Last Gospel be restored. He insisted that the words of consecration be recited with particularly conscious emphasis by the celebrant, highlighting this act of the celebrant *in persona Christi*.¹¹³¹

¹¹²⁷ See CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 130-131. Chiron provides the following articles regarding the debates that took place among the bishops during the Synod following upon their experience with the *Missa Normativa*: The articles published each day in *L'Osservatore Romano*, the long report published in *Notitiae*, (1967), 353-70, and two journalistic chronicles: G. CAPRILE, “Il Sino dei vescovi,” in *Civiltà Cattolica*, 2820 (16 December 1967), 595-603, and H. FESQUET, whose articles published in *Le Monde* are collected in IDEM, *Le Journal du premier synode catholique*, Paris, Robert Morel, 1967 (cf. CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 131, footnote 7, and BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 346-359). For a scholarly analysis, see KAPPES, *Missa Normativa*.

¹¹²⁸ BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 353.

¹¹²⁹ See *ibid.*, 359-364.

¹¹³⁰ Consilium made the following observations on the matter: “If the words [*mysterium fidei*] were said by the celebrant before the acclamation of the congregation, (a) this would be an innovation not found in the liturgical tradition; (b) it would alter the structure of the Canon at an important moment; (c) it would change the meaning of the words in question, since they are no longer connected with the consecration of the chalice” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 371-372).

¹¹³¹ See CHIRON, *Annibale Bugnini*, 134. For the complete text of the Paul VI’s feedback, see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 364-365 and 369-370.

In that same audience, Paul VI clearly expressed several additional wishes.¹¹³² He stated that the Trinity should be invoked by the Sign of the Cross vocalized by the celebrant with a response by the congregation.¹¹³³ He stated that the multiple options for a Penitential Rite were overly complicated and should have a single schema, using the Confiteor. He requested that the Offertory have formulas that express a joining of human labor with the sacrifice of Christ and that the celebrant recite the formulas in a low voice if there is no congregational singing.¹¹³⁴ Some of these matters were incorporated into the new *Ordo* that was promulgated universally.

Due to intervention by the Pontiff and others resulting in several adaptations and additions, the fundamental vision of Consilium for a liturgy stripped of all “foreign” influences, creating an order of Mass from 8th century liturgical notes, was not realized. The resulting Missal is a compromise of many influences but mainly between *MR/1962* and the vision of Consilium resulting in a hybrid that is neither but includes elements of both.¹¹³⁵

¹¹³² There were six in total. For the complete text of the these, see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 369-370. Paul VI remained steadfast in his position on these wishes, except for the Penitential Rite (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 372, footnote 40).

¹¹³³ This request caused considerable consternation among the members of Consilium. Their claim was that the practice of the Sign of the Cross sprung from the personal devotion of the priest. Additionally, “This would be an innovation contrary to the entire liturgical tradition. [...] If a Trinitarian formula is used in greeting the people, there would be two Trinitarian formulas in a row; there would be a doublet, contrary to the provision of the liturgical Constitution. [...] The Eastern Churches do not have it...” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 371). Additionally, “If the entire assembly sings, it seems discordant to end the song and begin the Mass with the sign of the cross, as though it had not already been begun with the congregational song” (ibid., footnote 35). The response seems somewhat disproportional.

¹¹³⁴ “The whole matter caused some dismay since the Pope seemed to be limiting the Consilium’s freedom of research by using his authority to impose solutions. Least convinced of all were the experts who saw not a few difficulties in reducing the Pope’s wishes to practice” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 370).

¹¹³⁵ The scope of this dissertation encompasses only the Mass as celebrated on Sundays and other Solemnities. Nonetheless, brief consideration may be given to the liturgy that is celebrated differently on ferials. Both the OF and the EF celebrate ferial days differently from Solemnities, simplifying these celebrations by eliminating some elements. In ongoing liturgical reform, consideration could be given to a ferial celebration more aligned with that found in *Ordines I*. For instance, the beginning of the *ordo* could be simplified to antiphon, Kyrie and Collect, as it is in the Extraordinary Form. The Gospel could be followed by the Offertory, with antiphon, preparation of the altar and perhaps simply placing the gifts upon it, followed

4.3 – Identifying Goals and Sources for Mutual Enrichment in the 21st Century

In juridic documents, Benedict XVI established liturgical reconciliation within the Latin Church as a primary goal, facilitated by the propinquity of the two Forms of the one Latin Rite. This was intended to result in achieving the goal of sacralizing the Mass celebrated in the Ordinary Form. With these great concepts in mind, coupled with the others enumerated above, goals that are more specific to liturgical enrichment may be established on the way to synthesis and practical implementation of the vision of *SP* and *CGF*.

Informed by the standards set forth historically, stirred with yearning for reconciliation and desiring an increase in sacrality for the sake of those who partake in Divine worship, the following goals for mutual enrichment emerge:

1. The Extraordinary Form is to become enriched in substance by the Ordinary Form by insertion of some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces into *MR/1962*;
2. The Extraordinary Form is to become enriched in substance by the Ordinary Form by insertion of recently canonized Saints into *MR/1962*;
3. The Extraordinary Form is to become enriched by its exposure to a proper and dignified celebration of the Ordinary Form, gaining means of active participation by the faithful;
4. The Ordinary Form is to be enriched by exposure to the proper and dignified celebration of the Extraordinary Form, gaining an increase in the expression of sacrality.¹¹³⁶

Means of achieving the first and second goals are proposed in Chapters II and III, respectively. The third goal is less germane to the immediate interests of this dissertation,

by an oration over the gifts. Then would follow the Eucharistic Preface and Canon, Lord's Prayer, *fractio*, *Agnus Dei*, immolation, distribution, post-Communion oration and dismissal. Pastoral benefits of such a simplified Mass would have to be considered. For instance, negatively, in such an *ordo*, active participation by the faithful, would be reduced as certain elements are eliminated. Positively, the marked difference in level of celebration between Sunday/Solemnity and ferial could serve as clear differentiation between the calendar's times and season and display with clarity the preeminence of Sundays/Solemnities.

¹¹³⁶ Because the goal seems to be enrichment of the two liturgical Forms by proximate existence, it may be said that the Forms, then, are expected, or at least hoped, to inform each other as well.

but the opportunity for overlap may present itself. The fourth goal is of interest to the instant Chapter.

Because the mutual liturgical enrichment under study is founded in mutual influence between the currently authorized Missals,¹¹³⁷ the primary sources for use in liturgical enrichment should be the euchological and instructive texts included in the respective Missals. The key instructive texts are the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae* promulgated with *MR/1962*, and the *GIRM* promulgated with *MR/2008usa*. Because the entire Roman Missal used in the Ordinary Form of the Mass is now bound in multiple covers to accommodate the expanded scripture readings, the *General Introduction to the Lectionary for Mass* likewise provides direction.¹¹³⁸

The Extraordinary Form Missal can be traced roughly from 1570 to 1962 and the Ordinary Form Missal from roughly 1965 to 2008. All these Missals, none of which are approved for current liturgical use, could inform some historical and contextual questions.

4.4 – Juridic Considerations

Some juridic considerations may well be undertaken at this point before the goals of liturgical enrichment are allowed to develop without grounding in ecclesiastical law. This section begins with observations of the methods employed by the related dicasteries in order to find insight into the Holy See’s juridic practice regarding matters of mutual

¹¹³⁷ Scholarly commentaries and reflections upon these sources may serve a helpful purpose. The time and context in which they were written would need to be considered and adapted appropriately as necessary. The so-called “interim” or “provisional” Missals of 1965 and 1967 may be used for reference. The difficulty with those iterations of *MR/1962* is that they were intended to be works in progress and end up somehow “neither here nor there.” They are akin to, but different from, either liturgical Form in current use.

¹¹³⁸ CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, General Introduction to the Lectionary for Mass, in NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *Lectionary for Mass for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America, Second Typical Edition, Volume I: Sundays, Solemnities, Feasts of the Lord and the Saints*, Catholic Book Publishing Company, Totowa, NJ, 1998, 13-35.

liturgical enrichment.¹¹³⁹ Juridic recognition of liturgical alterations are presented in the broad forms provided in ecclesiastical law, i.e., inculturation and custom. In hand with this, licit liturgical practice in light of the more closely circumscribed law canonized in *CIC/83*, c. 846, §1, that the celebrant may not add, change or remove anything in the Mass by his own authority, will be examined.

4.4.1 – Observing the Methods of the PCED, the CDF and the CDWDS

Universae ecclesiae art. 28 states: “[... B]y virtue of its character of special law, within its own area, the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* derogates from those provisions of law connected with the sacred Rites promulgated from 1962 onwards and incompatible with the rubrics of the liturgical books in effect in 1962.” The coexistence of two differing rules of liturgical law sometimes creates retro-*lacunae*. These are *lacunae* that did not exist in the law when it was written but have been opened with the reintroduction of the liturgical laws governing *MR/1962*. This situation has existed since both *Quattuor abhinc annos* and *Ecclesia Dei adflicta* permitted broader use of the EF.¹¹⁴⁰

Consequently, several questions regarding celebration of the EF have arisen. Among other reasons, to have a corps of specialists to whom to address these matters directly and authoritatively, John Paul II established Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* in the eponymous *motu proprio*. Competencies were later transferred to the CDF.¹¹⁴¹ When *TC* was promulgated, the CDWDS was stipulated as the dicastery with competence to deal

¹¹³⁹ At the time of this writing, the competencies that had been assigned to the CDF have been transferred to the CDWDS only recently.

¹¹⁴⁰ A retro-*lacuna* may be identified easily by asking the question, “But what about in the Extraordinary Form?” For instance, *CIC/83* c. 230 provides for laypersons to proclaim the non-Gospel scripture readings at Mass. At the time the *Code* was promulgated, this provision was assumed to apply to Masses celebrated according to the post-Conciliar Missal; the use of two Missals with differing disciplines was not foreseen. Thus today, when reading c. 230, the question is raised, “But what about in the Extraordinary Form?”

¹¹⁴¹ And then, as we have noted above, to the CDWDS and Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, by means of *TC*, art. 7.

with the matters contained within the *motu proprio*.¹¹⁴² These dicasteries have issued texts of varying authority and inconsistent methodology.

4.4.1.1 – Observing Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*

Summorum Pontificum enhanced the role of the PCED, stating that the dicastery “continues to exercise its function. The Commission is to have the form, duties and regulations that the Roman Pontiff will choose to assign to it.”¹¹⁴³ It goes on to say that “the same Commission, in addition to the faculties which it presently enjoys,¹¹⁴⁴ will exercise the authority of the Holy See in ensuring the observance and application of these norms.”¹¹⁴⁵ Upon examination, very few documents of general issue were produced, the most significant of which is *Universae ecclesiae*.¹¹⁴⁶ This document provides clarification to *SP* and *CGF*. Notably, it seems to reveal an internal consistency by remaining general whenever it may do so. For instance, when treating canon law, the document simply acknowledges its authority and *Summorum Pontificum*’s derogation from it.¹¹⁴⁷

Issuing only a limited number of major documents, it would appear, then, that this Dicastery’s preferred means of communication was that of private replies. A limited number of the many private replies have been made available; there is no sole source

¹¹⁴² See *TC*, art. 6.

¹¹⁴³ *SP*, art. 11.

¹¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, arts. 11 and 12. One might note a distant similarity between the authority granted to the PCED and the authority garnered by Consilium.

¹¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, art. 12.

¹¹⁴⁶ In fact, the Vatican web site only offers five documents, of which only three were produced by the PCED: 1. *Universae ecclesiae*; 2. the Redactional Note on *Universae Ecclesiae*; 3. Letter to the Ordinaries of the Episcopal Conferences concerning the faculties for the celebration of marriages of the faithful of the Society Saint Pius X. Additionally, there is the foundational *motu proprio Ecclesia Dei* and the *motu proprio* suppressing the dicastery and transferring its competencies to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. See http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_commissions/ecclsdei/index.htm (11 January 2022).

¹¹⁴⁷ To wit, *Universae Ecclesiae*: Art. 27. With regard to the disciplinary norms connected to celebration, the ecclesiastical discipline contained in the *Code of Canon Law* of 1983 applies. Art. 28. Furthermore, by virtue of its character of special law, within its own area, the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* derogates from those provisions of law, connected with the sacred Rites, promulgated from 1962 onwards and incompatible with the rubrics of the liturgical books in effect in 1962.

wherein these are compiled. Finding them usually requires maneuvering through the Internet, frequently revealing only commentaries on or references to a reply but not the full text of the reply itself.

Several replies appear contradictory or may be interpreted as such when taken out of context. However, these are not laws, for they have not been promulgated nor do they give any indication that they are to be interpreted as such. They are expert interpretations directed to the inquiring petitioner.¹¹⁴⁸ The same answer is not always given to different petitioners with the same question if the circumstances between them differ or the understanding by the PCED personnel, or the personnel themselves, has somehow shifted.

Among the private replies that may be examined are responses to several questions regarding the status of the SSPX and their chapels, validity of their sacraments and participation in Masses offered by them. Regarding liturgical discipline, for example,¹¹⁴⁹ there is a widely publicized response regarding the service of females at the altar in the EF,¹¹⁵⁰ as well as a response regarding the manner of receiving Holy Communion.¹¹⁵¹

¹¹⁴⁸ This is in keeping with *CIC/83* c. 16, §3: An interpretation in the form of a judicial sentence or of an administrative act in a particular matter, however, does not have the force of law and only binds the persons for whom and affects the matters for which it was given.

¹¹⁴⁹ Those included here are merely examples; this is not intended to be exhaustive or a compilation of available replies from the PCED.

¹¹⁵⁰ PONTIFICAL COMMISSION *ECCLESIA DEI*, private response on the use of female altar servers at the Extraordinary Form celebration of the Mass, 19 May 2011, prot. no. 092/2010, http://www.wdtpers.com/images2/11_06_05_PCED_letter_lr.jpg (11 January 2022).

¹¹⁵¹ Cardinal Dario Castrillon-Hoyos, former President of Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, to Michael Davies in November of 2000. This is an example of a private response that is not available but is referenced. Peter Vere summarizes it: “The reception of Holy Communion in the hand, Cardinal Castrillon-Hoyos explains, is a concession which the Holy See has made when requested to do so by episcopal conferences. Where this concession has been granted, the manner of receiving Holy Communion remains the option of the faithful. The manner of the faithful’s reception of Holy Communion is not prescribed by the 1962 Roman Missal. Hence, while we readily understand that the great majority of those who attend the celebration of the Mass according to the 1962 missal do not wish to avail themselves of the option of receiving Holy Communion in the hand, those who wish to do so may not be forbidden to do so” (P. VERE, *CLSA Advisory Opinions: 2001-2005*, 31).

Some responses address several questions in the same rescript. One of the most recent is a response to some twenty-nine questions submitted to the dicastery on 16 October 2018 by a priest ministering in Poland. The swift response to most of his questions was dated 14 November 2018.¹¹⁵²

The choice to use private responses as the principal means of communication is open to speculation. One arguable but plausible theory would posit that the PCED preferred to answer questions individually as they arrived rather than impose answers on all using the EF in order “to see how it goes,” so to speak. This non-judicial approach may have been employed in order to observe how the EF was being received and adapted in various places and circumstances throughout the world. With that, the dicastery could assess local and regional needs as well. This hands-off treatment, if you will, does not reflect a dicastery that was inattentive. On the contrary, inquiries to them were answered swiftly. At the same time, it appears that there was a respect for how the use of *MR/1962* may continue to develop organically.

¹¹⁵² PONTIFICAL COMMISSION *ECCLESIA DEI*, private reply to several questions regarding the celebration of the Mass in the EF, prot. no. 39/2011L-ED, 14 November 2018, English translations available at <https://www.ccwatershed.org/2018/11/28/pietras-ecclesia-dei-14-november-2018/> (7 July 2022). This list of questions addresses several notable situations. For instance, it is asked whether the Sunday Mass may be anticipated Saturday. The response in this case is that the anticipated Mass fulfills the Sunday obligation to assist at Mass, but the Mass formulary used is that of the Saturday. This would mean that an anticipated Mass would never be a sung or High Mass of the Sunday. An earlier response to several questions may be found in PONTIFICAL COMMISSION *ECCLESIA DEI*, private reply to an Australian bishop on several questions concerning the Extraordinary Form, prot. no. 40/97, 26 March 1997, available at <http://saintbedestudio.blogspot.com/2017/08/1997-decision-of-ecclesia-dei.html> (7 July 2022). Among these replies includes approval to use the additional Eucharistic Prefaces from *MR/1965* and *MR/1970*, allowance to use approved versions of the vernacular scriptures within the Mass and allowance for the entire *Pater noster* to be chanted by celebrant and congregation together. Included is a list of permissions for use within celebration of the EF in the Conventual Mass. These may appear quite permissive. For instance, the rites accompanying the readings from Sacred Scripture may be celebrated at the sedilia and the readings may be proclaimed facing against the people. Bidding prayers are allowed after the *Oremus* that precedes the Offertory. The Secret of the Offertory may be sung aloud, the celebrant may sing the entire *Per ipsum* with the Host elevated above the chalice. The Last Blessing may be sung; the Last Gospel may be omitted. One will bear in mind that these replies predate *Summorum Pontificum* by a decade and may demonstrate a desire for local inculturation and the development of custom particular to Australia.

On 17 January 2019, by means of Apostolic Letter *motu proprio*, Francis decommissioned (*È soppressa*) the PCED that had been established by means of the *motu proprio Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, 2 July 1988. At the same time, he entirely assigned the tasks (*compiti*) of the PCED to the CDF within a special section (*sezione*) to be established “to continue the work of supervision, promotion and protection conducted thus far by the decommissioned Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*.”¹¹⁵³

4.4.1.2 – Observing the CDF in *Quo magis* and *Cum Sanctissima*

Thirteen months after this suppression and transfer of competencies took effect, the newly established Section of the CDF issued two decrees, as treated above: *Quo magis*, on the presentation of seven additional Eucharistic Prefaces for use in the EF and *Cum sanctissima*, allowing the celebration of recently canonized Saints in the EF.

By means of *Quo magis*, additional Prefaces were made available for use by the OF, but they were not inserted into the *MR/1962*, in the sense that they are not assigned for use at any particular celebration but rather remain *ad libitum*. This could be interpreted as the first step toward insertion. In other words, it may be a controlled experimentation to see how they are accepted by those who use the EF. Some of the newly allowed Eucharistic Prefaces do not appear in the OF Missal. According to *Quo magis*, however, they appear in the OF for local use somewhere. Details of these texts remain unclear as the Holy See has not released the sources of these compositions, only that they have been of exceptional use locally and now available for universal use, *ad libitum*.

¹¹⁵³ FRANCIS, On Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, no. 2. These competencies were later assigned to the CDWDS and the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life by means of *TC*, art. 7.

The same appears to be true of the provisions of *Cum sanctissima* and the celebration of newer Saints and *Beati* in the EF. The provision is extremely broad; limitations are delineated clearly yet use remains *ad libitum*. As with *Quo magis, mutatis mutandis*, it inserts nothing material into the GRC/1960. How this is received, how these celebrations do or do not become part of the fabric of the EF, or do so with adaptation, will be revealed over time. These seem to be further experiments that may or may not result in “organic growth” that would culminate in juridical insertion into the 1962 Missal.¹¹⁵⁴

These actions on the part of the CDF appear to be consistent with the methods employed by the PCED and expanding upon them. The approach of the CDF in these two decrees is juridic, yet they offer provision to all without obligating them. There is recognition of a desire to update *MR/1962*, but the method chosen to enact this by the CDF appears to begin with planting the seeds of organic development. These actions demonstrate measured steps on the way to conformity with Benedict XVI’s request for material enrichment of the EF by the OF.

All told, the approaches of the PCED and the CDF reflect the perceived technique of Benedict XVI. In a 2010 interview with John L. Allen, Jr., Msgr. Guido Marini, Master of Pontifical Liturgical Celebrations, expressed his observations: “It’s the style of [Benedict XVI] to proceed not through impositions but propositions. The idea is that little by little, all this may be welcomed, considering the true significance that certain decisions and certain orientations may have. That seems to me a typical touch of Pope Benedict.”¹¹⁵⁵

¹¹⁵⁴ What resulted in the provisions of *SP* and *CGF* arose organically. Nonetheless, they were granted legitimacy, liceity and universality by Supreme Authority. Now, how these provisions are accepted in the broader Church, as opposed to the narrower contexts of those who requested them, remains to be seen; the results will bear the mark of organic development.

¹¹⁵⁵ J. ALLEN, JR., “Q&A with Msgr. Guido Marini, Papal Liturgist, in *National Catholic Reporter*, 03 March 2010, <https://www.ncronline.org/news/vatican/q-msgr-guido-marini-papal-liturgist> (11 January 2022).

Overall, the actions of both the PCED and the CDF express pastoral sensitivity and care for the adherents of the EF. At the same time, they imply a desire to experiment, observe and reflect upon the outcome, providing allowance for natural reception, rejection or even adaptation. This approach seems to align with the thrust of the earlier liturgical movement which perhaps foresaw a more pastorally sensitive introduction to the liturgical life of the Church.¹¹⁵⁶

4.4.1.3 – Observing the CDWDS in *Responsa ad dubia*

To the date of this writing, the CDWDS has issued only one universal document in regard to the use of the EF. After having made competent to address the norms and points made in motu proprio *Traditionis Custodes*, the dicastery issued the *Responsa ad dubia*, addressing questions raised in relation to *TC*.

The attitude expressed in these *Responsa* is quite different from that expressed in documents issued from the PCED and the CDF. Rather than focusing on private replies, ostensibly allowing the possibility of local adaptation and the development of custom, the CDWDS very clearly and closely circumscribed responses. *Inter alia*, that appear to end propinquity of the liturgical Forms by removing them from each other, limiting use of *MR/1962* and marginalizing both the celebration of the EF and the people attached to it.¹¹⁵⁷

The CDWDS has effected a shift in approach. While the dicasteries with earlier competence approached their replies with a concentration on pastoral sensitivity to the

¹¹⁵⁶ There was some degree of experimentation of various possibilities but there was no significant experimentation with the rite that was promulgated universally as the *MR/1970*. As the reform proceeded, the Order of Mass underwent several changes rapidly, as described above, making local experimentation not particularly useful, if even possible (see BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 355).

¹¹⁵⁷ For instance, *Responsa ad dubia*, R¹, Explanatory Note, states that if the EF celebration is permitted in a parish church building, “such a celebration should not be included in the parish Mass schedule, since it is attended only by the faithful who are members of the said group. Finally, it should not be held at the same time as the pastoral activities of the parish community.” The same Note continues: “There is no intention in these provisions to marginalize the faithful who are rooted in the previous form of celebration.”

needs of those who adhere to the *usus antiquior*, the latest approach concentrates on restricting access to it. Whether this act by the CDWDS is meant to be instructional or if it is juridical and binding is open to discussion at the time of this writing.

4.4.2 – Tools for Licit Recognition of Liturgical Change

Some time will be devoted to the ways by which local practices emerging from mutual liturgical enrichment may achieve juridical recognition. The principal tools provided by the *Code* are identified as Inculturation as well as Custom, as its use is described in the *CIC/83*.

4.4.2.1 – Inculturation

Post-factum analysis of the intrigues of what took place in the post-Conciliar reforms reveals that there was great interest in *ressourcement*, returning the Latin Mass liturgy to a time and practice that was determined to be thoroughly Roman. The aim was to remove any “foreign” influence from the Mass that had been introduced by other cultures and adopted into the Roman liturgy in the centuries subsequent to *Ordines I*.

Yet, the notion of inculturation was included in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* as something to be revisited with a greater degree of consideration. With a cooperation between *ressourcement* and inculturation, it could be interpreted that the original goal, if there ever was a unified and clear goal, was to present to the Latin Church what would be considered a purely Roman ceremony to serve as a stable and universal framework, augmented as deemed desirable and/or necessary in local Churches or regions by means of this notion of inculturation. The rationale behind the creation of the *Missa normativa* states as much.¹¹⁵⁸

¹¹⁵⁸ It is helpful to recall Bugnini’s words once again: “The Mass was called ‘normative’ because, while there would always be several forms of celebration, this was the one that was to serve as the norm or standard for the others” (BUGNINI, *Reform of the Liturgy*, 343).

As we have seen, this vision for the Mass did not come to fruition, due to interventions by Paul VI and others, requesting Concilium to make compromises and changes. The point is not moot, however; the possibility of inculturation yet exists and has been clarified to some degree within the context of what the post-Conciliar reforms ultimately produced. While it may not be so significant or useful as originally envisaged prior to the reforms of the late 1960's, liturgical inculturation should not be dismissed as an ineffective means of achieving licit recognition of local changes enacted by mutual liturgical enrichment.

Liturgical inculturation is first mentioned in *SC*, nos. 38 and 40 and repeated in *GIRM*, nos. 23-26. The possibility for inculturation exists as a licit means for introducing liturgical practices that are *praeter-* or *contra ius*. Huels describes inculturation as “the process whereby doctrine, morals, liturgy and canon law are ‘incarnated’ and take on new expressions in the many societies of the world in appropriate ways according to the culture and mentality of the people.”¹¹⁵⁹

Pecklers supports the notion that the possibility of liturgical inculturation has evolved since the time of the Second Vatican Council. He observes the influence of cautious inculturation into the contemporary reformed Mass:

[...]he Roman Rite has been adapted and contextualized since its very inception. The future of the Roman Rite will be determined by its continued capacity to be inculturated and contextualized in very diverse circumstances and situations, in a way radically different from 1963 when *Sacrosanctum concilium* was promulgated.¹¹⁶⁰

If liturgical inculturation has evolved, however, it cannot be allowed to devolve in such a way that local liturgy becomes self-referential, bound exclusively to local culture.

Pecklers promotes the need for an intrinsic balance when applying inculturation:

If our liturgical participation is only about us in this particular time and place, forgetting the rest of God's world especially where it is most in need, then the community will be

¹¹⁵⁹ J. HUELS, “Back to the Future,” in *CLSAP*, 59 (1997), 3.

¹¹⁶⁰ K. PECKLERS, *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, 116-117.

celebrating nothing more than itself — a sort of “liturgical isolationism.” On the other hand, if the Roman Rite of the twenty-first century fails to intersect with the lives of those gathered for worship — if they fail to recognize themselves within the Rite — then the future of Roman Catholic worship is very bleak indeed. The choice is ours.¹¹⁶¹

Consistent with the nature of *SC*, principles appear within its text regarding liturgical inculturation with few details. The Constitution states that the Church does not wish to impose a rigid uniformity in matters that are not contrary to the faith or the good of the entire community. Matters that belong to a particular people’s way of life that are not erroneous or superstitious are worthy of study and may result in admission to the Mass.¹¹⁶² The Constitution requires the reformed liturgy to include provisions that accommodate legitimate differences existing between groups, regions and peoples, with special attention given to these matters in mission lands while preserving the substantial unity of the Roman rite. That is, that the rite must remain recognizably Roman.¹¹⁶³

Sacrosanctum Concilium bestows the responsibility upon the territorial ecclesiastical authority to specify adaptations, which must be consistent with the norms set forth in the Constitution itself. Some of these adaptations will include local adaptations to the administration of the sacraments, sacramentals, processions, language, music and the arts.¹¹⁶⁴

The 1994 instruction *Varietates legitimae* on liturgical inculturation sheds light on the matter, with thirty years of observation and experience preceding it. Ultimately, however, the notion of inculturation does not appear clearly circumscribed.¹¹⁶⁵ The document reiterates what the *GIRM* had stated regarding the power possessed by episcopal

¹¹⁶¹ K. PECKLERS, *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, 117.

¹¹⁶² See *SC*, no. 37.

¹¹⁶³ See *ibid.*, no. 38. This reflects *Terzo principio* of the *Memoria*, above.

¹¹⁶⁴ See *ibid.*, no. 39.

¹¹⁶⁵ This may be by design or at least simply part of the *natura res*.

conferences to lay down norms for their own territories that pertain to the different traditions and character of peoples, regions and communities.¹¹⁶⁶ *Varietates legitimæ* draws together a list of provisions that are scattered throughout the *GIRM* in order to enumerate what aspects of the Mass may qualify for consideration toward inculturation by territorial authority.¹¹⁶⁷ This territorial authority applies to the gestures and postures of the worshipping faithful,¹¹⁶⁸ the manner of venerating the altar and the *Evangelarium*,¹¹⁶⁹ the texts of the chants at the beginning of the Mass, the offertory and communion antiphons (songs), use and expression of the rite of peace, materials for construction of the altar, liturgical furniture and sacred vessels, matters pertaining to liturgical vestments, the manner of receiving Holy Communion¹¹⁷⁰ and the manner of distributing Holy Communion.¹¹⁷¹

The document acknowledges that the Roman rite has integrated elements from various sources over the centuries. These elements include texts, chants, gestures and rites. When giving examples of gestures that have been integrated over time, it cites the sprinkling of Holy Water, the use of incense, genuflections and “hands joined.”¹¹⁷² It notes that gestures and postures bear particular importance. Therefore, “Those which belong to the essential rites of the sacraments and which are required for their validity must be preserved just as

¹¹⁶⁶ *Varietates legitimæ*, art. 54. See also *GIRM/2008usa*, no. 25, as well as *Ordo Lectionum Missæ, editio typica altera*, Praenotanda, 111-118.

¹¹⁶⁷ The list is not self-identified as merely demonstrative; it appears to be intended as comprehensive. As noted above, the same possibilities are enumerated in both the *GIRM* and *Varietates legitimæ*.

¹¹⁶⁸ See *GIRM/2008usa*, no. 43.

¹¹⁶⁹ See *ibid.*, no. 273.

¹¹⁷⁰ See *ibid.*, nos. 160 and 283.

¹¹⁷¹ See *De Sacra Communione et de Cultu Mysteriorum Eucharistici Extra Missam*, Praenotanda, 21. The provisions of inculturation as they appear in *SC* may appear today as minutiae. Perhaps when they were originally considered, these allowances were generous when applied to a much different liturgy that served as a more adaptable “skeleton,” i.e., the *Ordines*-based Mass, as mentioned above.

¹¹⁷² *Varietates legitimæ*, art. 17 and footnote 32.

they have been approved or determined by the supreme authority of the Church.”¹¹⁷³ As presider *in persona Christi*, the gestures and postures of the celebrant must be expressive of this function within his role.¹¹⁷⁴ The faithful congregated for the Mass express their active participation, foster a proper spiritual attitude, and indicate their unity by their gestures and postures.¹¹⁷⁵ Gestures and physical postures are to be chosen by each culture, truly Christianizing them by using them to express the attitude of creation before its Creator.¹¹⁷⁶

The document points out that there are several possible adaptations published in the post-Conciliar liturgical books. These leave choices to the “pastoral sensitivity of the one presiding.” The Dicastery counsels, “In making a choice, the celebrant should seek the good of the assembly, considering the spiritual preparation and mentality of the participants rather than his own preferences or the easiest solution. In celebrations for particular groups, other possibilities are available. Nonetheless, prudence and discretion are always called for in order to avoid the breaking up of the local Church into little ‘churches’ or ‘chapels’ closed in upon themselves.”¹¹⁷⁷

It becomes clear that inculturation as a concept is a noble goal. One might even interpret that the counsel provided within the document intimates that the very gestures eliminated from the Mass by *Consilium* might licitly be reintroduced locally. However, licit recognition of liturgical changes accomplished under the provisions of inculturation become complex, presenting a host of conditions, preliminary requirements and procedural

¹¹⁷³ *Varietates legitimae*, art. 41; cf. c. 841.

¹¹⁷⁴ *Varietates legitimae*, art. 41; cf. *SC*, no. 33 and c. 899, §2.

¹¹⁷⁵ *Varietates legitimae*, art. 41; cf. *SC*, no. 30.

¹¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* While it is conjecture, it would seem that the importance attributed to gesture and posture promoted in this 1994 Instruction took on practical expression by the appearance of no. 42 in the *GIRM*/2002, mentioned above.

¹¹⁷⁷ *Varietates legitimae*, art. 37, footnote 82.

norms.¹¹⁷⁸ Huels recognized these complexities, acknowledging that inculturation may take place through episcopal conferences and the creation of particular law, but that “the capability of conferences of bishops to make laws is greatly restricted such that most areas of the universal discipline are excluded from their competence unless they go through a rather cumbersome process (cf. c. 455).”¹¹⁷⁹

4.4.2.2 – Custom

Provision for licit liturgical change is not limited to inculturation. In fact, “the principal way that canon law is inculturated is by custom.”¹¹⁸⁰ Recognizing the limitations and complexities of achieving licit liturgical inculturation, Huels presents “another means for bringing about the inculturation of the Liturgy, one that goes back to the origins of the Church, namely, the formation of customs introduced by local communities.”¹¹⁸¹

Glendinning identifies custom as the historical means by which many liturgical adaptations have become codified:

[...] Many of the liturgical reforms that now find explicit legislative expression began as factual customs, introduced by the community, which found eventual approval by the competent legislator. Such practices have, in fact, become true ecclesiastical laws that have been duly promulgated, often in the form of an apostolic constitution, apostolic letter *motu proprio* or by means of a similar legislative act.¹¹⁸²

¹¹⁷⁸ See *Varietates legitimae*, arts. 21-32, 65-69.

¹¹⁷⁹ HUELS, *Back to the Future*, 3, footnote 8. For a clear presentation of this involved process, see HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 127-128.

¹¹⁸⁰ HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 127-128.

¹¹⁸¹ Ibid., 130. He continues, “The canonical doctrine of custom [...] ought to be in the forefront of the minds of pastors, scholars and other faithful in their reflection and discussions on inculturation, in their assessment of local practices and even in their experiments intended to make the Christian life of the local community more expressive and meaningful. Since the beginning of the Church, the development of local customs has been the principal means for inculturation. I believe the whole project of inculturation would be less perplexing and more effective if we consciously attended to the dynamic of custom and allowed it to take its proper place in the development of church order for the benefit of the numerous and highly diverse peoples and cultures in the universal Church” (HUELS, *Back to the Future*, 24). Cf. IDEM, *Liturgy and Law*, 142-143.

¹¹⁸² GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 26

Unlike laws that result from legislative authority, customs arise locally as a means of ordering the life of that local community in some way in response to a challenge or initiative. Such matters are addressed either by a creative interpretation of what the law permits or by the development of a factual custom *praeter ius* or *contra ius*.¹¹⁸³

As noted above, what we might now call liturgical law was typically a matter of custom and of governance by the diocesan bishop until the time of *Quo primum* in 1570, when the Mass liturgy of the Latin Church became the domain of Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority.¹¹⁸⁴ By this act, much of what had been customary practice either became universal law or was replaced by it.¹¹⁸⁵

This regularization of the Latin Church's worship, however, did not bring an end to local practices throughout the world. Such practices that are not addressed in ecclesiastical law continue to arise and develop. Huels recognizes this, stating, "The unauthorized liturgical adaptations that eventually attain the force of customary law are more often those that are apart from the law, not directly contrary to it."¹¹⁸⁶ Matters introduced into the Mass *praeter ius* happen regularly and stand the best chance of becoming custom of fact, if not immediately so.¹¹⁸⁷

¹¹⁸³ For a comprehensive treatment of these points, see GLENDINNING, "*Participatio Actuosa*," 26-27. For a helpful overview of liturgical adaptation and custom, see HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 130-143.

¹¹⁸⁴ See HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 130.

¹¹⁸⁵ The argument exists that what was codified in the post-Tridentine liturgical reforms and promulgated by *Quo primum* remain matters of Custom, even though they became codified in law. While the debate on both sides of the question is sometimes quite profound and compelling, it appears that the majority of mainstream canonists agree that once these matters entered the realm of law, they assumed recognition and treatment as laws and lost their status as Custom. This argument is not addressed herein, but it is important to be aware that it exists and remains, even though now moot due to the provisions of *Summorum Pontificum*.

¹¹⁸⁶ HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 141.

¹¹⁸⁷ An example of this is the practice of worshippers in some parishes to vocalize, "My Lord and my God," at the elevation of one or each of the consecrated elements. In some parishes, the celebrant and congregation joyfully embrace this. In others, the practice is found to be a disturbance and thus not generally desirable.

Legal approval of custom takes place when the five general requirements of cc. 24-26 are fulfilled. That is, 1) a custom must be reasonable; 2) it must not contradict divine law; 3) it must be observed with the intention of introducing a norm (*ius*); 4) it must come from a community capable of receiving law; 5) and it must be observed for thirty continuous and complete years.”¹¹⁸⁸

In our interests of considering divine worship in the diocese and secular parish, the fourth requirement is of interest. A community “capable of receiving a law” would be defined as one that may be the recipient of a law specific to it, issued by the competent particular or universal authority.¹¹⁸⁹ It appears undisputed that a diocese qualifies as community with such capacity.

Huels asserts that more canonists tend to support the position that a parish falls into this category as well.¹¹⁹⁰ Alternatively, Kowal recognizes that many other canonists do not support this position. He observes, however, that eliminating parishes as capable of receiving a law [...] seems to reduce considerably the scope of applicability of the institution of custom.”¹¹⁹¹ He adds:

Besides, it looks that an individual parish can in fact receive a law. That would be especially visible in the case of a parish erected for a community of the faithful of an Eastern Catholic Church with no proper hierarchy present in a given territory, and governed by a Latin hierarchy, or for personal parishes erected for the faithful of a determined nationality, language, profession, or other distinctive characteristics.¹¹⁹²

¹¹⁸⁸ HUELS, *Back to the Future*, 10. He adds the observable fact, “Ordinarily a legal custom is created without any intervention of the legislator at all. In fact, he does not even have to know the custom exists for it to obtain the force of law. Legal approval occurs automatically in virtue of the law itself when all the requirements of the law are fulfilled” (HUELS, *Back to the Future*, 10).

¹¹⁸⁹ But again, Huels maintains that more canonists support the capacity of a parish to receive a law. Specifically, he states: “Among those who expressly denied that a parish has this capacity are Berutti, Cocchi, Augustine and Coronata. Among those who regarded a parish as having this capacity are Beste, Michiels, Cappello, Vermeersch-Creusen, Van Hove and Regatillo” (HUELS, *Back to the Future*, 12, footnote 21). See also J. COOK, “Ecclesiastical Communities and Their Ability to Induce Legal Custom,” in *Canon Law Studies*, 300, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America, 1950, 101.

¹¹⁹⁰ See HUELS, *Back to the Future*, 12.

¹¹⁹¹ W. KOWAL, “Custom as an Expression of the Canonical Creativity of a Community of the Faithful,” in *CLSAP*, 81 (2019), 217-233, here, 226.

¹¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 226.

In any event, all species of customs remain customs and not laws even when they receive recognition of the equivalence of law. Customs do not originate from legislative acts of competent ecclesiastical authority. Because they emerge from the local community, they move in the down-up direction as opposed to the top-down imposition of law from higher authority. One can see the possibility of custom finding close partnership with organic development by their similar grass-roots origins if you will. Given restrictions placed upon use of *MR/1962* in *TC*, this partnership may become one of the key processes by which mutual liturgical enrichment takes place.

4.4.3 – Canon 846, §1 and the Authority of the Celebrant

A law recalled or repeated for at least the past four centuries was most recently canonized in *CIC/83* c. 846 §1: In celebrating the sacraments, the liturgical books approved by competent authority are to be observed faithfully; accordingly, no one is to add, omit, or alter anything in them on one's own authority.

With the law in mind, one notes that *SP*, art. 1 declares that the conditions for the use of *MR/1962* laid down by *Quattuor abhinc annos* and *Ecclesia Dei adflicta* are now replaced. This includes subrogation of “condition d)” of *Quattuor abhinc annos*: “There must be no interchanging of texts and rites of the two Missals.” This restriction is no longer in effect. Additionally, in the same article of *SP*, Benedict states, “These two expressions of the Church's *lex orandi* will in no way lead to a division in the Church's *lex credendi* (rule of faith); for they are two usages of the one Roman rite.”

With the same mind, one reads in *CGF*:

There is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal. In the history of the liturgy there is growth and progress, but no rupture. What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely

forbidden or even considered harmful. It behooves all of us to preserve the riches which have developed in the Church's faith and prayer, and to give them their proper place.¹¹⁹³

When Finigan and Johnston each address this matter from the point of view of their discipline of liturgy, they come to divergent conclusions. Their conclusions can then be considered within the context of canon law.

In the development of specific, practical possibilities for mutual enrichment, particularly the sacralization of the OF by the EF, Finigan holds a permissive position. He grants great weight to Benedict's statement: "There is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal."

First applying this text to the OF, he writes, "a number of striking points arise which run counter to an attitude which has become ingrained over forty years of celebration of the newer form." He observes that simplified elements as they appear in the OF cannot be seen properly as contradictions of the older forms of the same elements that exist in the EF.

He explains:

In other words, if a priest genuflects twice each time at the consecration of the host and the chalice, or if he incenses the altar with the so-called "multiple and complex gestures" while quietly saying the first four verses of Psalm 140, this cannot be seen as somehow overturning the new rite, the Second Vatican Council, or the "opening of the windows" of the Church: "there is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal."¹¹⁹⁴

Applying this text conversely, Finigan asserts that the gestures employed in the EF Mass are not simply harmonious with or noncontradictory of the OF Mass. Rather, he holds that the traditional gestures of the EF:

[...] are to be considered part of what is "sacred and great" both for previous generations and for us. Thirdly one has to raise the question of the scope of the expression used by Pope Benedict in saying that such traditional elements of the Roman liturgy cannot be suddenly forbidden or considered harmful. In the manner in which he celebrates Mass himself, it does seem that Pope Benedict would apply this to at least some traditional

¹¹⁹³ *CGF*, §11.

¹¹⁹⁴ FINIGAN, "Mutual Enrichment in Theory and Practice," 63.

elements used in the newer form, as well as the denial of any restrictions on the use of the pre-conciliar Missal in its entirety.¹¹⁹⁵

Interpreting Finigan's expressed position in canonical terms, it would appear he holds that concrete liturgical changes, made under the aegis of the provisions and the vision of *SP* and *CGF*, either derogate licitly from or do not exceed the law.

The Supreme Pontiff has presented the two Forms as one unitary Latin Rite, a single reality that is "the liturgy." Consistent with Finigan's interpretation, then, movement within this one Rite is not adding, changing and removing, but a matter of internal exchange.

Finigan's position could be supported based upon logic as well. Benedict XVI created an impossible situation if his call for sacralization of the OF, which necessarily requires changes of some kind, is illicit in its enactment at a grass roots level so to speak. Therefore, what is ostensibly breaking the law must have a provision somewhere that permits changes either by licit derogation from the law or by some means that allows the actions to be considered as taking place within the law. In this way of thinking, actualization of liturgical changes that come from internal exchange between the Forms remains within and does not exceed the restriction of c. 846, §1.

Juridically, Finigan's approach is more complicated to explain and support yet more easily enacted. One may say that his position emerges from use of the provisions of c. 17 primarily by interpretation of the "mind of the legislator" as manifested in *CGF*, and secondarily by calling upon "parallel sources" of law, that is, *SP* itself. This interpretation operates out of a presumption that the *Code* and liturgical law do not address the specific matter of mutual liturgical enrichment sufficiently or at all.

¹¹⁹⁵ FINIGAN, "Mutual Enrichment in Theory and Practice," 63-64.

Johnston's approach, on the other hand, is more cautious. Primarily, he looks to the requirement of *Universae Ecclesiae*, compelling use of the liturgical books in the Extraordinary Form "as they are." This is augmented by the further requirement that those who use those liturgical books are to "know the pertinent rubrics and in celebrations are obliged to follow them correctly."¹¹⁹⁶

Allowing for mutual enrichment while remaining within the stricture of *Universae Ecclesiae*, Johnston proposes that liturgical enrichment does not consist of modifications, for instance to the rubrics of the OF, "but rather of choices made within the rubrics regarding the way a ritual is enacted by a community - choices by, variously, the one who presides, the different liturgical ministers and all those participating."¹¹⁹⁷ He proposes that liturgical changes come into practice by means of custom and by the act of a legislator.¹¹⁹⁸ Johnston suggests three phases by which mutual enrichment could take place. The first involves actions at a local level which in the second come to the knowledge of higher authorities who in turn would pass along to the Holy See what is deemed worthy. This would culminate in the final phase, that of recognition by the Holy See.¹¹⁹⁹

To the canonist, Johnston's approach is more readily defensible under existing law yet more difficult to enact. One may say that Johnston's approach, like that of Finigan, is

¹¹⁹⁶ *Universae Ecclesiae*, 24; JOHNSTON, *Care for the Church and Its Liturgy*, 238. Within the possibilities he considers, Johnston does not remain strictly in adherence to his proposition. For instance, as cited earlier, he mentions the possibility of a celebrant restoring the genuflections at the consecration (see W. JOHNSTON, *Care for the Church and Its Liturgy*, 243). Finigan will concede that certain changes may be enacted as "inoffensive uses *praeter legem*..." (FINIGAN, "Mutual Enrichment in Theory and Practice," 66).

¹¹⁹⁷ JOHNSTON, *Care for the Church and Its Liturgy*, 238.

¹¹⁹⁸ See *ibid.*, 241.

¹¹⁹⁹ See *ibid.*, 243-247. His suggested means of authoritative acceptance of liturgical changes for the purposes of mutual enrichment are clearly identifiable as falling within the provisions of inculturation. But the question is raised regarding what Johnston means when he refers to actions that take place at a lower level. If the only actions taking place are those contained in the OF Missal, then there is no need to move up the chain in terms of authoritative acceptance. The question is raised, then, of whether Johnston admits the possibility of admitting certain elements without the permission of higher authority, such as the genuflections at the consecration, mentioned above.

supported by his use of the provisions of c. 17 yet by giving weight conversely. Johnston primarily calls upon “parallel sources” of law, that is, *Universae Ecclesiae*, and secondarily by interpretation of the “mind of the legislator” as manifested in *CGF*.

Positively, Finnigan’s permissive interpretation allows for mutual enrichment that would enact liturgical changes at the local level, permitting an immediate down-up movement, in the way he perceives as having been introduced by Benedict XVI. Johnston’s cautious interpretation places the authority to enact liturgical changes at a higher level, which ensures liceity and maintains a top-down approach clearly supported by long-standing practice of the Latin Church.

Negatively, it may be said that Finnigan’s approach is too liberal. If allowed, it could lead to arbitrary liturgical experimentation with potentially deleterious consequences, recalling the era following the Second Vatican Council. Johnston’s approach could be said to be too restrictive. If enacted, it could inhibit organic growth and mutual enrichment. Due to the length of time it would take for juridic recognition of changes, mutual enrichment as proposed in *SP* and *CGF* could be ineffectual in the liturgical life of the Latin Church.

At first, these juxtaposed arguments may appear to be little more than intellectual pursuits. However, as we shall see below, they are germane to liturgical life and, most importantly, to the conscience of celebrants in the current context. Apart from this, they certainly present the possibility of ongoing debate.

4.4.4 – *Traditionis custodes*

On 16 July 2021, Francis issued apostolic letter *motu proprio Traditionis custodes*, effective on the date of issue. According to the Holy Father's words, the document was prepared in response to the results of a survey of bishops conducted in 2020 by the CDF.¹²⁰⁰

The resulting *motu proprio* places certain restrictions upon the grants for use of *MR/1962* as provided in *SP*. Because it contains restrictions, the general norm of c. 18 is immediately invoked and must be born in mind throughout examination of the document. That is, laws establishing penalties, restricting rights or containing juridic exception are to be interpreted strictly.

It may be argued that *TC* has effected an integral reordering of the law as described in c. 20, abrogating *SP* and all related prior law and matters related thereto.¹²⁰¹ That is to say, one might argue that *TC* presents the entire matter of the EF within a new framework, with a new face and a new attitude that intends to minimize, marginalize and eventually phase-out its use. As such, earlier juridic matters connected to the use of *MR/1962* are not merely made moot intellectually by this new reality, but they are also abrogated juridically.

In order to arrive at this conclusion, however, one would have to overlook the significance of the revocation formularies found in *TC* itself. No doubt, these were worded carefully and had followed upon full consideration of their potential consequences.

¹²⁰⁰ *TC*, §3. At the conclusion of *CGF*, Benedict had requested "Furthermore, I invite you, dear Brothers, to send to the Holy See an account of your experiences, three years after this *Motu Proprio* has taken effect. If truly serious difficulties come to light, ways to remedy them can be sought."

¹²⁰¹ Integral reordering of the law is addressed in c. 20: "A later law abrogates, or derogates from, an earlier law if it states so expressly, is directly contrary to it, or completely reorders the entire matter of the earlier law. A universal law, however, in no way derogates from a particular or special law unless the law expressly provides otherwise." The essence of integral reordering is that an earlier law is incompatible with the new law; i.e., the two cannot be reconciled. Direct contrariety is indeed closely related to this as a species of integral reordering since that which is directly contrary to the new is also incompatible with it by its lack of conformity to it. But direct contrariety does not necessarily effect abrogation of the totality of a legislative document.

In order to determine how *TC* affects *SP*, or more specifically to our immediate interests, how *TC* affects mutual enrichment, an examination begins with consideration of what the document reveals about its own juridic effect. Within its text, *Traditionis custodes* contains explicit revocation of all:

1. Prior norms (cc. 29-33),
2. Instructions (c. 34),
3. Rescripts and Permissions (c. 59)¹²⁰² and
4. Customs (cc. 23-28) that do not conform with its new internal content.

Additionally, *TC* includes a general formula implicitly revoking anything contrary to it, even if worthy of particular mention.¹²⁰³

Each of these express formularies limits the scope of *TC*'s revocation:

1. The first formula indicates integral reordering by the mention of earlier matters not in conformity, which is to say, incompatible, with the norms of the new *motu proprio*;
2. Both formulae indicate revocation in the case of direct contrariety.

A comprehensive study of the matter would then utilize these elements as a basis for examination and comparison between *TC* and *SP* to determine:

1. What of *SP* and related prior law has been revoked manifestly by *TC*?
2. What, if anything, has been revoked doubtfully by *TC*?
3. What of prior law remains unaffected and/or may be harmonized with *TC*?
4. Has *TC* effected an integral reordering of the law, abrogating *SP* and related prior law?

Such a comprehensive study exceeds the scope of the instant work. Nonetheless, a degree of examination is essential to it.

¹²⁰² This includes delegated faculties.

¹²⁰³ This clause indicates the revocation of contrary particular norms and customs in addition to universal norms. It is described as implicit because it does not explicitly name any previous legislation that is being revoked (cf. c. 20).

When one compares *SP* and *TC* side by side, at least the following significant matters emerge from *SP* that do not appear in *TC*:

1. Extraordinary Form Mass liturgies may be attended by the faithful spontaneously;¹²⁰⁴
2. Any priest of the Latin Church may use the 1962 *Breviarium Romanum*;¹²⁰⁵
3. The pastor should allow celebration of the EF for weddings, funerals and pilgrimages, special circumstances and other celebrations;¹²⁰⁶
4. The pastor may permit the EF for Baptism, Marriage, Penance and Anointing of the Sick;¹²⁰⁷
5. If a pastor is approached by the faithful for celebration of the EF, “he is earnestly requested to provide for their request;”¹²⁰⁸
6. The Rector gives permission for use of the EF in churches that are not parochial or conventual;¹²⁰⁹
7. The ordinary may grant a faculty to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation in the EF.¹²¹⁰

From this simple list, it becomes evident that many substantive aspects of *SP* are not addressed in *TC*. These include such important grants as the use of the older *Breviarium Romanum* and the sacraments and sacramentals of the *Rituale Romanum* that are celebrated apart from context of Holy Mass. This raises another level of question regarding the effects of *TC*.

Therefore, the next to consider is whether *TC* has accomplished a complete integral reordering of the law effecting abrogation of *SP*, or whether *TC*, changing only certain norms of *SP*, effects derogation only from those norms while leaving the remainder of *SP*

¹²⁰⁴ See *SP*, art. 4.

¹²⁰⁵ See *ibid.*, art. 9, §3.

¹²⁰⁶ See *ibid.*, art. 5, §3.

¹²⁰⁷ See *ibid.*, art. 9, §1.

¹²⁰⁸ See *ibid.*, art. 7.

¹²⁰⁹ See *ibid.*, art. 5, §5.

¹²¹⁰ See *ibid.*, art. 9, §2.

as part of the *ius vigen*s.¹²¹¹ A guiding principle to such a brief examination of this question is provided in c. 21: integral reordering of a law can never be presumed; it must be proved.¹²¹²

There is no doubt that *TC*, as a *motu proprio* issued by the Roman Pontiff and promulgated universally for the Latin Church, has the juridic authority to reorder integrally or to derogate from *SP*, a juridically equivalent document, even though issued by a predecessor.¹²¹³

Smith states, “Norms within juridic documents may be revoked by later norms either by direct contrariety or by integral reordering.”¹²¹⁴ Of interest to this examination is that tacit abrogation of the entirety of a juridic document can only be accomplished by integral reordering. On the other hand, derogation by direct contrariety takes place when individual norms in the laws being compared are directly opposed to each other.¹²¹⁵

Once the norms of *TC* are compared with those of *SP*, it appears that *TC* is concerned almost exclusively with derogation from *SP* in its norm of granting universal faculties for use specifically of *MR/1962*, which is much more closely circumscribed than the other faculties granted by *SP*. That is to say, the norms of *TC* include revocation of universal faculties for use of *MR/1962*, revocation of the faculty to establish new personal parishes for celebration of the EF, revocation of the use of parish church buildings for celebration of the EF.

¹²¹¹ See P. SMITH, *The Integral Reordering of Law with Application to Religious Law*, Doctoral Dissertation, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law, Saint Paul University/Ann Arbor, MI, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2000, 72-73.

¹²¹² See SMITH, *Integral Reordering*, 80.

¹²¹³ See *ibid.*, 77.

¹²¹⁴ See *ibid.*, 74.

¹²¹⁵ See *ibid.*

Likewise, from this list it becomes evident that *Summorum Pontificum* presents at least two levels of competence after that of the Holy See: a level of competence belonging to the local ordinary and a level of competence belonging to the local pastor (or rector). This latter level of competence and associated acts and matters does not appear in *TC*. That is to say, the prerogatives granted to the pastor in *SP* are not mentioned at all in *TC*, limiting its scope to the competence of the ordinary. By this, it becomes apparent that *TC* has a determinate juridical extent that is much more closely circumscribed than that of *SP*.

Traditionis custodes' silence on the many other elements found in *SP* exposes *TC's* concern with only certain norms found in *SP*. Given that *TC* also expresses care for those who continue to be attached to the EF, it is clear that use of *MR/1962* is not abrogated nor is there concern for matters pertaining to the ritual celebration therefrom.¹²¹⁶

The instant study, however, remains focused on liturgical enrichment between the liturgical Forms. *Traditionis custodes* does not reduce the value of the EF but rather reaffirms that the two Forms are less-than-equal.¹²¹⁷ The text of the document leaves the ritual of the Mass unaffected apart from the order to use vernacular languages when proclaiming the lections from Holy Scripture in the EF celebration of Mass.¹²¹⁸ As such, neither *TC* nor the accompanying *Come già* issued by Francis expresses any significant

¹²¹⁶ It could be argued that by not mentioning the competencies of the pastor and by not mentioning the celebration of other sacraments and sacramentals, that the new law is, indeed, a new order that eliminates these substantive matters. However, it is vital to take context into consideration. The importance of the substantive acts of mutual enrichment approved by Francis only a year prior to the promulgation of *TC* cannot be overstated, nor can the expression of his desire that abuses in the Mass in either Form end, i.e., his desire for liturgical reconciliation. See discussion and notes below on the discussion of "unique expression."

¹²¹⁷ See *TC*, art. 1, and *Come già*, §10. It should be noted that the way Benedict presented the Forms in *SP*, the two were not placed as absolute equals. Hence the coining of the term Extraordinary Form for the *usus antiquior* while presenting norms and placing restrictions upon its use that do not exist for the Ordinary Form. Francis' description of "the unique expression" puts a finer point on the distinction and perhaps even broadens it but does not create it. This finer distinction and/or broadening makes the terms Ordinary Form and Extraordinary Form at least as apt if not more so post-*TC*.

¹²¹⁸ See *TC*, art. 3, §3.

interest in the active ritual of the sacred liturgies. The documents instead focus on addressing the difficulty experienced in those places wherein the celebration of the EF has been distorted into a manifestation of rejection of the Second Vatican Council itself or at least the post-Conciliar reforms.

TC's revocation formularies do not include *MR/1962* nor the right of priests to offer the EF from it. *Traditionis custodes* rather regulates the exercise of this right, which regulation itself becomes the competence of the diocesan bishop.¹²¹⁹ Regarding the faithful, it is observed:

It should be noted that the Apostolic Letter [*TC*] says nothing about the right of the faithful to attend the 1962 Mass, the celebration of the other sacraments according to the older Roman Ritual, or the saying of the older Divine Office by priests in public or in private: accordingly, all of these things remain permitted.¹²²⁰

In fact, it would appear that neither document is at all interested in matters of celebration but exclusively in disciplinary matters of permission for the celebration, location, timing and the psychology and catechesis of acceptance of the Council and the liturgical reform that followed.¹²²¹

Because *TC* is concerned about specific matters that do not pertain to the specific celebration of the Mass liturgy, mutual enrichment remains unaffected by its norms. In a word, *TC* is concerned about matters of who, where and when; not about how. According to the texts, elimination of mutual enrichment conceptually or specifically is not an express concern of the mind of the legislator in *TC* and his accompanying letter. Thus, discussion

¹²¹⁹ See *TC*, art. 2; *Christus Dominus*, 11; *CGF*, §13.

¹²²⁰ THE LATIN MASS SOCIETY OF ENGLAND AND WALES, “*Traditionis Custodes* in light of Canon Law,” 23 July 2020, https://lms.org.uk/tradcust/canon_law (11 January 2022).

¹²²¹ Within the discussion of juridic documents, it should be observed that the concept of mutual liturgical enrichment exists in a papal letter outside of *SP*. As such, it is intellectually connected to *SP*, which provided the occasion for its expression. Simply put, then, unless mutual enrichment is made moot by the abrogation of *MR/1962*, the exploration of mutual liturgical enrichment remains a legitimate course of action.

of the ritual celebration of *MR/1962* can coexist harmoniously with the revised competencies, restrictions and revocations declared and decreed regarding faculties and places of celebration of the OF in *Traditionis custodes*.

Nonetheless, the statement of the last phrase of *TC*, art. 1 in the official English translation that *MR/2008* is “the unique expression” of the *lex orandi* could permit an argument that *TC* integrally reorders *SP* and all associated law, customs and the like. After all, if *MR/2008* is the only or exclusive expression, then *MR/1962* becomes a part of the Latin Church’s liturgical history no greater or less than the many other historical Missals mentioned above in Chapter II and Chapter III. This requires some reflection.

Examination of the definition of the term “unique” reveals nuances that must be taken into consideration. Merriam-Webster’s tome defines the word in one sense as unequalled, distinctively characteristic, “able to be distinguished from all others of its class or type,”¹²²² distinct in the sense that it is “distinguishable to the eye or mind as being discrete or not the same.”¹²²³ This is much broader meaning than “only” or “exclusive.”

Yet further, the matter of linguistic distinction becomes important in order to bolster such an interpretation. When examining the phrase with the Italian version provided by the Vatican, one finds: “l’unica espressione.” A similar nuance is revealed to that of the English. In one sense, *unica* in Italian refers to an emphatic value of a thing. (“Con valore enfatico, detto di cosa....”) This is significantly less limiting than interpretation as “only” or “exclusive.” The nuances in these English and Italian understandings of the term eliminate what would appear otherwise to be contrary to the juridical reality of the

¹²²² <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unique> (11 January 2022).

¹²²³ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/distinct> (11 January 2022).

provisions of *TC* and to the practice of the Church of interpreting the expression of the *lex orandi*.¹²²⁴

Furthermore, the text of *Traditionis custodes* does not indicate abrogation of *MR/1962*, it does not end its universal authorization, it does not challenge its legitimacy, nor does it end celebration of Mass in the EF. That is, *MR/1962* remains a Missal authorized universally, though not necessarily permitted universally, for use in the Latin Church.¹²²⁵ Because the two Missals remain in licit use throughout the Latin Church, the matter of mutual enrichment remains an important consideration, particularly from a juridic perspective.¹²²⁶

¹²²⁴ See Dizionario Italiano, <https://www.dizionario-italiano.it/dizionario-italiano.php?lemma=UNICO100> (11 January 2022). If the term were intended to mean “the only form,” then it seems logical that the Pope would have ended use of the EF. However, other languages express exactly that confounding vocabulary. To wit: The German iteration of *TC* provided on the same Vatican website reads, “die einzige Ausdrucksform.” This translates more closely to “the only form of expression.” This is a very limiting turn of phrase. *Einzigartig* would be more nuanced and less limiting in this case but is not the chosen term. See https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/de/motu_proprio/documents/20210716-motu-proprio-traditionis-custodes.html (11 January 2022). The Spanish presented is similar: “la única expresión,” a typical reading of which would be “the only expression.” The nuance of *único/única* is less clear because Spanish lacks a distinctive vocabulary to nuance the phrase. As a liturgical example of usage, however, the creed employs the phrase, “hijo único de Dios,” indisputably intended to mean the “only” son of God. See https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/es/motu_proprio/documents/20210716-motu-proprio-traditionis-custodes.html (11 January 2022). *La Croix* has provided a French translation of the document. The text under consideration therein reads, “la seule expression.” This translates quite potently: “the only expression.” The term *unique* in French would have allowed more nuance but was not chosen in this presumably unofficial translation. See <https://www.la-croix.com/Traditionis-custodes-motu-proprio-pape-Francois-liturgie-2021-09-08-1201174387> (11 January 2022). A Latin version of *TC* was not published at the time of promulgation. It is not unreasonable to assume that the Italian text was the original. Of these other languages presented by the Vatican and one provided by *La Croix*, only the English version bears the moniker of “Official” translation. A Latin text appeared at the time the *Responsa ad dubia*; see mention below.

¹²²⁵ It is worth noting once again in certain terms that *SP* authorized use of *MR/1962* universally but did not permit it universally. Universal authorization has not been withdrawn by *TC*; it has changed the means of permission and has limited location.

¹²²⁶ This is supported by a decree of Francis granting the faculty to every member of the FSSP to use all of the rituals of the *usus antiquior*. This decree comes well after *TC* and the *Responsa ad dubia*. Francis, decree, Confirming the use of the 1962 liturgical books, 11 February 2022, available in English at <https://fssp.com/decrees/> (14 March 2022). It could be said as well that, even if celebration from *MR/1962* had been discontinued by *TC*, exercise of the provisions of *Summorum Pontificum* for well more than a decade cannot be erased from ecclesiastical and human experience. Furthermore, *GIRM*, no. 42 permits the celebrant of the OF to contextualize his questions historically, which, in order to employ this permission, necessitates an understanding of *MR/1962*.

4.4.5 – *Responsa ad dubia*, 4 December 2021

On 4 December 2021, the CDWDS issued *Responsa ad dubia*. The species and authority of the document is not stated explicitly within it. However, the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments possesses competence over the norms of *Traditionis custodes* for secular entities and thus exercises the authority of the Apostolic See for material within that competence.¹²²⁷

The document sustains the explicit revocation formulary found in *Traditionis Custodes*: “Previous norms, instructions, permissions, and customs that do not conform to the provisions of [TC] are abrogated.”¹²²⁸ Additionally, the document contains the following *post scriptum*: “The Supreme Pontiff Francis, in the course of an Audience granted to the Prefect of this Congregation on 18 November 2021, was informed of and gave his consent to the publication of these *Responsa ad dubia* with attached *Explanatory Notes*.”¹²²⁹

The *Responsa* indicates that the eventual plan of the Supreme Pontiff is to bring an end to use of the Extraordinary Form: “The motu proprio *Traditionis custodes* intends to re-establish in the whole Church of the Roman Rite a single and identical prayer expressing its unity,¹²³⁰ according to the liturgical books promulgated by the Popes Saint Paul VI and Saint John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of the Second Vatican Council and in

¹²²⁷ See *Responsa ad dubia*, §1, R¹, R², R⁵. Cf. TC, no. 7.

¹²²⁸ Ibid., R². Cf. TC, no. 8.

¹²²⁹ The document does not state that the text has been approved by the Supreme Pontiff *in forma specifica*, which would grant it the authority of binding law. Indeed, it does not state that the text has been ordered by the Supreme Pontiff or has been approved by him in any manner, merely that he approved its publication. The juridic value of the *Responsa* may receive greater clarification in future. Until such clarification is stated by the competent authority, doubts of law remain.

¹²³⁰ See section 4.5.4 for a discussion on this.

line with the tradition of the Church.”¹²³¹ The document reiterates that the rites of the ordinary Form are “the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite.”¹²³²

The need for authorization for liturgical participation in celebrations of Mass according to *MR/1962* is expanded in the *Responsa*. According to this latest text, “Deacons and instituted ministers” participating in such celebrations also need authorization from the diocesan bishop in order to do so.¹²³³

The document restricts the diocesan bishop’s competence provided in c. 905, §2 to grant the faculty to binate on weekdays. These *Responsa* indicate that a priest authorized to celebrate according to *MR/1962* who celebrates a Mass on a weekday according to the OF may not then be permitted to binate by celebrating a second Mass in the EF. The explanation for this states that “there is no ‘just cause’ or ‘pastoral necessity’ as required by canon 905, §2.”¹²³⁴ A similar prohibition prevents authorized priests from offering the EF on any day for a second group of the faithful. Bination under these circumstances is not

¹²³¹ *Responsa ad dubia*, R². If the statement, “... to re-establish in the whole Church of the Roman Rite a single and identical prayer expressing its unity,” is taken literally, a broader conversation needs to take place regarding the status of the other rituals in use within the Latin Church. For example, the Anglican Ordinariate describes its own Missal stating: “It is a pastoral variation of the Roman Rite.... [...] It is an adaptation of the Roman Rite for the sanctification of the faithful.... [...] Let there be no mistaking: This is not an Anglican liturgy separate and distinct from the Roman Rite of the Catholic Church...” (J. STEENSON AND C. BRAND, “Divine Worship: The Missal,” at The Personal Ordinariate of the Chair of Saint Peter, <https://ordinariate.net/divine-worship-missal> [7 July 2022])). It is noteworthy that the quoted statement refers to “liturgical books” and not to sacramentals.

¹²³² *Responsa ad dubia*, §2, R², R⁵, R¹⁰. Cf. *Traditionis custodes*, no. 1. Within the responses, it is stated that the later-released Latin text of *TC* is the official text to be referenced (see *Responsa ad dubia*, R⁵). In the Latin text, *TC*, art. 1, states, “Art. 1. Libri liturgici a sanctis Pontificibus Paulo VI et Ioanne Paulo II promulgati, iuxta decreta Concilii Vaticani II, unica expressio ‘legis orandi’ Ritus Romani sunt.” Pursuant to the above examination of language in the vernacular versions of *TC*, the term *unica* presented in the Latin text maintains the argument. One of the main translations of *unica* into English is “unique,” which in turn redounds to the examination of this term above.

¹²³³ See *Responsa ad dubia*, R⁹.

¹²³⁴ *Ibid.*, R¹⁰. It is difficult to understand how this judgment could be made. A simple solution, however, would be to assure that extraordinary Form Masses are scheduled at the earlier times. If the diocesan bishop has granted the faculty to binate on weekdays, the second Mass then would be in the Ordinary Form.

permitted. From the juridic perspective of competencies, this is to say that the diocesan bishop is not allowed to permit it.¹²³⁵

Use of the older *Rituale Romanum* and the *Pontificale Romanum* is addressed directly in the second query/response, inquiring whether it is possible “to celebrate the sacraments with the *Rituale Romanum* and the *Pontificale Romanum* which predate the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council.”¹²³⁶ The answer is in the negative. However, the diocesan bishop may grant permission to use the *Rituale Romanum* of 1952 to canonically erected personal parishes that exist for the celebration of the EF. He may not grant permission to use the *Pontificale Romanum*.¹²³⁷ The explanation adds that the *Rituale Romanum* and the *Pontificale Romanum* of the older use are abrogated texts because “these are liturgical books.”¹²³⁸

Additionally, a clarification further limits the competency of the diocesan bishop as it appears to have been granted in *TC*. *Traditionis custodes* art. 4 states: “Art. 4. Priests ordained after the publication of the present Motu Proprio, who wish to celebrate using the *Missale Romanum* of 1962, should submit a formal request to the diocesan Bishop who shall consult the Apostolic See before granting this authorization.” The *Responsa* states,

¹²³⁵ See *Responsa ad dubia*, R¹¹.

¹²³⁶ *Ibid.*, R².

¹²³⁷ See *ibid.*, R². It should be noted that the query and response refer to celebration of the sacraments. Neither *TC* nor these *Responsa* mention the sacramentals or the *Breviarium Romanum*.

¹²³⁸ *Responsa ad dubia*, R². This response could use clarification. On the one hand, it states that the older *Rituale* is abrogated, which is not expressed in *TC*, yet it also permits its use in some circumstances. Additionally, the reference to “liturgical books” appears to describe the rituals for the sacraments contained in these books. This response does not appear to extend beyond *TC* by altogether prohibiting the older formularies for sacramentals. It would appear, then, that the blessings and processions contained in the *Rituale* of the *usus antiquior* remain permitted for use with the permission of the diocesan bishop or at least remain in doubt. If it is a case of doubt, their use can be permitted with dispensation from the diocesan bishop. In the spirit of *TC*, which is particularly concerned with returning authority over matters regarding the EF to the bishop, this form of discretion of the diocesan bishop appears consistent and appropriate. In support of this, c. 14 states: “Laws, even invalidating and disqualifying ones, do not oblige when there is a doubt about the law. When there is a doubt about a fact, however, ordinaries can dispense from laws provided that, if it concerns a reserved dispensation, the authority to whom it is reserved usually grants it.”

however: “This is not merely a consultative opinion, but a necessary authorization given to the diocesan Bishop by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, which exercises the authority of the Holy See over matters within its competence.”¹²³⁹

Nonetheless, consistent with *TC*, the only item in the text of the *Responsa* regarding the celebration of the ritual of the Mass concerns use of vernacular languages for the Scripture readings. This takes form in a response to a question of whether a Bible may be used to proclaim the lections from *MR/1962* in the vernacular languages. The response is in the affirmative. The Bible to be use is one that is “approved by the individual Bishops’ Conferences.”¹²⁴⁰

4.5 – Formulating Principles for Mutual Enrichment in the Twenty-first Century

As common sense would insist, not all opportunities presenting possible liturgical enrichment may be desirable. What we have is not just bins of parts and bins of tools, from which we may then draw and assemble as we like. Therefore, principles that serve the stated goals need to be formulated. Principles are necessary to provide a check against which material opportunities may be compared.

An authentic array of principles for liturgical reform exists in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, having acquired a solid form as principles of liturgical reform less than two decades prior in the *Memoria* of 1948. These may be adopted easily as the principles to be applied to the subject at hand. They require no adaptation yet could benefit from additional reflection.

¹²³⁹ *Responsa ad dubia*, R⁵, *Explanatory Note*.

¹²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, R⁴.

In order that one may judge authenticity of liturgical enrichment, a path of consistency is devised in such a way that propositions and efforts to that end result in adopting the following principles:

1. Maintenance or creation of balance between conservation and innovation;
2. Introduction of change only as is genuinely beneficial;
3. Maintenance of what is recognizably Roman.
4. Innovation arising only while maintaining respect for organic development.

4.5.1 – Particular Opportunities for Mutual Enrichment

Despite restrictions upon use of *MR/1962* in place due to *TC* and the *Responsa*, celebration of the Mass according to the EF continues and both Missals remains in the current practice and experience of the Latin Church. Particular opportunities for mutual enrichment, particularly enrichment of the OF from the EF, continue to exist.

Therefore, and moving onward, with goals and principles in place and the provisions of the law before us, it is beneficial to examine the situations that could provide material opportunities for enrichment of the Ordinary Form.¹²⁴¹ Opportunities for mutual enrichment may arise passively or actively. Passive opportunities arise from situations and conundra for which the solution is not immediately intended to be mutual enrichment. For example:

1. When the celebrant perceives a *lacuna* in the OF regulations;¹²⁴²
2. When the celebrant perceives lack of clarity in the OF regulations.¹²⁴³

¹²⁴¹ This is not an exhaustive list but rather intended for practical discussion.

¹²⁴² That is, the *GIRM*, rubrics or another official directive.

¹²⁴³ This could include lack of detail in the regulations. A celebrant could find himself in a situation of pressure with no resources available to him at the moment to offer resolution. This situation could occur, for instance, in the sacristy immediately prior to a ceremony or even during the ceremony. The celebrant may find himself unsure as to how to proceed but is aware of what the EF would prescribe under the same or parallel circumstances. This could also occur in a situation not of such immediacy but in which the priest cannot find satisfactory resolution to his question or conundrum through his use of the ordinary means of research available to him. Such situations arise when a celebrant does not know what to do but wishes to do something that is rooted in Roman practice rather than of his own or some arbitrary construction.

Active opportunities arise from the direct desire to enact mutual enrichment. For example:

1. Requests by the faithful for enrichment in ways found in the EF;
2. The desire of the celebrant to introduce enrichment in ways found in the EF.

Evaluating such opportunities will require standards to which possible responses may be applied and to which preceding goals may be compared. The point is to provide a celebrant with the means by which he could address individual liturgical possibilities in the form of difficulties, questions or prospects, even if they did not arise from the broader desire for mutual enrichment, allowing him to proceed “without recourse to an out-of-place, arbitrary improvisation”¹²⁴⁴ and thus retaining authenticity in liturgical matters and peace of conscience.

4.5.2 – Balancing Conservation and Innovation

Conservation is understood as the intact retention of substantial elements.¹²⁴⁵ *Sacrosanctum Concilium* demands conservation; this demand is reinforced by the requirement that innovation be answerable to the forms already existing. Considering the entire trajectory of the liturgical movement, the mandate to avoid antiquarianism remains operative.¹²⁴⁶

At the same time, the Fathers maintained the possibility for legitimate innovation. Not to be confused with novelty, innovation is understood to be the alteration of at least nascent

¹²⁴⁴ A theme repeated in *Letter to Bishop Rossi*, 547, no. 1, §6.

¹²⁴⁵ An example of this is the retention of the structure of the Eucharistic Preface, with attached acclamations, intact from *MR/1962* to *MR/1969*, &ff.

¹²⁴⁶ See *Mediator Dei*, no. 61. Like so many other matters, the demand that something has value and use simply because it is old can lead to the absurd. In the matters with which we are concerned, intrinsic value may be enhanced by antiquity, but by Western reckoning, antiquity *per se* does not impart intrinsic value. Conversely, to dismiss something as valueless simply because it is old without due assessment of its origins, context and possible contemporary usefulness is equally absurd. Therefore, while there exists a caution against antiquarianism, there should be an equivalent caution against the converse anti-antiquarianism.

existing elements.¹²⁴⁷ Innovation may result only from the organic development of what already exists. Narrowly circumscribed in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, innovation is likewise closely attached to the other principles it sets forth. Thus, innovation is only to take place if it is demonstrably beneficial,¹²⁴⁸ useful, intelligible and historically consistent, without antiquarianism or anti-antiquarianism if you will.

Balance between conservation and innovation is achieved by the natural tension that arises between them. Conservation grounds innovation and prevents it from becoming detached from the whole by reminding it that its existence must be consistent and necessary. Innovation, on the other hand, calls for assessment of the value of what is considered for conservation. Considering an element from the point of view of innovation is what may determine that it should be conserved. This is the tension that must be present for balance to occur. Therefore, conservation and innovation must be kept in close interactive conversation; both must always exist.

4.5.3 – Ensuring that Changes are Beneficial

Benedict XVI has stated the benefits of mutual liturgical enrichment. These benefits are that “the celebration of the Mass according to the Missal of Paul VI will be able to demonstrate, more powerfully than has been the case hitherto, the sacrality which attracts many people to the former usage”¹²⁴⁹ and “an interior reconciliation in the heart of the Church.”¹²⁵⁰

¹²⁴⁷ Examples of innovation include truncating the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar and the *Confiteor* as done in the *MR*/1965 revisions. These changes remain unitary in that the altered versions are effortlessly recognizable as the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar and the *Confiteor* of the Roman Mass. An example of novelty would be the introduction of the Memorial Acclamation, which did not arise or develop from something already in existence, even nascently.

¹²⁴⁸ See *SC*, no. 23.

¹²⁴⁹ *CGF*, §9.

¹²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, §10.

The Pope identifies his motivation by restating the concern of his predecessors: “The Supreme Pontiffs have to this day shown constant concern that the Church of Christ should offer worthy worship to the Divine Majesty, ‘for the praise and glory of his name’ and ‘the good of all his holy Church.’”¹²⁵¹ After hearing the continued requests of the faithful and listening to “the views expressed by the Cardinals present at the Consistory of 23 March 2006, upon mature consideration, having invoked the Holy Spirit and with trust in God’s help,”¹²⁵² the Pope’s chosen course of action arose and his will was manifested by promulgating *SP* and presenting his *ratio legis* in *CGF*.

By all of this, we can be assured that reasonable changes enacted through mutual enrichment are genuinely beneficial. This assurance is contingent upon remaining aligned with the stated goals and the motives of the Pontiff who initiated this endeavor.

4.5.4 – Retaining a Recognizable Roman Unity

The *CIC/83* does not define what a Rite is. The *CCEO/90*, c. 28, §1 provides: “A rite is the liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary patrimony, culture and circumstances of history of a distinct people, by which its own manner of living the faith is manifested in each Church *sui iuris*.”

A tremendous patrimony of the entire Church resides in all the identifiably unique liturgical traditions of East and West. Each liturgical or ritual family, however, has its own history. Each has experienced development under the influence of socio-political situations, heavily influenced by language and other matters of culture proper to them. It would not be respectful to reach into the other Catholic ritual families for enrichment of

¹²⁵¹ *SP*, §1.

¹²⁵² *Ibid.*, §9.

the Latin liturgy. Changes considered herein must be unitary in the sense that they should be recognizably “Roman.”

Reaching a logical and useful definition of what it means for something liturgical to be “Roman” requires reflection. As mentioned above, the operative understanding employed by Consilium of what is definitively and pristinely Roman is based upon the practices found in the 8th century ritual notes found in *Ordines I*. Despite the desire of Consilium to return to what they perceived to be purely Roman, there remain in the revised Mass elements of what liturgiologists consider to be of non-Roman Western origin.¹²⁵³

On the other hand, when considering what was embraced as Roman at the time of the post-Tridentine reforms, it appears that the operative definition would include that which was of Roman usage, which is to say, what was accepted and practiced in the liturgy in Rome.¹²⁵⁴ This definition of what is Roman admits many more elements into the Mass than what Consilium’s definition would permit, opposed as it is to elements that entered the Mass at the time of, or subsequent to, the Carolingian period. According to the Tridentine definition, Roman elements were successfully retained and promulgated in *MR/1570*. These elements were received in the current *MR/1962*. According to the Consilium definition, many of these elements were to be rejected.

The appeal of the non-Roman features inculturated into the Roman Mass should be acknowledged. Davies describes these influences:

The additions to the Roman rite, some of which originated in Jerusalem and the East as well as from Gallican rites, or via Gallican rites, form its more elaborate, decorative and symbolic parts. The pure Roman rite was exceedingly simple, austere and plain; nothing was done except for some reason of practical utility. Its prayers were short and dignified,

¹²⁵³ If the operative understanding of Consilium is used to define what is Roman, *MR/2008* would require further reduction of text and ritual rather than enrichment.

¹²⁵⁴ The different determinations of what is Roman perhaps could be illustrated by saying “Roman is as Roman does,” as appears to be the mindset of Trent and Benedict XVI, versus “Roman is as Roman was,” as appears to have been the mindset of Consilium.

but almost too austere when compared with the exuberant rhetoric of the East. In our Missal we have from non-Roman sources much of the Holy Week ritual, and such decorative and symbolic processions and blessings as those of Candlemas and Palm Sunday.¹²⁵⁵

Early Christian visitors and pilgrims to Rome found the liturgy there to be quite different from that in their Eastern and other-European regions. As mentioned in Chapters II and III, some of the practices in the Holy Land soon found local adaptation in the Roman liturgy. These enrich the Mass in both Forms to this day and are considered Roman by usage.

Benedict XVI intimates a definition of what is Roman that exceeds both the Tridentine and Consilium definitions. By his embrace of the Missals of both Forms, Benedict necessarily embraces the history of both. That history includes the post-Vatican II revisions in the OF. It must include as well at least the inculturation that took place during and after the Carolingian period, not to mention the adaptations introduced following the experiences of pilgrims returned from the *terra sancta* and received in *MR/1962*¹²⁵⁶ Consistent with this reading of *CGF*, one may construct a definition of what is Roman as that which is now or has been practiced licitly by the Roman Church.

Preserving Roman unitarity is facilitated by adopting Benedict XVI's broader consideration of what is Roman. Coupled with an understanding that enrichment between the liturgical Forms must emanate from the Roman sources enumerated above, if the substance of enrichment comes from the two Roman Missals, that substance is identifiably Roman, and the elements therein possess a Roman unitarity.

¹²⁵⁵ M. DAVIES, *A Short History of the Roman Mass*, Charlotte, NC, TAN Books, 1997, 12-13.

¹²⁵⁶ This confirms that inculturation has been admitted to some degree throughout the life of the Roman Mass, particularly in the missions, though the term itself may not have become popularized until the mid-twentieth century.

4.5.5 – Respecting Organic Development

The elements found in the identified sources must not be thought of as a buffet of options to be added or discarded quixotically. Their use must be balanced, beneficial and recognizably Roman. The principle of respect for organic development can place a check on what otherwise may result in a random mélange.

What has come to be known as organic development, strongly intimated in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,¹²⁵⁷ is a concept that may be foreign to the mind of a jurist. As we have seen, regulation of the Mass of the Latin Church became the exclusive juridic domain of the Holy See and now, to a limited degree, shared with the episcopal conference and the diocesan bishop, frequently via the episcopal conference. Since 1570, and apart from custom, anything added, removed or changed in the Mass has materialized by juridical imposition; nothing has happened on its own. The Holy See has manifested and maintained this control and frequently reaffirmed it in the twentieth century.

Under these circumstances, then, the legal mind must extend itself somewhat to see the place and value of organic development in the Church. As love does not create the Matrimonial Contract but may be the impetus for entering into it, so in an analogous way, organic development does not create liturgical law but may be the means by which something eventually becomes part of it.

In a way similar to liturgical innovation, mutual liturgical enrichment must have its roots in organic practice. As Glendinning aptly articulates, “This principle continues to find expression, incidentally, in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* itself, which instructs that ‘there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires

¹²⁵⁷ See SC, no. 23.

them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing' (*SC*, no. 23)."¹²⁵⁸

Using the identified sources ensures that mutual enrichment develops “from forms already existing.” However, their use must be respectful of organic development and must have grounding in the welfare and practice of the faithful. Liturgical development must adopt sensitivity and proceed with a reasonable way of enriching the Mass. Respect for organic development is highly dependent upon the level of pastoral awareness that local church leaders possess.

4.6 – Identifying Kinds of Mutual Enrichment

Taking the goals, sources, opportunities, principles and laws presented, it now seems prudent to categorize mutual enrichment into kinds of elements so that matters of authority and jurisdiction may be applied practically, and arbitrariness and undue difficulties may be avoided. While there may be other ways to categorize kinds of mutual enrichment, the following is presented as reasonable.

4.6.1 – Elements and Permissions Currently Authorized

The Roman Mass is regulated almost entirely by the Holy See. Fittingly, then, the Holy See has issued some material elements of mutual enrichment that undoubtedly belong to its authority.

For example, as visited in Chapter I, the addition of the text found in no. 42 of the *GIRM* since its 2002 iteration may be an example of officially sanctioned mutual enrichment. As mentioned above, the words, “[A]ttention should be paid to [...] the traditional practice of the Roman Rite [...] rather than private inclination or arbitrary

¹²⁵⁸ GLENDINNING, “*Participatio Actuosa*,” 27.

choice,”¹²⁵⁹ appear to replace earlier prohibitions placed on using older practice to inform usage in the OF.¹²⁶⁰

Additionally, as visited in Chapters I-III, Benedict XVI demanded in *CGF*¹²⁶¹ and reiterated in *Universae Ecclesiae*¹²⁶² insertion of new Saints and some of the new Eucharistic Prefaces into *MR/1962*. While anyone could and might make such a call, only supreme authority can and does make it a requirement, mandate that it be fulfilled and grant competence to a particular dicastery to fulfill it.

Other examples, visited in Chapters II and III, exist in recent acts of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. As the successor dicastery to the PCED, their decrees *Cum sanctissima* and *Quo magis*, inserting new Eucharistic Prefaces and new Saints into *MR/1962*, at least partially fulfill the requirement issued by Benedict XVI.

¹²⁵⁹ “The gestures and posture of the priest, the deacon, and the ministers, as well as those of the people, ought to contribute to making the entire celebration resplendent with beauty and noble simplicity, so that the true and full meaning of the different parts of the celebration is evident and that the participation of all is fostered. Therefore, attention should be paid to what is determined by this General Instruction and the traditional practice of the Roman Rite and to what serves the common spiritual good of the People of God, rather than private inclination or arbitrary choice” (*GIRM/2008usa*, no. 42. Cf. *SC*, nos. 30, 34, and *Musicam sacram*, no. 21).

¹²⁶⁰ These would appear to replace, *inter alia*, the private responses made by the Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments in 1978, visited above in Chapter I. These specified that the ways of celebrating the older rite were not permitted to inform celebration of the newer rite. Consideration should be given for the context in which these responses were made. It would seem logical that, at the time, it was necessary for the new rite to be accepted in its completeness in every way. It seems reasonable that there was caution so that a hybrid rite would not become the norm of celebration. In any event, it must be duly noted that the aforementioned directives took the form of private replies. The juridic value of them is surpassed by the *GIRM*, which is decreed with universal force by an act of Supreme Authority. With all of this in mind, no. 42 of *GIRM/2002* and ff. is a text of primary juridic value today and takes its place as a significant point of reference for considerations of mutual liturgical enrichment as “laws issued in similar matters” (c. 19).

¹²⁶¹ “[...T]he two Forms of the usage of the Roman Rite can be mutually enriching: new Saints and some of the new Prefaces can and should be inserted in the old Missal. The “*Ecclesia Dei*” Commission, in contact with various bodies devoted to the *usus antiquior*, will study the practical possibilities in this regard” (*CGF*, §9).

¹²⁶² “New saints and certain of the new prefaces can and ought to be inserted into the 1962 Missal, according to provisions which will be indicated subsequently” or “... which will be laid down as soon as possible” (*Universae Ecclesiae*, no. 25).

These examples illustrate elements and actions of liturgical enrichment that belong exclusively to the highest authority. The authority to take such action never falls under the authority of the celebrant. For instance, the celebrant has no authority of his own to use the Eucharistic Prefaces proposed in Appendix V or to introduce celebration of Saints and Beati for which there is no provision granted in the GRC governing either liturgical Form.

4.6.2 – Elements within the Provisions of the Ordinary Form Introduced by the Celebrant on His Own Accord

The Missal used in the Ordinary Form celebration of the Mass provides a multitude of options; the *GIRM* grants the celebrant great latitude as to which Mass formulary may be used on ferial days.¹²⁶³ When acting in compliance with law, no additional permission or indult of any kind is required for the celebrant to make use of them. Some of these options may parallel or reflect practices found within the Extraordinary Form. Following the mind of Johnston, above, creative but licit use of some of these options would contribute to enrichment of the OF.¹²⁶⁴

For example, a plethora of additional euchological texts is provided in the form of Votive Masses and Masses for Various Needs and Occasions in *MR/2008usa*. Additionally, there is the rich *Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary*.¹²⁶⁵ When permitted by the local *ordo*, these could be used to enrich the OF.

¹²⁶³ Options considered on any given day must be reconciled with possible restrictions placed on that day by the regional *Ordo* or local directive.

¹²⁶⁴ Huels cites a number of examples of accommodations made by the celebrant within the provisions of the OF Missal in HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 124-126.

¹²⁶⁵ *Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Volume I: Sacramentary, Approved for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America*, prepared by INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing Company, 2012; *Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Volume II: Lectionary, Approved for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America*, prepared by INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing Company, 2012.

An example of this would be that, rather than repeat the Sunday formulary on ferials following major Sunday feasts and those that have been transferred permanently, a votive Mass could be used on the weekdays following, were the calendar to permit. For instance, the Votive of the Holy Spirit could be used on the days following Pentecost and the Votive of the Holy Eucharist following Corpus Christi. Likewise, the celebrant could use the many optional Masses for the Dead on ferials in November.¹²⁶⁶ Such choices can be introduced effectively with very few words prior to Mass or at its introduction. For example, one might say, “Continuing in the spirit of Feast (or Season) X, today we offer the Votive Mass of Y.”

Additionally, the Votive Mass of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus and the *Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary* are useful for First Friday and First Saturday observances, respectively. Furthermore, the options provided in the OF Missal present the opportunity to observe Ember and Rogations days as well as to continue or reintroduce traditional monthly associations. Among these are, for example, the Holy Name of Jesus in January, the Holy Family in February and the Most Holy Eucharist in April.¹²⁶⁷

4.6.3 – Elements Neither Provided nor Prohibited by the Ordinary Form Introduced by the Celebrant on His Own Accord for Pastoral Purposes

A celebrant could entertain the possibility of certain enrichments for the sake of the souls of the faithful and himself. Generally, these enrichments are conceptual and can be made through catechetical instruction during the pastoral address during the Mass. Some

¹²⁶⁶ See KOCIK, “Reform of the Reform,” 36.

¹²⁶⁷ An additional example of elements provided in the OF and permitted by the celebrant to enact is the use of Gregorian Chant. *GIRM/2008usa*, art. 41 states: “All other things being equal, Gregorian chant holds pride of place because it is proper to the Roman Liturgy.” The texts set to the Gregorian modes could be vernacular or Latin. Additionally, the celebrant could introduce greater use of the Latin language, provided it does not infringe the participation of the faithful. Furthermore, the celebrant could introduce some silence by offering the rite of the Presentation and Preparation of the Gifts quietly (see KOCIK, “Reform of the Reform,” 35). Cf. *GIRM/2008usa*, art. 142. Because the use of incense in the OF is optional for any grade of celebration, a celebrant may choose more frequent use of it (see *GIRM/2008usa*, art. 276). Furthermore, *GIRM/2008usa*, art. 279 now allows the purification of the sacred vessels to be done “with water alone or with water and wine.”

enrichments might include selected euchological texts when permitted. The celebrant, however, would not be adding, deleting or modifying the Mass.

For instance, a celebrant may enact some form of observance of *Septuagesima* by way of his pastoral address. Though this season has been eliminated in the OF, pastoral use of the time period that it occupies in the EF could be beneficial for the faithful. The celebrant could use the three Sundays prior to Lent with the goal of guiding the faithful so they are not caught off guard, so that they do not fail to prepare for the great season of Lent and so that their Lenten practices may be most fruitful. Such observance would also effect a spiritual unity and reconciliation between the faithful observing either liturgical Form.¹²⁶⁸

While there is no explicit provision in the OF for the celebrant to enrich worship in this way, there is no prohibition, even implicit, against doing so. The celebrant would not be adding, altering or removing any element of the Mass. Introduction of such enriching elements into the Mass appear to be within the authority of the celebrant himself.

¹²⁶⁸ Comparably, a celebrant may use his time at the pulpit to make pastoral observance of the shift that Passiontide brings about during Lent. While identifying this portion of Lent with a unique name has been withdrawn from the OF, the redirection it brings about yet exists. Awareness and observance of this shift could be of pastoral benefit. Furthermore, a celebrant may make pastoral observance of Ember Days. The *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars* states that “the ember days should be restored to their former importance as days devoted to penance and charity” (NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, no. 71). At least in Canada and the United States of America at this writing, Ember Day observances have not been restored officially to the respective particular calendars. The celebrant nonetheless could catechize the faithful and present observance as optional, promoting them as ways to sanctify personal and family life outside of Sunday worship. The Holy See, appearing to encourage observance of Ember Days, proposed updated observance of them, including prayer for peace, for those in material need and for ecclesiastical vocations (see NCCB, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, no. 71, and also *GNLYC*, nos. 45-47). Similarly, a celebrant could make pastoral observance of Rogation Days. Along with Ember days, such observance might also include some degree of permissible liturgical observance. This redounds to the permissible use of various texts provided in *MR/2008usa* as Masses for Various Needs and Occasions. In the case of Rogation Days, though the formularies found in *MR/1962* are not present in *MR/2008usa*, there are two sets of texts for “At Seedtime” and one for “After the Harvest,” which may reflect appropriate aspects of the historical themes of these days (see *MR/2008usa*, nos. 27 A, 27 B, and 28, 1137-1140).

4.6.4 – Elements External to the Provisions of the Ordinary Form

Elements beyond the provisions of the Ordinary Form could be subdivided further into those that would surely require the action of higher competent authority and those that remain unclear and invite discussion. In some instances, the appropriate authority to allow such changes is clear; other instances could be the basis for spirited debate.

Some possible liturgical changes are impermissible for the celebrant to undertake by his own accord and require the authorization of the Holy See. Because they enact substantial ritual change or do not fill a *lacuna*, higher authority would be required to permit them. In addition to the examples given above in acts that have been accomplished by the Holy See, further examples of this kind of mutual enrichment involve some speculation. Nonetheless, examples of such changes that appear quite inflexibly within the exclusive purview of the Holy See are:¹²⁶⁹

1. Imposition of the lectionary cycle from one Form upon the other.¹²⁷⁰
2. Removal and replacement of prayers from one Form into the other.¹²⁷¹
3. Changes or additions made where there is no *lacuna* to fill and no indicator of presider's license is present, such as the words, "In similar terms," and the like.¹²⁷²

¹²⁶⁹ These examples are given because they are at least intellectually raised as possibilities. Whether any or all of them are desirable or pastorally suitable is a different matter not taken under consideration herein.

¹²⁷⁰ "The new lectionary in the vernacular could be used as a way of providing a richer fare for the faithful at the table of God's word in Masses celebrated according to the 1962 Missal" (*Guidelines for Implementation of Ecclesia Dei*, 144-145). Introducing "the new lectionary in the vernacular" into "Masses celebrated according to the 1962 Missal" would require a radical alteration of the structure of the *GRC*/1960, which differs greatly from the *GRC* governing the OF. This would involve a substantive change and alteration of the Missal(s), competency for which belongs to the Holy See.

¹²⁷¹ An example of this would be using the Offertory from one Form in the other. This is a substantive change and alteration of the Missal(s), competency for which belongs to the Holy See.

¹²⁷² See HUELS, *Liturgy and Law*, 106, 124, 125, as above &ff. For example, if the celebrant were to use the formula from the EF for distribution of Holy Communion in the OF, it would not effect a tremendous change, but it would be baseless. *GIRM*/2008usa, art. 161, clearly prescribes words for the distribution of Holy Communion in the OF celebration of Mass; there is no *lacuna*. On the other hand, if he were to make the sign of the cross with the Holy Eucharist at the time of distribution to each individual, this would require more reflection.

Some elements may be juridically ambiguous. Depending upon one's espoused school of thought, what authority would be competent to permit some possible elements of liturgical enrichment are less clear. This lack of clarity is due sometimes to the simple lack of legislation on the matter and sometimes to lack of contemporary scholarship and/or scholarly debate.

On the one hand, consideration is given to whether individual matters create a substantive ritual change or merely a ritual augmentation, that is, the "sacralization" called-for by Benedict XVI. On the other hand, the question of authority arises depending upon one's fundamental interpretation of what defines mutual liturgical enrichment.¹²⁷³

Some of these ambiguous elements are enacted by the celebrant privately and others more publicly. Because these are perhaps among the most practical elements of the Mass, they are also the easiest and most prone to actual implementation by a celebrant in the Ordinary Form. Therefore, they occasion careful attention.¹²⁷⁴

Examples of private changes are:

1. Adopting the private prayers that exist in both Forms but have been modified in the OF.¹²⁷⁵

¹²⁷³ Two reasonable schools of this sort of fundamental interpretation that likely encompass, at least to a high degree, the majority of those who approach the concept of mutual enrichment, are treated above in section 4.4.3 in the presentation of the divergent perspectives of Johnston and Finigan.

¹²⁷⁴ Arguably, with the exception of the use of the pre- and post-Mass rites, these are finer points of ritual. If one espouses the school represented by Finigan, above, authority to reintroduce these elements into the OF celebration of the Mass is not ambiguous; it belongs to the celebrant. If one espouses the school represented by Johnston, then the authority to introduce such changes is unambiguous; it belongs to a higher authority after a lengthy process. Therefore, ambiguity belongs to one attempting to make an objective observation and examination of the divergent schools. Within each school, there is little ambiguity. Matters that appear to be authoritatively ambiguous as of this writing may not be so in future. The difficulty at present is a lack of recorded dialogue and commentary on individual matters of mutual enrichment. This lack facilitates consideration of these matters in the instant project.

¹²⁷⁵ Some examples of these prayers are those offered before proclamation of the Holy Gospel, the prayer at the comingling of the consecrated elements and the prayers of preparation by the priest prior to the Immolation. This would include using the full EF texts of these prayers in the OF or the modified versions from the OF in the EF.

2. Using private prayers from the EF that no longer exist in the OF and against which no explicit prohibition exists.¹²⁷⁶

Examples of public changes are:

1. Adopting norms from the *GIRM* and *RSCM* from one Form to the other.¹²⁷⁷
2. Adopting into the OF additional gestures that existed in the EF but no longer exist in the OF.¹²⁷⁸
3. Using the pre- and post-Mass rites.¹²⁷⁹

4.7 – Practical Assessment of Synthesis

The primary purpose of this last section is to introduce a way by which one could consider the possibilities of mutual enrichment in a licit manner, avoiding actions that are merely the whim of the celebrant. Thus, herein is presented a method that creates a sort of test that incorporates the information from earlier in this chapter that can be employed when considering the implementation of a liturgical element for purposes of mutual enrichment. This could be helpful when a tangible situation arises, actively or passively.

¹²⁷⁶ Some examples of these are the *Aufer a nobis* prayer of ascent, the *Oramus te, Domine* prayer at the initial veneration of the altar and the words accompanying incensation at the Offertory. This could also include adopting the manner in which the texts of the private prayers of preparation by the priest are offered prior to the Immolation. That is, the use of both prayers in the OF or only one of them in the EF.

¹²⁷⁷ This would include adoption of norms from the EF into the celebration of the OF. In the *RSCM*, III and IV, general norms are given describing hand position and gestures while in procession, when the hands are to be joined, how the hands are held when making the Sign of the Cross and when blessing objects and persons. Further examples comprise directives on where the focus of the celebrant is placed at various times during the celebration of Mass. Conversely, this would also include adoption of general norms of the OF into the EF. These are found in *GIRM/2008usa* in arts. 273-287 and include norms somewhat parallel to those found in the *RSCM*.

¹²⁷⁸ These additions include, for example, gestures prescribed in the EF to be executed during the *Gloria* and Creed, the *Sanctus* and Canon. With very few exceptions, where these gestures were removed, they were not replaced. Therefore, the gestures from the OF would be introduced as restorations/additions to, but not conflicting with, the OF. Two conflicts exist in the Roman Canon: the place in which the celebrant's hands are extended over the elements to be offered has changed in the OF; the single signation of the elements to be offered conflicts with the triple signation that occurs at the corresponding time in the EF.

¹²⁷⁹ Examples of these are the *Asperges/Vidi aquam* and Prayers at the Foot of the Altar prior to Mass, as well as the *Placeat* and the Last Gospel following Mass. One could argue that, because these elements are technically defined as taking place immediately prior to and after the Mass, they are not part of the Mass. As such, they could have a place in the OF celebration similar to that of devotional prayers and practices immediately prior to and following the Mass, as frequently performed in local communities. One could argue on the other hand, that since the usual Sunday/Solemnity EF Mass is not celebrated without some or all of these elements, and they appear within and not separated from the *Ordo Missae* in *MR/1962*, they are treated ritually as part of the Mass and thus not within the authority of anyone but the Holy See to permit in the OF.

For instance, when the celebrant encounters a *lacuna* or finds a retro-*lacuna* that has opened in the law or when he directly intends mutual liturgical enrichment.

The test is simple to use. As the element under consideration passes one question successfully, it moves to the next. Some of these steps by their nature are objective while others are, to greater and lesser degrees, subjective and may be aided by the use of rhetorical questions. A significant presupposition exists, however. That is, the celebrant must have and call upon his experience, wisdom, expertise and pastoral-liturgical acumen. Good faith is likewise presumed.

Step 1: Determine who is permitted to introduce the liturgical element.

As discussed above, this is not a settled science. At present, it requires the celebrant to consider several factors. A celebrant must first determine to what kind of mutual enrichment the element may be compared and determined that he is permitted to introduce it.

Step 2: Consider the primary goals of the liturgical movement.

“In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy, this full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else....”¹²⁸⁰ Thus, the question must be posed: Does the element in question expand or at least not infringe the participation of the faithful? This should be rather easy to ascertain.¹²⁸¹

Step 3: Consider the co-primary goals of mutual enrichment.

1. Mutual enrichment is intended to promote liturgical reconciliation. While this goal may be subjective, comparison with it may be aided by approaching it with a

¹²⁸⁰ SC, no. 14.

¹²⁸¹ If answering any of the questions in this sort of test reveals a conflict, the matter need not be dismissed summarily. One may first review if it could be adapted in some way, without loss of integrity, which would make the element permissible.

negative question. Thus, the questions must be posed: Is the motivation virtuous or is it the promotion of an exclusively personal desire? What is the likelihood that introduction of the element would be divisive?

2. Consider the other co-primary goal of mutual enrichment indicated by Benedict XVI: Mutual enrichment is intended to increase the sacralization of the celebration of the OF celebration of the Mass. Judgment at this step depends upon the sense of the celebrant. Thus, the question must be posed: Does the element positively enrich the sacral experience of the celebration or is it superfluous?

If the primary goals of the liturgical movement and of mutual enrichment would be maintained by introduction of the element in question, then comparison with the principles may proceed. That is, the element is assessed to determine whether it is balanced, beneficial, Roman and respectful of organic development.

Step 4: Compare use of the element against the principles for mutual enrichment.¹²⁸²

1. Principle: An element should balance conservation and innovation.

An element is balanced, at least minimally, when on the one hand its use is not founded merely in antiquarianism and on the other hand, it is not a novelty. Thus, the question must be posed: Is the element in question balanced? If the sources used are those named above, namely the Missals of each Form, elements taken from the EF to enrich the OF might easily pass this question.

2. Principle: An element must be beneficial.

An element is beneficial when it fulfills a need respectfully by closing a *lacuna* or contributing to an elevated experience of the sacred in the celebration of Mass. Thus, the

¹²⁸² See Sections 4.6.1-4.6.4, above, for statement of the Principles.

question must be posed: Is the element in question beneficial? This aspect is inevitably subjective to some degree. The ability to answer it resides in the knowledge of one's local faith community as well as one's conscience.

3. Principle: An element must retain Roman unitarity.

When determining Roman unitarity, one confronts the three definitions presented above. That is, an element is Roman if it is part of accepted use in Rome, i.e., the Tridentine definition; an element is Roman if it is found to have belonged to a certain era prior to the introduction of Gallican elements, i.e., the *Consilium/Ordines I* definition;¹²⁸³ an element is Roman if it ever was accepted in Roman liturgical practice, i.e., the Benedict XVI definition. Thus, the question must be posed: Is the element in question identifiably Roman? If one adopts the broader definition used by the Tridentine Reformers or Benedict XVI, this litmus is not difficult to pass: if it is in the *MR/1962*, it is identified as Roman. The *Consilium* definition greatly narrows the possibilities.

4. Principle: Introduction of an element must respect organic development.

An element respects organic development when it not only fulfills a need, as identified in Principle 2, but does so in a way that the faithful involved will desire it, and will be capable of fulfilling, tolerating and sustaining it. Thus, the next question that must be posed is: Does the element respect organic development?

The following is a fabricated illustration of how this practical test could be employed. Rather than present the simplest results, the scenario demonstrates some degree of complexity, how it could go awry and be rectified as well as how it could be abused.

¹²⁸³ As demonstrated above, the *Consilium* definition was operative in the research and desire of the body itself but was not accepted by the Pope or the bishops in the operative liturgy that was created based upon that definition.

A fictitious celebrant has responsibilities for regular supply of the Mass at a nursing home, hospital or another place where the weak and/or infirm comprise the majority of those gathered for worship, along with some medical assistants. These are normally low ferial Masses. The space is not inspiring, there is no opportunity for music. In an active desire of his own accord, the celebrant seeks to enrich these Masses in some way by elevating the experience of the sacred by those in attendance. The celebrant decides that incense would be a lovely addition and that the detailed and complex method of incensation from the EF would be the perfect enrichment to lend to the Mass. The celebrant uses the method presented above to ascertain whether he may use the gestures from the EF in his OF celebrations.

Step 1. The use of incense is a liturgical element of a public nature. As a conscientious man, the celebrant first makes examination to determine whether he is authorized to add incense to these particular Mass at all. As a result, he finds that use of incense at any Mass exists within the provisions of the OF.¹²⁸⁴

He considers the position of those scholars represented by Johnston. Following this school of thought, the celebrant concludes that he is not permitted to introduce changes in the name of mutual enrichment but is limited to his choice of options and elements existing within the OF. Therefore, while free to use incense, he would not be free to add the complex gestures and words from the EF.

He then considers the position of those scholars represented by Finigan. Following this school of thought, the celebrant decides that he is allowed to make such an introduction

¹²⁸⁴ *GIRM/2008usa*, art. 276, a: “Incense may be used if desired in any form of Mass.”

without remorse, because it is merely a matter of restoring elements from the EF to something that was simplified in the OF.¹²⁸⁵

With these schools of thought in mind, the celebrant chooses to proceed with caution and decides to examine the element in question further by practical assessment, entering the remaining steps. He arrives at the following:

Step 2. When compared to the goals of the liturgical movement and of mutual enrichment, the celebrant determines that the use of incense according to the rubrics of the EF is neutral in the face of active participation by the faithful.

Steps 3a and 3b. The celebrant determines that the use of incense in the manner described may aid liturgical reconciliation given the diverse backgrounds of the residents gathered for worship. After reflection, he determines that his choice to add incense was motivated by virtuous care for the faithful that gather at those celebrations. Whether its use would be divisive cannot become apparent until it is applied in an actual celebration of Mass. The celebrant believes the addition would achieve increased sacralization of the Ordinary Form to the benefit of the faithful. It is precisely for this reason that he is investigating its possible use.

Step 4a. When the principles of mutual enrichment are applied, the celebrant determines that the element is undoubtedly balanced.

Step 4b. The celebrant determines that it may be useful to achieve his intended end of enriching the liturgy, but determination will need to be made following actual use.

Step 4c. Use of incense as prescribed in the Western liturgy is undoubtedly Roman.

¹²⁸⁵ See FINIGAN, "Mutual Enrichment in Theory and Practice," 63.

Step 4d. The element's respect for organic development would need to be assessed upon use. Because the celebrant acts within his own authority to use incense at any grade of Mass in the Ordinary Form, experimentation by means of at least one trial use seems reasonable. He intends to explain the incense and the incensation to the worshippers.

The celebrant concludes that the element has passed all stricture and can be used. Once the celebrant has offered Mass in the described context and used incense with the addition of the detailed and complex method from the EF, he comes to the conclusion that it is not useful. In fact, it is detrimental. Those in attendance find immediately that the heavy smoke of the incense triggered negative respiratory responses in many and allergic reactions in others. Health care attendants for the infirm noted that the addition of the gestures from the EF unduly lengthened the Mass; they insist that the Mass celebrated there needs to be celebrated expeditiously since most of the infirm need to be returned to their rooms swiftly. With all the best intentions, the addition is roundly rejected by that particular regular gathering of the faithful as something impossible for them to tolerate or sustain.

If the celebrant then retracts use of the element that has failed, then no harm has been done. Regardless of its failure, the synthesizing test has worked. If the celebrant nonetheless insists on continuing to use the failed element, the synthesizing test has nonetheless worked; it convicts the celebrant of imposing his own will, in this case, by acting contrary to the stated principles.

Conclusion

Benedict XVI presents his desire for enrichment of the Ordinary Form by the Extraordinary Form in conceptual terms. The ends are stated, i.e., internal liturgical reconciliation and sacralization of the Ordinary Form, but instructions to achieve them are

not provided. This style is consistent with the call for liturgical reform from the Councils of Trent and Vatican II, of the PCED, the CDF and ostensibly the style of Benedict himself. This chapter's objective was to create a framework within which a synthesis of goals and principles could be developed that respects history and adheres to ecclesiastical law and at the same time would give way for real opportunities for mutual liturgical enrichment to be applied by the application of standards.

This presents tremendous opportunity and great challenge. The joy and privilege is to be able to circumscribe the field to some degree. The challenge lies in remaining within ecclesiastical law and not losing sight of the desires found within the root conceptual request. For an ecclesiastical lawyer, the task includes determining the bounds of the law insofar as expressed in the *Code* and juridic documents, utilizing the tools within it and maintaining historical consistency.

It was important to identify the need for reconciliation within the liturgy first. It is important to acknowledge that there is a goal that surpasses any individual discipline, the need for which must be born in mind when narrower considerations are made. Then, the goals and principles of the liturgical movement had to be examined. These provide foundation. The historical survey presented the development of the movement of liturgical reform, as opposed to elements of liturgical reform that are presented in Chapters II and III. This survey provides reference against which liturgical enrichment may be compared, in order to inform current practical goals with authentic grounding and consistency. From the understanding gleaned from that study, more immediate goals and principles were formulated in consistency with them.

Juridic considerations were then interjected. By observing recent actions of the Holy See, the ways in which liturgical reform has been coming into being can inform and direct twenty-first century progress. Exploration of what the *Code* provides by way of recognition of liturgical changes further narrows the field. The pressure of this yet narrower circumscription allows specific opportunities to emerge with some clarity. *Traditionis custodes* provides disciplinary measures on the use of *MR/1962* but does not address the ritual celebration therefrom, allowing the exploration of mutual liturgical enrichment to carry-on, even with intimated or implied encouragement to do so.

With all of this in mind, it became possible to fit particular opportunities into some form or paradigm that identifies classes and categories, that is, kinds, of mutual enrichment, including what authority would be necessary to enact these opportunities. These kinds necessarily comprise both what is clear and what is ambiguous, due to differing schools of thought, lack of scholarship on the matter and lack of clarity in juridic documents.

As Chapters II and III include practical application of the knowledge and tools developed in them by means of appendices, this chapter follows suit. It includes a tool for practical assessment allowing one to apply the knowledge presented in this chapter so that one may judge the admissibility of a given element into the liturgy. The last section provides the opportunity for material synthesis, involves less taxing practical thought and concludes the dense body of the dissertation on a lighter note.

The final sections of the instant chapter differentiate kinds of enrichment of the OF by the EF. It could be argued that, in light of *TC* and the *Responsa*, these have devolved and come under the authority of the Holy See now. This would make the opportunities for individual celebrants limited to those options that appear within the Missal of the OF.

This is a reasonable and respectable point to raise. At the same time, it must be considered that *GIRM*, no. 42, continues to allow historical reference when celebrating the OF. In fact, consideration of these various kinds of enrichment could then become more powerful if joined with the provisions of custom. That is to say, enrichments could be made by means of the *GIRM*'s provision for reference to the Church's past liturgical normative practices, as opposed to arbitrary choices. Such practices, especially those *praeter ius*, could become licit by means of custom. If this perspective were to be taken, the various kinds of mutual enrichment may assume some adjustment of means, perhaps reorganized into kinds that are *praeter ius* and those that are *contra ius*, but the ends would remain the same. In any event, would that they would be of some assistance in the virtuous and increasingly compelling cause of liturgical reconciliation at the very heart of our Church.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Catholic ecclesiastical law does not exist in a vacuum nor is it merely dry bones. If one uses canon law as a thread to study associated disciplines, the scholar is brought through several adjacent subjects along the way, which he is compelled to consider respectfully. Ecclesiastical law is essentially bound with ecclesiastical history, ergo by the influences of development within the Church and of the greater lot of human history influencing the Church. Philosophy and its discipline of theology along with spiritual and historical reflection are inextricably linked within any study that involves ecclesiastical law. A study of ecclesiastical law brings one into art, architecture, prayer, worship, the sacraments and even our daily calendar. Canon law, therefore, while so often a quiet background actor, touches the Catholic in the ordering of daily life, directing preparation for eternal life and organizing the means by which to attain it.

This work has encountered many of the above-mentioned aspects of the Church and life in the attempt to address the juridic matters at hand. That is, it is essentially an attempt to present a licit, methodical and reasonable approach to understanding and actualizing the practical and conceptual desires of Benedict XVI for mutual liturgical enrichment.

Chapter I, as the sort of front bookend, set context. It traced a history of permission for use of the Extraordinary Form since the time the Ordinary Form was about to be promulgated. In this we discovered how we arrived at the time and situation in the Western Church that allowed *Summorum Pontificum* and *Con grande fiducia* to be introduced into the *ius vigens*.

Chapters II and III, as the internal layers, addressed the specific requests of Benedict origins of liturgical observances in the West and how these developed into the calendars

that govern each Form of the Mass. We observed that the Extraordinary Form may truly be enriched by the inclusion of Saints canonized since its publication, even if only with particular calendars, an example of which is provided in Appendix II. This provides a tangible example that the desire of Benedict XVI for enrichment of the Roman Calendar can be done, with respect for the laws governing both liturgical Forms. *Cum sanctissima* actualized the beginning of the specific matter of mutual liturgical enrichment by modifying the understanding of *Missa festiva latiore sensu*, while allowing the provision to be observed *ad libitum*.

Chapter III undertook a similar study, tracing the origins and development of the Eucharistic Prefaces. The study revealed the wealth of Eucharistic Prefaces found in the Western Church, despite periods of aberration. Among the plethora of texts that were entered into the Ordinary Form, there are several that share the same history, style and mind of those found in *MR/1962*. With history and law in mind, the fruit of research is presented in Appendix V, Eucharistic Prefaces used in the Ordinary Form that could be used to enrich the Missal of the Extraordinary Form, as requested by Benedict XVI. *Quo magis* has manifested some criteria and exposed to some degree the methodology at work in the highest levels of juridic authority in regard to mutual liturgical enrichment. It has reinforced the work of Chapter III and the accompanying Appendix V.

Chapter IV, the sort of back bookend, likewise included historical and juridical considerations. These were presented in order to ground what would become goals and principles for the practical application of enrichment of the Ordinary Form, lacking the sort of specific direction provided by *Summorum Pontificum* and *Con grande fiducia* that the subjects of Chapters II and III possessed. As Benedict XVI expressed his desire for mutual

liturgical enrichment, we hope that this study and its accompanying proposals have provided some direction and has provided some answers to the hopeful question, raised by Dr. Chad Glendinning, of how mutual enrichment could be accomplished.

Several significant questions have been raised by this work, many of which have been set aside for practical reasons. A basic question that could be pursued is simply: What is the “Roman Rite” to which Benedict XVI refers in *SP* and *CGF* and to which Francis refers in *TC*? There is no ostensible clear and definitive answer to what the term “Roman Rite” means in light of its usage in *SP* and *TC*.

A significant contribution to the field of canon law could be made by a close study of c. 846, §1 and its applicability to the enactment of mutual liturgical enrichment. Such a study would necessarily examine the applicability of c. 14 and the doubt of law; this might include some dialogue with the Holy See. Conclusions of such a study could be vital to eliminating the vexing difficulty of those ambiguous kinds of mutual liturgical enrichment by defining the authority under which they could be applied practically. Meanwhile, one must depend upon the scholarship of a few and that provided herein.

Furthermore, one may conjecture on the future of the Roman Missals themselves. One might study the possibility and practicality of the convergence of the two Missals in use. Cardinal Sarah may have intimated this when he mentioned “return to a common reformed rite.”¹²⁸⁶ Perhaps in future, the two Missals will have enriched each other to such a degree that they would differ only as much as, for instance, ferial and solemnity celebrations differ

¹²⁸⁶ “... retourner à un rite commun réformé...” R. SARAH, “Pour une réconciliation liturgique,” on *La Nef*, July-August 2017, <http://lanef.net/2017/12/02/pour-une-reconciliation-liturgique/> (11 January 2022). Translations are my own. One may conjecture about the meaning of his term “common reformed rite.” This could be a reference to the post-Tridentine reforms or even the Gregorian reforms, among others.

in either Form today or as much as the Forms of the Divine Liturgy in the Churches of Byzantine practice.

On the other hand, influences might arise that we cannot at present imagine. One may consider that the Missals would in fact become more diversified and reflect, to a degree, what existed in Western liturgical practice prior to *Quo primum*. That is to say, perhaps the Mass will become more localized, returning to more “Gallican” practices in some areas and more local practices in others, yet still recognizably Roman. Perhaps diocesan or regional Missals will develop in a way that existed in the pre-Tridentine era.

A more distantly related study, as mentioned above in Chapter IV, would be a close examination of *TC*. Such a study could aim to determine in detail what of *SP* has been revoked manifestly and/or doubtfully by *TC* and what of prior law remains unaffected and may be harmonized with *TC*.

Because of the rate at which some changes in the Mass liturgies of the Latin Church have taken place recently, it is useful to engage in some speculation, since additional acts or clarifications may be forthcoming.

One consideration involves how Benedict XVI spoke of liturgical reconciliation by means of mutual liturgical enrichment while Francis spoke of accomplishing it by means of bringing celebration of the EF to an end. When one considers the expression of the CDWDS that the goal is to achieve “a single and identical prayer” in the Roman Rite, it raises the question of whether this goal is desirable or achievable. In a word, this plan to bring the EF to an end throughout the Church may not last through subsequent pontificates. Chapter I demonstrated the vacillations that have taken place historically in allowances for

celebration of the *usus antiquior*; there is no reason to believe that similar would not or could not take place in future.

Another consideration involves the suppression of *MR/1962* and the presumption that the remaining OF would then no longer be open to further enrichment. When considering liturgical history, as liturgiologists would testify and as demonstrated herein, it is clear that ritual forms have changed and evolved over the course of history. There is no reason to think this would no longer take place. Even if its use were suppressed, *MR/1962* is one of the major source texts of the OF Missal; it remains an important precursor. At the same time, *MR/1962* remains an influence in future developments to the Mass liturgy of the Latin Church. This statement can be made because, even without Benedict's call for mutual enrichment, there is at least nascent recognition in the *ius vigens*, that is, in *GIRM* no. 42, that the *usus antiquior* remains influential to OF celebrations.

A third consideration is that, if use of *MR/1962* were to be suppressed,¹²⁸⁷ liturgical enrichment would become moot. When speculation is lent to such a situation, it could be stated on the other hand that enrichment of the OF would then become more relevant and even necessary in order to achieve liturgical reconciliation. Otherwise, suppression of the EF would be a matter of forced compliance and of practical liturgical enforcement, with a degree of rigor not hitherto experienced in the Roman Rite. Such action runs the risk of creating the retrospective appearance that Francis' participation in the call for liturgical reconciliation has been disingenuous.

Finally, the plan begun in *TC* and made clear in the *Responsa* to end the EF may not come to fruition. There have been attempts at ritual reforms in the past that have not been

¹²⁸⁷ The same consideration may be given within the current context of restricting use of *MR/1962*, rather than its utter suppression.

successful.¹²⁸⁸ Just as Francis's plan is to revert to the past by replacing or reversing Benedict's legislation, so subsequent pontiffs could do the same with that of Francis.

In any event, would that what has been presented in this dissertation initiate, facilitate and encourage further examination by means of academic research and practical experimentation. It is my hope that the role of canonist will come to be respected within the realm of the greater expanse of ecclesiastical law, so much of which is liturgical law. Perhaps Baldovin's adopted motto that the liturgy is too important to be entrusted to liturgists is somehow illuminated by the participation of a canon lawyer.

¹²⁸⁸ For instance, there was *Urbis et orbis evulgato*, from the Sacred Congregation of Rites just twenty-two days after Pius X's *motu proprio De diebus festis* by which several liturgical innovations of Pius X were reversed, as cited in section 2.8.2 above. More recently and by experience, the 1998 reformed *Rite for Exorcism* so lacked reception, at least in English translation, that it could be said to have been rejected, largely, though not exclusively, because it lacked the Imperative Formula for exorcism in favor of a strictly Deprecative Formula that did not seem to be so effective. Consequently, the 1614 Rite which it was intended to replace became optional. The new Rite was emended in 2004 and an updated version released in 2017 that includes the Imperative Formula. This is an example of a reform that failed but was rehabilitated due to enrichment from the older ritual. See UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *The Roman Ritual, Renewed by Decree of the Most Holy Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican and Promulgated by authority of Pope John Paul II, Exorcisms and Related Supplications, for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America*, Washington, DC, USCCB, 2017, 28-31. For a full examination of this revision and the forms it has taken, see GROB, J. A Major Revision of the Discipline of Exorcism: A Comparative Study on the Liturgical Laws in the 1614 and 1998 Rites of Exorcism, Doctoral Dissertation, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law, Saint Paul University, 2007, esp. 170.

APPENDIX I

DECREE *CUM SANCTISSIMA*

CONGREGATIO PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

Prot. no. 137/2009S - ED

DECRETUM

[§1] Cum sanctissima resplendeat in virtutibus Sanctorum virtus ipsa Iesu Christi, cumque semper proponenda sint fidelibus exempla eorundem Sanctorum¹²⁸⁹ Benedictus PP. XVI Epistula die VII mensis Iulii a. D. MMVII data Pontificiae Commissioni “Ecclesia Dei” mandavit ut quidam eorum, qui recentioribus decenniis Sanctorum Albo ascripti erant, secundum formam quoque extraordinariam Ritus Romani coli possent.¹²⁹⁰ Nam “maximopere decet ut qui sanctus est apud Deum, sanctus etiam ab hominibus habeatur,”¹²⁹¹ et “quia non parum prodest christifidelibus nova semper habere exempla virtutum quae imitentur.”¹²⁹²

[§2] Pontificia enim Commissio “Ecclesia Dei”, quae eam sententiam per Instructionem *Universae Ecclesiae* confirmaverat,¹²⁹³ aggressa est quaestionem num Servi Dei in Catalogum Sanctorum nuper relati veteri Missali commode inseri possint. Investigationem igitur hanc ab illa Pontificia Commissione inchoatam Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei modo absolvit, postquam Litteris Apostolicis die XVII mensis Ianuarii a.D.

¹²⁸⁹ See PIUS XII, Litt. enc. *Mediator Dei*, in *AAS*, 39 (1947), 581; CONCILIUM VATICANUM II, Const. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 104.

¹²⁹⁰ BENEDICTUS XVI, Epistula ad Episcopos ad producendas Litteras Apostolicas Motu Proprio datas, de Usu Liturgiae Romanae Institutioni anni 1970 praecedentis, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 798.

¹²⁹¹ BENEDICT XIV, *De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Canonizatione*, Lib. I, Cap. XIII, 2.

¹²⁹² *Ibid.*, 5.

¹²⁹³ PONTIFICIA COMMISSIO “ECCLESIA DEI,” Instructio ad exsequendas Litteras Apostolicas Summorum Pontificum a S. S. Benedicto PP. XVI Motu Proprio datas, in *AAS*, 103 (2011), 413-420, no. 25.

MMXIX motu proprio datis Summus Pontifex Franciscus omnia munera illius Commissionis in hanc Congregationem transtulit.¹²⁹⁴

[§3] Quapropter Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, consultis nonnullis institutis religiosis, societatibus vitae apostolicae, et viris peritis usui antiquiori illigatis, necnon Em.mo Card. Praefecto Congregationis de Cultu Divino et Disciplina Sacramentorum, infrascriptas normas ad cultum Sanctorum in forma extraordinaria fovendum adprobavit, firmis vero manentibus concessionibus kalendariorum vel festorum particularium a S. Sede hucusque datis.

[1°] Missa festiva latiore sensu (cf. RGMR 302) celebrari potest iusta de causa omnibus diebus festis III classis (iis exceptis de quibus inferius sub no. 8) necnon in vigiliis de Sanctis III classis.

[2°] Praeterea, quod attinet ad RGMR 302 c), permittitur etiam Missa cuiuslibet Sancti Catalogo Sanctorum post diem XXVI mensis Iulii a.D. MCMLX ascripti, eo nempe die quo memoriam liturgicam eiusdem ab Ecclesia Universa recoli statutum est. Missa autem votiva eiusdem item permittitur ad normam RGMR 311, servatis aliis rubricis de Missis votivis.

[3°] Quotiens dicitur Missa festiva latiore sensu, integrum Officium divinum cum Missa concordans absolvi potest, velut Officium ordinarium (RGR 169).

[4°] Commemoratio ordinaria de festo aut vigilia omissa iuxta ea quae in nos. 1-3 statuuntur semper fit cum aliis commemorationibus occurrentibus iuxta rubricas, servata RG 111 d).

¹²⁹⁴ FRANCISCUS, Litterae Apostolicae Motu Proprio datae de Pontificia Commissione “Ecclesia Dei,” die 17 Ianuarii 2019.

[5°] Ad formulam Missae et Officii secundum suprascriptas ordinationes eligendam, nisi habetur in Proprio Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis Missalis Romani anni MCMLXII vel in eius novo Supplemento a S. Sede approbato, sumitur de Communi Missalis vel Breviarii. Quotiens in eodem Communi plures exstant formulae, electio fit ad libitum celebrantis. Formulae autem quae recensentur in praedicto Proprio Sanctorum vel Supplemento adhiberi debent eo die quo in iis habetur.

[6°] Commemoratio praeterea ordinaria ad libitum celebrantis admitti potest de Sancto vel Mysterio eo die quo recensetur in Proprio Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis vel in novo Supplemento tam in Missa quam in Officio diebus liturgicis III vel IV classis, servata RG 111 d).

[7°] Indomibus institutorum religiosorum vel societatum vitae apostolicae superiori domus, haud celebranti, competit decernere modum fruendi his ordinationibus in missa conventuali necnon in officio choraliter vel communiter celebrato.

[8°] Dies festi III classis qui his ordinationibus neque impediri neque omitti possunt enumerantur in sequenti tabella. Dieta festa celebrari possunt etiam in feriis III classis Quadragesimae et Passionis, facta commemoratione ferire iuxta rubricas.

Quaecumque hoc Decreto statuta sunt, a die XIX mensis Martii huius anni, in festo S. Ioseph, Sponsi Beatae Mariae Virginis, Confessoris et Ecclesiae Universae Patroni, servantur, contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Summus Pontifex Franciscus, in Audientia die V mensis Decembris a.D. MMXIX infrascripto Archiepiscopo Secretario Congregationis pro Doctrina Fidei concessa, hoc Decretum ratum habuit et publici iuris fieri iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Congregationis pro Doctrina Fidei, die XXII mensis Februarii a.D. MMXX, in festo Cathedrae S. Petri Apostoli.

Aloisius F. Card. Ladaria, S.I., Congregationis pro Doctrina Fidei Praefectus

✠ Iacobus Morandi, Archiepiscopus tit. Caeretanus, Secretarius

**Adnexus decreto diei XXII Februarii MMXX
Elenchus dierum festorum III Classis qui non impediri possunt**

Ianuarius

17 S. Antonii Abb.
20 Ss. Fabiani Papae et Sebastiani Mm.
21 S. Agnetis Virg. et Mart.
24 S. Timothei Ep. et Mart.
25 In Conversione S. Pauli Ap.
26 S. Polycarpi Ep. et Mart.
27 S. Ioannis Chrysostomi Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
29 S. Francisci Salesii Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
31 S. Ioannis Bosco Conf.

Februarius

01 S. Ignatii Ep. et Mart.
05 S. Agathae Virg. et Mart.
06 S. Titi Ep. et Conf.

Martius

06 Ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis Mm.
07 S. Thomae de Aquino Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
09 S. Franciscae Romanae, Vid.
12 S. Gregorii I Papae, Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
21 S. Benedicti Abb.

24 S. Gabrielis Archang.

Aprilis

11 S. Leonis I Papae, Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
14 S. Iustini Mart.
30 S. Catharinae Senensis Virg.

Maius

02 S. Athanasii, Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
04 S. Monicae Vid.
05 S. Pii V Papae et Conf.
09 S. Gregorii Nazianzeni Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
25 S. Gregorii VII Papae et Conf.
26 S. Philippi Neri Conf.

Iunius

05 Bonifatii Ep. et Mart.
11 S. Barnabae Ap.
13 S. Antonii de Padua Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
14 S. Basilii Magni Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.
21 S. Aloisii Gonzagae Conf.

30 In Commemoratione S. Pauli Ap.

Iulius

07 Ss. Cyrilli et Methodii Epp. et Cc.

14 S. Bonaventurae Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.

19 S. Vincentii a Paulo Conf.

22 S. Mariae Magdalenae Paenitentis

29 S. Marthae Virg.

31 S. Ignatii Conf.

Augustus

02 S. Alfonsi Mariae de Ligorio Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.

04 S. Dominici Conf.

05 In Dedicatione S. Mariae ad Nives

08 S. Ioannis Mariae Vianney Conf.

12 S. Clarae Virg.

20 S. Bernardi Abbatis et Eccl. Doct.

28 S. Augustini Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.

29 In Decollatione S. Ioannis Bapt.

September

03 S. Pii X Papae et Conf.

12 Sanctissimi Nominis B. Mariae Virg.

16 Ss. Comelii et Cypriani Ep., Mm.

27 Ss. Cosmae e Damiani Mm.

30 S. Hieronymi Presb., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.

October

02 Ss. Angelorum Custodum

03 S. Teresiae a Iesu Infante Virg.

04 S. Francisci Conf.

06 S. Brunonis Conf.

14 S. Callisti I Papae et Mart.

15 S. Teresiae Virg.

November

04 S. Caroli Ep. et Conf.

11 S. Martini Ep. et Conf.

14 S. Iosaphat Ep. et Mart.

18 In Dedicatione Basilicarum Ss. Petri et Pauli App.

22 S. Caeciliae Virg. et Mart.

23 S. Clementis I Papae et Mart.

24 S. Ioannis a Cruce Conf. et Eccl. Doct.

December

03 S. Francisci Xaverii Conf.

06 S. Nicolai Ep. et Conf.

07 S. Ambrosii Ep., Conf. et Eccl. Doct.

11 S. Damasi I Papae et Conf.

13 S. Luciae Virg. et Mart

NOTA PRAEVIA OF DECREE CUM SANCTISSIMA

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH

Prot. no. 137/2009S – ED

[§1] With the Decree *Cum sanctissima* of 22 February 2020, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which since January 2019 deals with those matters formerly assigned to the Pontifical Commission “*Ecclesia Dei*,”¹²⁹⁵ completed the work initiated several years earlier by that Commission in order to fulfill the mandate given by Pope Benedict XVI to facilitate the celebration of more recently canonized Saints according to the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite.¹²⁹⁶ Indeed, since the Sanctoral of the *forma extraordinaria* is determined by the liturgical books in force in 1962, Saints canonized thereafter were not included therein.

[§2] The studies carried out in order to develop a practical solution for the liturgical celebration of more recent Saints in the *Usus Antiquior* provided an opportunity to address the many issues that this matter raises, such as the density of the existing calendar (particularly as regards III class feasts), the consideration of all the repercussions of any potential changes, the always preferable consistency between Mass and the Divine Office, and the matter of the liturgical texts to be used.

¹²⁹⁵ See Francis, *Apostolic Letter in the form of Motu Proprio on the Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei,”* 17 January 2019.

¹²⁹⁶ “New Saints (...) can and should be inserted in the old Missal. The “*Ecclesia Dei*” Commission, in contact with various bodies devoted to the *Usus Antiquior*, will study the practical possibilities in this regard”: Benedict XVI, *Letter to the Bishops on the occasion of the publication of the Apostolic Letter “Motu Proprio Data” Summorum Pontificum on the use of the Roman Liturgy prior to the reform of 1970*, AAS 99 (2007) 798. This mandate was further confirmed and completed in 2011 by the Instruction *Universae Ecclesiae* of the same Pontifical Commission: See Pontifical Commission “*Ecclesia Dei*”, Instruction on the Application of the Apostolic Letter Summorum Pontificum of His Holiness Benedict XVI given Motu Proprio, n. 25, AAS 103 (2011) 418.

In this context, it appeared that rather than dealing with this or that more recent Saint, it would be more appropriate to lay down a general principle that would enable, within the general rubrical context of the *forma extraordinaria*, and when the liturgical day permits, the celebration of any Saint canonized after the 1960's, on the date of their proper feast.

[§3] Specifically, the Decree broadens the scope of *missae festivae latiore sensu* referred to in no. 302-c of the *Rubricae Generales Missalis Romani* (which hitherto only applied to IV Class days), to several III class feasts and to III class vigils¹²⁹⁷ (cf. Decree, no. 1). It is therefore clear that the new provisions will not in any way affect other celebrations, and those of I Class or II Class. In addition, the Decree specifies that *missae festivae latiore sensu* may be celebrated in honor of Saints canonized after 26 July 1960 (which is the date of the last amendment to the Martyrology of the *forma extraordinaria*), on their respective liturgical feast day (no. 2).

[§4] With this principle in mind, the other provisions of the Decree give the necessary indications that derive therefrom, such as the applicability to the Divine Office, which in such a case is to be celebrated in full in honor of the Saint (no. 3), the requirement to make a commemoration of potentially occurring III class feasts, as the case may be (no. 4), and the rules relating to the selection of the liturgical texts to be used (no. 5). Regarding this point, one should note the three successive sources from which texts are to be drawn, namely in the first place the *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis* which already exists in the Missal of the *forma extraordinaria*, secondly a special Supplement to be published

¹²⁹⁷ In fact, there is only one such III class vigil in the calendar of the *forma extraordinaria*, namely that of St. Lawrence on 9 August. On this subject one may be reminded that from 1568 until the *Codex Rubricarum* of 1960, non-privileged vigils such as that of St. Lawrence were of the *simplex* rite, and accordingly, when they fell in occurrence with a *semiduplex* or *duplex* [aka, semidouble or double] feast of a Saint, that feast would prevail over the vigil. With the reform enacted under St. Pius X in 1911-1914, in non-conventual Masses the celebrant could, in certain cases, choose between the Mass of the occurring Saint or the Mass of the vigil (see *Additiones et variationes in rubricis Missalis*, no. 1).

by the Holy See in the future, and finally, should the two former sources be lacking, the existing *Commune Sanctorum*.

[§5] It is noteworthy that the celebration of more recent Saints pursuant to the new provisions is a mere possibility, and therefore it remains optional. Accordingly, those who wish to continue to celebrate the Saints according to the existing calendar of the *forma extraordinaria* as it appears in the liturgical books, remain free to do so. In relation to this, one should be reminded that the existence of optional feasts in honor of the Saints is not a complete novelty in the Roman Rite, given that throughout the post-Tridentine period, and up until the rubrical reform conducted by Pope St. Pius X, the calendar included no fewer than twenty-five such so-called *ad libitum* feasts.

[§6] The new Decree also opens a further possibility for cases in which while following the existing calendar, one wishes at the same time to honor eventual other occurring Saints. Specifically, according to no. 6 of the Decree, an *ad libitum* commemoration of an occurring Saint may be made, if said Saint appears in the *Proprium pro aliquibus locis* or in the future special Supplement.

[§7] In choosing whether to make use of the provisions of the Decree in liturgical celebrations in honor of the Saints, the celebrant is expected to make use of good pastoral common sense. As regards the case of celebrations in Religious Institutes and Societies of Apostolic Life, no. 7 of the Decree provides some useful clarification.

[§8] The Decree concludes (no. 8) with reference to a list of seventy III class feasts that may never be impeded by its provisions. This list, which is provided as an appendix, reflects the particular importance of the feasts in question, on the basis of precise criteria, e.g., the importance of these respective Saints in the Plan of Salvation or in the history of

the Church, their importance in terms of either the devotion they have generated or their writings, or the antiquity of their worship in Rome.

APPENDIX II

A PROPOSED EXTRAORDINARY FORM *PROPRIUM SANCTORUM*

Presented below is a tangible proposal for insertion of feasts from the OF particular calendars of Canada and the United States of America into the EF calendar, thereby producing a possible *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis* for each territory. This has been created by application of the knowledge gleaned and tools gained in Chapter II. The creation has taken place in ways consistent with more recent juridic documents governing creation of juridic documents coupled with similar documents that govern the *MR/1960* and guided by the provisions and restrictions of *Cum sanctissima*.¹²⁹⁸ It is appropriate to make some general comments prior to proceeding.

According to *Decreto Sacrae Congregationis Rituum*, celebrations listed in particular calendars are observed with the ranks transferred as follows: I Class become Solemnities; II Class become Feasts; III Class become Obligatory Memorials; Commemorations become Optional Memorials.¹²⁹⁹ This is easily used in the converse as well.

¹²⁹⁸ Most of the Saints and *Beati* to be overlaid upon the *GRC/1960* from the particular calendars in question will translate to the rank of Commemoration from that of Optional Memorial. In addition to a rank of Feast, “Commemoration” may refer to a second and/or third Saint or *Beatus* appearing on the same day, or it may refer to the Commemoration of another feast that falls on the day due to occurrence or concurrence, or vice-versa. It should be noted that Commemorations are either Privileged or Ordinary. Privileged Commemorations are made at all Masses; Ordinary Commemorations are made only at conventual and low Masses. Privileged Commemorations are Commemorations of Sunday, I Class days, days within the Octave of Christmas, Ember Days of September, ferias of Advent, Lent and Passiontide as well as the Greater Litanies. All other Commemorations are Ordinary Commemorations. On I Class liturgical days and in sung non-conventual Masses, only a Privileged Commemoration is allowed. On II Class Sundays, only one Commemoration, that of a II Class feast is allowed. This is omitted if a Privileged Commemoration must be made. On other II Class liturgical days, only one Commemoration is allowed, either one Privileged or one Ordinary. To our interests, on III and IV Class liturgical days, two Commemorations are allowed. Any Commemoration that exceeds the number allowed for the individual liturgical day is omitted (see *Novum rubricarum*, nos. 106-111, 114). The Commemoration of St. Paul is always made in the Office and Mass of St. Peter, and vice-versa. This Commemoration is termed inseparable; the two prayers are considered to be united in such a way that, in counting the number of prayers, they are reckoned only as one.

¹²⁹⁹ SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction *Decreto Sacrae Congregationis Rituum* on the interim adaptation of particular calendars, 29 June 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 283, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 480, 1244, here, 1244, no. 2, a-d.

When overlaying the OF calendars of Canada and of the United States of America onto the GRC/1960, some incompatibilities emerge. Each is highlighted with a proposed solution. Repeated difficulties are addressed with the proposal of solutions that may be applied typically.

The OF calendar for the Dioceses of Canada contains thirty-one celebrations¹³⁰⁰ and that for the Dioceses of the United States of America contains twenty-four celebrations.¹³⁰¹ Not all of these are unique; some appear in the Roman Calendar assigned to a different date and/or with a differing rank. Difficulties with ranking are treated within the footnotes.

Because most celebrations in the existing OF particular calendars translate to the rank of Commemoration from that of Optional Memorial, they have only a proper Collect assigned to them; this would replace use of the Collect from the Common.¹³⁰² Orations provided in complete Mass formularies would replace those in the Common. Several celebrations have optional scripture readings for application to the Common in the revised *OLM*. In both forms, celebrations that rank below that of Solemnity have only one non-

¹³⁰⁰ Approved by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 27 January 2016, prot. no. 32/16, available at <https://www.cccb.ca/liturgy-sacraments/resources-in-english/liturgical-calendar> (11 January 2022).

¹³⁰¹ Approved by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See (last updated: 23 September 2015) and confirmed by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, prot. no. 578/10/L, 24 July 2010), available at <https://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/liturgical-year-and-calendar/proper-calendar> (11 January 2021).

¹³⁰² The proper texts in Latin may be obtained from the respective episcopal conference. Some editions of *MR/1962* for the United States of America printed in 1962 contain the post-1960 revision of the *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis* for the United States in appendix “*Missae Speciales*” (see *Missale Romanum ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio Iuxta Typicam*, New York, NY, Benziger Brothers, 1962, Appendix, 1-12). Some other bindings retain the 1959 version of the *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis* preceding the revisions in *Missae Propriae dioecesium Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis*, from the “2° trimestre 1959” (see *Missale Romanum ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio Prima Iuxta Typicam*, Rome, Mame, 1962, Appendix, 1-19). Having both versions of the *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis* is useful for comparative purposes but most especially for the euchological texts they contain, sometimes complete Mass formularies.

Gospel reading. The single non-Gospel text and the Gospel text itself could be applied from the *OLM* to the Common.¹³⁰³

The proposal is not for a single particular calendar for the dioceses of both countries. Rather, both countries are presented in a single presentation so as to avoid repetition. Celebrations proper to each calendar are denoted as such. Days and feasts that are affected by celebrations belonging to either country are in ***bold italics***. Feasts enumerated by *Cum sanctissima* that are not permitted to be impeded are included in the chart for the sake of graphic reference.

¹³⁰³ This is not the equivalent of the proposal made by the PCED above suggesting the new *OLM* would be imposed upon the Mass of the Catechumens in *MR/1962*. Rather, only direct insertion of the texts of the Epistle and Gospel is proposed, optionally, with no other modification to the Mass of the Catechumens.

A *Proprium Sanctorum* Proposed for Use in Canada and the United States¹³⁰⁴**January**

04: Feria. *St. Elizabeth Ann Seton, Religious, III Class.*¹³⁰⁵ **

05: St. Telesphorus, Pope Martyr, Comm. *St. John Neumann, Bishop, III Class.* **

06: Feria. *St. André Bessette, Religious, Comm.*¹³⁰⁶ ***

07: Feria. *St. André Bessette, Religious, III Class.*

Sunday between 2 and 8 January: *Permanent External Feast of the Epiphany of the Lord, I Class*

08: Feria.¹³⁰⁷

12: Feria. *St. Marguerite Bourgeoys, Virgin, III Class.*

17: (CS) St. Anthony, Abbot, III Class.

20: (CS) Ss. Fabian, Pope and Sebastian, Martyrs, III Class.

21: (CS) St. Agnes, Virgin and Martyr, III Class

22: Ss. Vincent and Anastasius, Martyrs, III Class. *Day of Prayer for the Legal Protection of Unborn Children, Comm.* ¹³⁰⁸

23: St. Emerentiana, Virgin Martyr, Comm.; St. Vincent, Deacon Martyr, Comm.

*St. Raymond of Peñafort, Confessor, III Class.*¹³⁰⁹

*St. Marianne Cope, Virgin, Comm.*¹³¹⁰ ****

¹³⁰⁴ Some conventions:

“(CS)” denotes the seventy III Class feasts that may never be impeded by the provisions of decree *Cum sanctissima* (see Decree *Cum sanctissima*, Appendix, and *Nota praevia*, §9).

Asterisks indicate the degree of texts extant in the 1956 and 1961 *Proprium Sanctorum pro aliquibus locis* for the United States of America, as cited above, in the following manner:

* Contains texts of complete proper Mass formulary.

** Contains texts of all three proper Orations.

*** Contains text of proper Collect only.

**** No texts provided; formulary taken entirely from the appropriate Common.

¹³⁰⁵ All three Orations are available in the EF. A proper Epistle and Gospel, when provided in the *OLM*, could be taken therefrom, at the discretion of the celebrant. Typ.

¹³⁰⁶ A proper Collect exists. The remainder could be taken from the Common as if for III Class. A proper Epistle and Gospel, when provided in the *OLM*, could be taken therefrom, at the discretion of the celebrant. Typ.

¹³⁰⁷ See note for 23 January.

¹³⁰⁸ In places in the United States in which the EF is celebrated, by decree of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the “Votive Mass for Peace” is said in honor of the *Day of Prayer for the Legal Protection of Unborn Children* for the anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*. When 22 January falls on Sunday, this is observed on 23 January (see *GIRM/2000usa*, no. 373).

¹³⁰⁹ Observation: St. Raymond of Peñafort is inscribed in the Canadian Particular Calendar for 8 January as a commemoration. Difficulty: The celebration of St. Raymond of Peñafort is present in *GRC/1960* on 23 January with the higher rank of III Class feast. Solution: Retain the date of 23 January from *GRC/1960*, as required by *GNLYC*, no. 50. Typ.

¹³¹⁰ The Commemoration of St. Marianne Cope would impede either the Commemoration of St. Emerentiana or of St. Vincent (see *Novum rubricarum*, 111, d). This is permitted by the following determination of competent authority: On 10 July 2013, the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments confirmed the inscription of Saint Marianne Cope, Virgin, into the Proper Calendar for the Dioceses of the United States of America, with the rank of Optional Memorial, celebrated on 23 January. Her proper liturgical texts in English and Spanish were confirmed the following day. On this

- 24: (CS) St. Timothy, Bishop and Martyr, III Class.
 25: (CS) The Conversion of St. Paul, Apostle, III Class, St. Peter Apostle, Comm.
 26: (CS) St. Polycarp, Bishop and Martyr, III Class.
 27: (CS) St. John Chrysostom, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.
 29: (CS) St. Francis de Sales, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.
 31: (CS) St. John Bosco, Confessor, III Class.

February

The particular calendars approved for use in each country in the OF and the former *Proprium Sanctorum* for the United States of America do not contain particular celebrations in the month of February.¹³¹¹

- 01: (CS) St. Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr, III Class.
 05: (CS) St. Agatha, Virgin and Martyr, III Class.
 06: (CS) St. Titus, Bishop and Confessor, III Class; St. Dorothy Virgin and Martyr, Comm.

March

03: Feria. *Katharine Drexel, Virgin, Comm.*  ***

- 06: (CS) Ss. Perpetua and Felicity, Martyrs, III Class.
 07: (CS) St. Thomas Aquinas, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.
 09: (CS) St. Frances of Rome, Widow, III Class.
 12: (CS) St. Gregory I, Pope, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.
 19: *St. Joseph, Spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Confessor and Patron of the Universal Church, Principal Patron of Canada.*¹³¹² 
 21: (CS) St. Benedict, Abbot, III Class.
 24: (CS) St. Gabriel, Archangel, III Class.

April

- 11: (CS) St. Leo I, Pope, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.
 14: (CS) St. Justin, Martyr, III Class; Ss. Tiburtius, Valerian, and Maximus Martyrs, Comm.

same date is celebrated the Optional Memorial of Saint Vincent, Deacon and Martyr, which was transferred from 22 January to make place the Day of Prayer for the Legal Protection of Unborn Children. In years when that is transferred from 22 January to 23 January, the liturgical celebrations of both St. Vincent and St. Marianne Cope are omitted. Apart from the proper Collect, the orations are taken from the Common of Virgins. See <https://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/liturgical-year-and-calendar/saint-marianne-cope> (11 January 2022).

¹³¹¹ Additionally, the following note appears in *GRC/1960*: “In leap year the month of February is of 29 days, and the feast of St. Matthias is celebrated on the 25th day and the feast of St. Gabriel of Our Lady of Sorrows on the 28th day of February, and twice is said *Sexto Kalendas*, that is on the 24th and 25th; and the dominical letter, which was taken up in the month of January, is changed to the preceding; that, if in January, the dominical letter was A, it is changed to the preceding, which is g, etc.; and the letter f is kept twice, on the 24th and 25th.” “In anno bissextili mensis februius est dierum 29, et festum S. Matthiae celebratur die 25 ac festum S. Gabrielis a Virgine Perdolente die 28 februarii, et bis dicitur *Sexto Kalendas*, id est die 24 et die 25; et littera dominicalis, quae assumpta fuit in mense ianuario, mutatur in praecedentem; ut, si in Ianuario, littera dominicalis fuerit A, mutetur in praecedentem, quae est g, etc.; et littera f bis servit, 24 et 25.”

¹³¹² The celebration of the principal Patron of a nation or ecclesiastical region is inscribed as a I Class feast (*Novum rubricarum*, 42, a.). Typical.

17: St. Anicetus, Pope and Martyr, Comm. ***St. Kateri Tekakwitha, Virgin, III Class.*** 🇨🇦

18: Feria. ***Bl. Marie-Anne Blondin, Virgin, Comm.*** 🇨🇦

26: Ss. Cletus and Marcellinus, Popes and Martyrs, III Class. ***Our Lady of Good Counsel, Comm.***¹³¹³ 🇨🇦

30: (CS) St. Catherine of Siena, Virgin, III Class. ***St. Marie de l'Incarnation, Rel., Comm.***¹³¹⁴ 🇨🇦

May

02: (CS) St. Athanasius, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.

04: (CS) St. Monica, Widow, III Class.

Bl. Marie-Léonie Paradis, Virgin, Comm. 🇨🇦

05: (CS) ***St. Pius V, Pope and Confessor, III Class.*** 🇨🇦¹³¹⁵

06: Feria.

St. François de Laval, Bishop, III Class. 🇨🇦

08: Feria.

Bl. Catherine de Saint-Augustin, Virgin, III Class. 🇨🇦

09: (CS) St. Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.

15: St. John Baptist de la Salle, Conf., III Class. ***St. Isidore, Confessor, Comm.*** 🇺🇸 ***

21: Feria. ***St. Eugène de Mazenod, Bishop, Comm.*** 🇨🇦

24: Feria. ***Bl. Louis-Zéphirin Moreau, Bishop, Comm.*** 🇨🇦

25: (CS) St. Gregory VII, Pope and Confessor, III Class; St. Urban I, Pope and Martyr, Comm.

26: (CS) St. Philip Neri, Confessor, III Class; St. Eleutherius, Pope and Martyr, Comm.

Thursday of the Fifth Week after Easter: ***Ascension, I Class.*** 🇺🇸

Sunday after Ascension: ***External Feast of the Ascension in all dioceses of Canada, I Class.*** 🇨🇦

Sunday after Ascension: ***External Feast of the Ascension in some dioceses of the United States of America, I Class.*** 🇺🇸

Second Sunday after Pentecost: ***External Solemnity of Corpus Christi Perm. Transferred, II Class.*** 🇨🇦 🇺🇸

First Sunday after Easter: ***Divine Mercy Sunday.***¹³¹⁶

Last Monday: ***Memorial Day, Comm.*** 🇺🇸

June

05: (CS) St. Boniface, Bishop and Martyr, III Class.

¹³¹³ Simple Commemoration with proper Collect. Typ.

¹³¹⁴ Observation: St. Catherine of Siena is one of the III Class days which, according to the provisions and restrictions of *Cum sanctissima*, may not be impeded. Difficulty: St. Marie de l'Incarnation in the Canadian Particular Calendar is inscribed on this same date with the rank of Obligatory Memorial, which translates into III Class. Because two III Class feasts cannot be celebrated concomitantly and St. Catherine of Siena cannot be impeded, the feast of St. Marie de l'Incarnation can never be observed as a III Class feast. Solution: Reduce observance of the feast of St. Marie de l'Incarnation to that of Commemoration.

¹³¹⁵ Observation: The Feast of St. Pius V is inscribed in the Canadian Particular Calendar for 1 May as an Obligatory Memorial, which translates to a III Class feast. Difficulty: St. Pius V is already present in *GRC/1960* on 5 May with the same rank of III Class feast. Solution: Retain the date of 5 May in *GRC/1960*, as required by *GNLYC*, no. 50. Typ.

¹³¹⁶ It would be reconciling if this title for the Sunday after Easter to be extended to the OF.

11: (CS) St. Barnabas, Apostle, III Class.

13: (CS) St. Anthony of Padua, Confessor, III Class.

14: (CS) St. Basil the Great, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.

21: (CS) St. Aloysius Gonzaga, Confessor, III Class.

27: Feria. ***Bl. Nykyta Budka and Vasyl Velychkowsky, Bishops and Martyrs, Comm.*** 🇺🇸

Sunday after 29 June, when it falls on a weekday: ***External Solemnity of Ss. Peter and Paul, II Class.***¹³¹⁷ 🇺🇸

30: (CS) St. Paul, Apostle, III Class, Com. of St. Peter, Apostle.

July

01: The Most Precious Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, I Class.

Canada Day (concomitantly Memorial Day in Newfoundland and Labrador), Comm. 🇺🇸

St. Junípero Serra, Priest, Comm. 🇺🇸 ***

04: Feria. ***Independence Day, Comm.***¹³¹⁸ 🇺🇸 *

05: St. Anthony Mary Zaccaria, Conf., III Class. ***Elizabeth of Portugal, Comm.*** 🇺🇸 ***

07: (CS) Ss. Cyril and Methodius, Bishops and Confessors, III Class.

14: (CS) St. Bonaventure, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class. ***Kateri Tekakwitha, Virgin, Comm.***¹³¹⁹ 🇺🇸 ***

18: St. Camillus de Lellis, Confessor, III Class; St. Symphorosa and her Seven Sons, Martyrs, Comm. ***Camillus de Lellis, Priest, Comm.***¹³²⁰ 🇺🇸 ***

19: (CS) St. Vincent de Paul, Confessor, III Class.

22: (CS) St. Mary Magdalene, Penitent, III Class.

26: St. Anne, Mother of the Blessed Virgin Mary, II Class. ***St. Anne, Mother of the Bl. Virgin Mary, Patron of the Province of Québec, and St. Joachim, Parents of the Bl. Virgin Mary, I Class.***¹³²¹ 🇺🇸

¹³¹⁷ In years when 1 July (the Feast of the Most Precious Blood, I Class) falls on Sunday, the External Solemnity of Ss. Peter and Paul is not observed in the United States.

¹³¹⁸ Mass formulary includes all proper eucharological texts, including two unique options for the Eucharistic Preface and unique solemn blessing.

¹³¹⁹ Observation: St. Bonaventure is one of the III Class days which may not be impeded. Difficulty: St. Kateri Tekakwitha in the Particular Calendar of the United States of America is inscribed on this same date with the rank of Obligatory Memorial, which translates into III Class. Because two III Class feasts cannot be celebrated concomitantly and St. Bonaventure cannot be impeded, the feast of St. Kateri Tekakwitha can never be observed. Solution: Reduce observance of the feast of St. Kateri Tekakwitha to that of Commemoration.

¹³²⁰ St. Camillus de Lellis is celebrated universally on this same date in the *GRC/1960* at a higher rank of III Class. When using the OF, it would seem appropriate that the Saint would be celebrated at the higher rank, in keeping with the universal calendar.

¹³²¹ Observation: This feast as inscribed in *GRC/1960* celebrates St. Anne, Mother of the Blessed Virgin Mary. As it is inscribed in the Canadian Particular Calendar, the feast includes St. Joachim, father of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The celebration of the principal Patron of a nation or ecclesiastical region is inscribed as a I Class feast. (*Novum rubricarum*, 42, a.). Consider that 26 July is the date inscribed as the feast of the parents of the Blessed Virgin Mary in *GRC/1969*; it is not a novelty introduced by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. The 16 August date observance of the II Class feast of St. Joachim is inscribed in *GRC/1960* as the only feast of this Saint. Additionally, *GNLYC*, no. 49 states, “Particular calendars have more specialized celebrations, arranged to harmonize with the general cycle.” The same document reiterates, (no. 50, b) “Particular calendars must be coordinated harmoniously with universal celebrations, with care for the rank and precedence indicated for each in the Table of Liturgical Days.” This is reinforced in the later

29: (CS) St. Martha, Virgin, III Class; Ss. Felix, Simplicius, Faustinus and Beatrice, Martyrs, Comm.

31: (CS) St. Ignatius, Confessor, III Class.

August

02: (CS) St. Alphonsus Mary of Liguori, Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class; St. Stephen I, Pope and Martyr, Comm.

04: (CS) St. Dominic, Confessor, Greater III Class.

05: (CS) The Dedication of Our Lady of the Snows, III Class. **Bl. Frédéric Janssoone, Priest, Comm.** 🇨🇦

08: (CS) St. John Mary Vianney, Confessor and Priest, III Class; Ss. Cyriacus, Largus and Smaragdus, Martyrs, Comm.

12: (CS) St. Clare, Virgin, III Class.

16: St. Joachim, Father of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Confessor, II Class.¹³²²

20: (CS) St. Bernard, Abbot and Doctor of the Church, III Class.

21: Feria. **St. Jane Frances de Chantal, Widow, III Class.** 🇨🇦

28: (CS) St. Augustine Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class; St. Hermes. Martyr, Comm.

29: (CS) The Beheading of St. John the Baptist, III Class; St. Sabina, Martyr, Comm.

September

02: St. Stephen, King and Confessor, III Class. **Bl. André Grasset, Priest and Martyr, Comm.** 🇨🇦

03: (CS) St. Pius X, Pope and Confessor, III Class.

04: Feria. **Bl. Dina Bélanger, Virgin, Comm.** 🇨🇦

09: St. Gorgonius, Martyr, Comm. **St. Peter Claver, Confessor, III Class.** 🇲🇻 ***

12: (CS) The Most Holy Name of Mary, III Class.

16: (CS) St. Cornelius, Pope and St. Cyprian, Bishop, Martyrs, III Class; Ss. Euphemia, Virgin, Lucy and Geminianus, Martyrs. Comm.

24: Our Lady of Ransom, Comm. **Bl. Émilie Tavernier-Gamelin, Religious, Comm.** 🇨🇦

25: Feria. 27. [**Ss. Cosmas and Damian, Martyrs, III Class.**]¹³²³ 🇨🇦

Calendaria particularia, no. 1 “[P]articular calendars are to coordinate those celebrations with the general cycle.” Difficulty: A separate feast of St. Joachim, Father of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Confessor, is celebrated on 16 August as a II Class feast in *GRC/1960*. This results in two celebrations of St. Joachim in Canada. The *GNLYC* limit the celebration of any Saint to only once per year, with an exception for persuasive pastoral reasons such as a date that would commemorate the discovery or transfer of bodies of patrons or founder (50, b). The later *Calendaria particularia* will restate the same (no. 3). However, the same *GNLYC* state a reason for the limitation: “Lest particular calendars be enlarged disproportionately, individual Saints may have only one feast in the liturgical year” (*GNLYC*, 50, b.). Solution: Harmony among those celebrating the patronal feast in both Forms of the Latin rite and harmony with the General Roman Calendar is preserved by leaving both the Provincial Patronal feast and the pre-existing universal feast of St. Joachim intact. The feast inscribed for this date in *GRC/1960* already celebrates part of the feast inscribed for this date in *GRC/1969*. The localized nature of the Patronal celebration of both parents of the Blessed Virgin Mary makes confusion among the faithful over the matter highly unlikely.

¹³²² See footnote above for 26 July.

¹³²³ Observation: The feast of Saints Cosmas and Damian, Martyrs, appear in the Canadian Particular Calendar on 25 September with the rank of Optional Memorial, which translates to a Commemoration. Difficulty: Saints Cosmas and Damian already exists in *GRC/1960* on 27 September with the higher rank of III Class feast. Solution: Retain the date of 27 September from *GRC/1960* as required by *GNLYC*, no. 50, celebrated as the higher rank.

26: Ss. Cyprian and Justina Virgin, Martyrs, Comm. *Ss. Jean de Brébeuf and Isaac Jogues, Priests, and Companions, Secondary Patrons of Canada, II Class*¹³²⁴ 🇨🇦

27: (CS) *Ss. Cosmas and Damian, Martyrs, III Class*.¹³²⁵ 🇨🇦

30: (CS) St. Jerome Priest, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.

October

First Monday: *Labour Day, Comm.*¹³²⁶ 🇨🇦

Second Monday: *Thanksgiving Day, Comm.*¹³²⁷ 🇨🇦

02: (CS) The Holy Guardian Angels, III Class.

03: (CS) St. Teresa of the Child Jesus, Virgin, III Class.

04: (CS) St. Francis of Assisi, Confessor, III Class.

05: St. Placid and Companions, Martyrs, Comm. *Bl. Francis Xavier Seelos, Priest, Comm.*¹³²⁸ 🇺🇸 ****

06: (CS) St. Bruno, Confessor, III Class. *Blessed Marie-Rose Durocher, Virgin, Commemoration.* 🇨🇦 🇺🇸 ***

14: (CS) St. Callistus I. Pope and Martyr, III Class.

15: (CS) St. Teresa, Virgin, III Class.

16: St. Hedwig, Widow, III Class. *St. Marguerite d'Youville, Religious, III Class*.¹³²⁹ 🇨🇦

19: St. Peter of Alcantara, Confessor, III Class. *John de Brébeuf and Isaac Jogues and Companions, Martyrs, III Class*.¹³³⁰ 🇺🇸 ***

20: St. John Cantius, Confessor, III Class; St. Hedwig, Religious, Comm.

St. Marguerite-Marie Alacoque, Virgin, Comm. 🇨🇦

St. Paul of the Cross, Priest, Comm. 🇺🇸 **

22: Feria. *Dedication of Consecrated Churches with unknown Consecration Date, I Class.* 🇨🇦

November

04: (CS) St. Charles, Bishop and Confessor, III Class; Ss. Vitalis and Agricola. Martyrs, Comm.

11: (CS) St. Martin, Bishop and Confessor, III Class; St. Mennas Martyr, Comm.

Remembrance Day, Comm. 🇨🇦

Veteran's Day, Comm. 🇺🇸

13: St. Didacus Confessor, Comm. *St. Frances Xavier Cabrini, Virgin, III Class.* 🇨🇦 🇺🇸 ***

¹³²⁴ The celebration of the secondary Patron of a nation or ecclesiastical region is inscribed as a II Class feast. (*Novum rubricarum*, 42, b.). Typical.

¹³²⁵ See footnote for September 25.

¹³²⁶ This may be celebrated with greater festivity if it falls on 1 or 5 October.

¹³²⁷ This may be celebrated with greater festivity if it falls on 1 or 5 October.

¹³²⁸ On 25 July 2014, the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments confirmed the inscription of Blessed Francis Xavier Seelos, Priest, into the Proper Calendar for the Dioceses of the United States of America, with the rank of Optional Memorial, celebrated 5 October. His proper liturgical texts in Latin and English were also confirmed the same day. The texts in Spanish were confirmed on 23 September 2015. See <https://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/liturgical-year-and-calendar/blessed-francis-xavier-seelos> (11 January 2022).

¹³²⁹ St. Marguerite d'Youville impedes St. Hedwig, a feast permitted to be impeded by the provisions of CS.

¹³³⁰ John de Brébeuf and Isaac Jogues would impede St. Peter of Alcantara, a feast permitted to be impeded by the provisions of CS.

- 14: (CS) St. Josaphat, Bishop and Martyr, III Class.
- 18: (CS) The Dedication of the Basilicas of Ss. Peter and Paul, III Class. ***St. Rose Philippine Duchesne, Virgin, Comm.***  ***
- 22: (CS) St. Cecilia, Virgin and Martyr, III Class.
- 23: (CS) St. Clement I, Pope and Martyr, III Class; St. Felicitas, Martyr, Comm. ***Bl. Miguel Agustín Pro, Priest and Martyr, Comm.***  ***
- 24: (CS) St. John of the Cross, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class, St. Chrysogonus Martyr, Comm.

Fourth Thursday of November: Thanksgiving Day, Comm.¹³³¹  *

December

- 03: (CS) St. Francis Xavier, Confessor, III Class.
- 06: (CS) St. Nicholas, Bishop and Confessor, III Class.
- 07: (CS) St. Ambrose Bishop, Confessor and Doctor of the Church, III Class.
- 08: ***Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, I Class; Patronal Feast of the United States of America, I Class.***¹³³²  *
- 11: (CS) St. Damasus I, Pope and Confessor, III Class.
- 12: Feria. ***Our Lady of Guadalupe, Patroness of the Americas, II Class.***¹³³³  
- 13: (CS) St. Lucy, Virgin and Martyr, III Class.

¹³³¹ This may be celebrated with greater festivity if it does not fall on a day of a higher-ranking feast. Mass formulary contains all proper euchological texts, including a unique Eucharistic Preface.

¹³³² Contains all proper euchological texts, including a unique Eucharistic Preface.

¹³³³ This feast might be observed by dioceses in Canada and the United States of America as II Class; it has the equivalent rank of Feast in both countries' calendars and, due to the assigned title of Patroness of the Americas, might be considered co-Secondary Patroness of Canada and Secondary Patroness of the United States of America. The celebration of the secondary Patron of a nation or ecclesiastical region is inscribed as a II Class feast (*Novum rubricarum*, 42, b.).

APPENDIX III

DECREE *QUO MAGIS* WITH *NOTA PRAEVIA*

CONGREGATIO PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

Prot. no. 137/2009P – ED

DECRETUM

[§1] Quo magis altera Ritus Romani forma alteram locupletaret, in Epistula ad universos Ecclesiae latinae Episcopos die VII mensis Iulii a. D. MMVII data,¹³³⁴ censuit Benedictus PP. XVI aliquot ex novis praefationibus veteri Missali esse inserendas.

[§2] Cum enim Pontificia Commissio “Ecclesia Dei” eam sententiam per instructionem *Universae Ecclesiae* confirmavisset,¹³³⁵ eadem Commissio, de mandato eiusdem Benedicti XVI in dicta epistula dato et a fontibus novis veteribusque hauriens, investigationem de aptioribus rationibus praefationum in antiquo Missali adiungendarum aggressa est. Eam vero investigationem ab illa Pontificia Commissione inchoatam Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei modo absolvit, postquam Litteris Apostolicis die XVII mensis Ianuarii a.D. MMXIX motu proprio datis Summus Pontifex Franciscus omnia munera supra dictae Commissionis in illam Congregationem transtulit.¹³³⁶

[§3] Quapropter Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, consultis nonnullis institutis religiosis, societatibus vitae apostolicae, et viris peritis usui antiquiori illigatis, necnon Em.mo Card. Praefecto Congregationis de Cultu Divino et Disciplina Sacramentorum, septem praefationes, uti in adiecto inveniuntur exemplari, probat, et concedit ut a quolibet

¹³³⁴ BENEDICTUS XVI, *Epistula ad Episcopos ad producendas Litteras Apostolicas Motu Proprio datas, de Usu Liturgiae Romanae Instaurationi anni 1970 praecedentis*, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 798.

¹³³⁵ PONTIFICIA COMMISSIO “ECCLESIA DEI,” *Instructio ad exsequendas Litteras Apostolicas Summorum Pontificum a S. S. Benedicto PP. XVI Motu Proprio datas*, in *AAS*, 103 (2011), 413-420, n. 25.

¹³³⁶ FRANCISCUS, *Litterae Apostolicae Motu Proprio datae de Pontificia Commissione “Ecclesia Dei,”* die 17 Ianuarii 2019.

sacerdote Sacrificium Eucharisticum ad normas Litterarum Apostolicarum *Summorum Pontificum* secundum Missale Romanum anni MCMLXII celebrante, servatis rubricis appositis, adhiberi possint.

Quaecumque hoc Decreto statuta sunt, a die XIX mensis Martii huius anni, in festo S. Ioseph, Sponsi Beatae Mariae Virginis, Confessoris et Ecclesiae Universae Patroni, serventur, contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Summus Pontifex Franciscus, in Audientia die V mensis Decembris a. D. MMXIX infrascripto Archiepiscopo Secretario Congregationis pro Doctrina Fidei concessa, hoc Decretum ratum habuit et publici iuris fieri iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Congregationis pro Doctrina Fidei, die XXII mensis Februarii a.D. MMXX, in festo Cathedrae S. Petri Apostoli.

Aloisius F. Card. Ladaria, S.I., *Congregationis pro Doctrina Fidei Praefectus*

NOTA PRAEVI OF DECREE ***QUO MAGIS***

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH

[§1] With the Decree *Quo magis* of 22 February 2020, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which since January 2019 deals with those matters formerly assigned to the Pontifical Commission “*Ecclesia Dei*,”¹³³⁷ has approved the text of seven new Eucharistic Prefaces to be used *ad libitum* in the celebration of Mass according to the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite.¹³³⁸

[§2] This Decree constitutes the completion of the work previously initiated by the aforementioned Pontifical Commission in order to carry out the mandate given by Pope Benedict XVI to add some additional Prefaces to the Missal of the *forma extraordinaria*.¹³³⁹

The studies conducted lead to the selection of a limited number of texts, to be used for particular occasions such as feasts of Saints, votive Masses or *ad hoc* celebrations, without making any changes to the celebration of the temporal cycle. This choice was made in order to safeguard, through the unity of texts, the unanimity of sentiments and of prayer that are appropriate for the confession of the mysteries of Salvation celebrated in what constitutes the backbone of the liturgical year. In addition, the historical development of the *Corpus*

¹³³⁷ See FRANCIS, *Apostolic Letter in the form of Motu Proprio on the Pontifical Commission “Ecclesia Dei,”* 17 January 2019.

¹³³⁸ The texts of these Prefaces, with the musical notation according to the various tones in use in the *forma extraordinaria*, will be available at the *Libreria Editrice Vaticana*.

¹³³⁹ “Some of the new Prefaces can and should be inserted in the old Missal. The “*Ecclesia Dei*” Commission, in contact with various bodies devoted to the *Usus Antiquior*, will study the practical possibilities in this regard.” BENEDICT XVI, Letter to the Bishops on the occasion of the publication of the Apostolic Letter “*Motu Proprio Data*” *Summorum Pontificum* on the use of the Roman Liturgy prior to the reform of 1970, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 798. This mandate was further confirmed and completed in 2011 by the Instruction *Universae Ecclesiae* of the same Pontifical Commission: See PONTIFICAL COMMISSION “*ECCLESIA DEI*,” Instruction on the Application of the Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum* of His Holiness Benedict XVI given Motu Proprio, n. 25, in *AAS*, 103 (2011), 418.

Praefationum of the *Missale Romanum* up until the middle of the 20th Century shows a general movement towards the use of new prefaces for occasional celebrations rather than for celebrations of the temporal cycle.

[§3] At the same time, the opportunity was taken to extend to all those who celebrate in the *Usus Antiquior* the faculty to use three other Prefaces previously approved for certain places. These too are texts for determined occasional celebrations.

[§4] Four of the newly approved texts, namely the Prefaces *de Angelis*, *de Sancto Ioanne Baptista*, *de Martyribus* and *de Nuptiis*, are taken from the Missal of the *forma ordinaria*, and for the most part their central section, known as the “embolism,” appear in ancient liturgical sources. In order to guarantee consistency with the rest of the *Corpus Praefationum* of the old Missal, in three cases, the standard forms of Preface conclusion of the *forma extraordinaria* have been used. As indicated, the three other texts (Prefaces *de Omnibus Sanctis et Sanctis Patronis*, *de Sanctissimo Sacramento* and *de Dedicatione ecclesiae*) are Prefaces previously granted to French and Belgian Dioceses, where they were in use before the post-conciliar liturgical reform. From now on, these may be used wherever Mass is celebrated in the *forma extraordinaria*.

[§5] Two of the seven Prefaces will allow to aptly give more prominence to liturgical celebrations in honor of certain leading figures in God’s design, as manifested in the history of Salvation, namely the Angels and St. John the Baptist, which hitherto both lacked a proper Eucharistic Preface in the *Usus Antiquior*. In the same vein, the Preface *de Martyribus* will allow to further underline the eminent character of the gift of martyrdom among the other witnesses of *Sequela Christi*. Indeed, the first Saints recognized as such were the Martyrs. The Prefaces *de Dedicatione Ecclesiae*, *de Omnibus Sanctis et Sanctis*

Patronis and *de Ss.mo Sacramento*, already in use in some places, will appropriately enrich the celebrations in question with a more suitable eucology than the standard *Praefatio Communis*. Finally, special note should be taken of the Preface *de Nuptiis*, which together with the long Nuptial Blessing still in use in Masses *pro Sponsis*, is to be found – with minor variations – in early Sacramentaries such as the *Gelasianum Vetus* or the *Gregorianum*. This ancient Preface, already existing in the *forma ordinaria*, may therefore now be used in the *forma extraordinaria* as well.

[§6] As indicated above, the use or not, in the relevant circumstances, of the newly approved Prefaces remains an *ad libitum* choice. Obviously, the celebrant is expected to make use of good pastoral common sense in this regard. In addition, it should be noted that the Decree does not cancel any eventual concessions of proper Prefaces granted in the past, and therefore in those particular cases where there already exists, on the basis of preceding permissions, and for the same liturgical circumstance, a different particular Preface, one may choose between that Preface and the newly approved texts

APPENDIX IV

SEVEN NEW EUCHARISTIC PREFACES FOR THE *FORMA EXTRAORDINARIA*¹³⁴⁰

De Angelis

Praefatio de Angelis dici potest in missis festivis et votivis Angelorum necnon in festo Dedicationis S. Michaelis Archangeli die 29 septembris.

Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutäre, nos tibi semper et ubique grätias ägere: Dömine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus:

Et in Archángelis Angelísque tuis tua praecónia non tacére, quia ad excelléntiam tuam recúrrit et glóriam quod angélica creatúra tibi probábilis honorétur: et, cum illa sit amplo décore digníssima, tu quam sis imménsus et super ómnia praeferéndus osténderis, per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

Per quem multitúdo Angelórum tuam célebrat maiestátem, quibus adorántes in exsultatíone coniúngimur, una cum eis laudis voce clamántes:

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God:

And to praise you without end in your Archangels and Angels. For the honor we pay the angelic creatures in whom you delight redounds to your own surpassing glory, and by their great dignity and splendor you show how infinitely great you are, to be exalted above all things, through Christ our Lord.

Through him the multitude of Angels extols your majesty, and we are united with them in exultant adoration, as with one voice of praise we acclaim: ¹³⁴¹

¹³⁴⁰ Presented by CATHOLIC NEWS SERVICE, available at <https://www.vaticannews.va/it/vaticano/news/2020-03/testo-nuovi-prefazi-messale-romano-1962-dottrina-fede.html> (11 January 2022). Of the following seven new texts, ferial, solemn and most solemn chant settings have been prepared for all but the Preface for the Most Blessed Sacrament. An index of them with links to the settings may be found at <https://www.ccwatershed.org/2021/02/07/musical-notation-for-new-cf-prefaces/> (11 January 2022).

¹³⁴¹ Adapted from G. DIPIPO, “The New Prefaces of the EF Mass, Part 1: The Preface of the Angels,” on *New Liturgical Movement*, 22 May 2020, http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/05/the-new-prefaces-of-cf-mass-part-1.html#.XvS_TqFKiUk (11 January 2022).

De Sancto Ioannae Baptista

Praefatio de Sancto Ioanne Baptista dici potest in Missis festivis et votivis S. Ioannis Baptistae.

Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutáre, nos tibi semper et ubíque grátias ágere: Dómine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus: per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

In cuius Praecursóre beáto Ioánnē tuam magnificéntiam collaudámus, quem inter natos mulierum honóre praecípue consecrásti. Qui cum nascéndo multa gáudia praestitisset, et nondum éditus exsultásset ad humánae salútis advéntum, ipse solus ómnium prophetárum Agnum redemptiónis osténdit. Sed et sanctificándis étiam aquae fluéntis ipsum baptísmatis lavit auctórem, et méruit fuso ságuine suprémum illi testimónium exhibére.

Et ídeo cum Angelis et Archángelis, cum Thronis et Dominatiónibus, cumque omni milítia caeléstis exércitus, hymnum glóriæ tuæ cánimus, sine fine dicéntes:

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God, through Christ our Lord:

In his Precursor, blessed John the Baptist, we praise your great glory, for you consecrated him for a single honor among those born of women. His birth brought great rejoicing; even in the womb, he leapt for joy at the coming of human salvation. He alone of all the prophets pointed out the Lamb of redemption. And to make holy the flowing waters he baptized the very author of Baptism and was privileged to bear him the supreme witness by the shedding of his blood.”¹³⁴²

And so, with Angels and Archangels, with Thrones and Dominions, and with all the hosts and Powers of heaven, we sing the hymn of your glory as without end we acclaim:

¹³⁴² Adapted from G. DiPIPPA, “The New Prefaces of the EF Mass, Part 2: The Preface of St. John the Baptist,” on *New Liturgical Movement*, 11 June 2020, <http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/05/the-new-prefaces-of-ef-mass-part-2.html> (14 February 2021).

De Martyribus

*Praefatio de Martyribus dici potest in Missis festivis et votivis Sanctorum Martyrum, modo ne agatur de S. Ioanne Baptista, vel praefatione propria gaudeant. Loco verborum * beatórum mártýrum dici potest pro opportunitate: vel beáti mártýris N. (beátae mártýris N.), vel beatórum mártýrum N. et N. (beatárum mártýrum N. et N.).*

Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutáre, nos tibi semper et ubique grátias ágere: Dómine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus:

Quóniam beatórum mártýrum pro confessióne nóminis tui, ad imitatióem Christi, sanguis effúsus tua mirábília maniféstat, quibus pérficis in fragilitáte virtútem, et vires infirmas ad testimónium róboras, per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

Per quem maiestátem tuam laudant Angeli, adórant Dominatióes, tremunt Potestátes. Caeli caelorúmque Virtútes, ac beáta Séraphim, sócia exsultatióne concélebrant. Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admítte iúbeas, deprecámur, súpplíci confessióne dicétes:

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God:

The venerable blood of the blessed martyrs, being shed for the confession of your name, manifests your wonders, by which you perfect virtue in weakness, give increase to our devotion, and grant aid to those who are weak before you.¹³⁴³

Through whom Angels praise your majesty, Dominations worship and Powers stand in awe, the heavens and the heavenly hosts together with the blessed Seraphim in triumphant chorus unite to celebrate. And we beg you that you may be pleased to unite our voices with theirs, while we say with humble praise:

¹³⁴³ Adapted from G. DIPIPO, “The New Prefaces of the EF Mass, Part 3: The Preface of the Martyrs,” on *New Liturgical Movement*, 4 June 2020, <http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/06/the-new-prefaces-of-ef-mass-part-3.html> (14 February 2021).

De Omnibus Sanctis et Ss. Patronis

Praefatio de Omnibus Sanctis et Ss. Patronis dici potest in Missis festivis et votivis Omnium Sanctorum, et in Missis festivis et votivis Sanctorum Patronorum cum principalium tum secundariorum, necnon Titularis ecclesiae vel oratorii, modo ne agatur de Angelo vel praefatione propria gaudeant.

Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutáre, nos tibi semper et ubique grátias ágere: Dómine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus:

Qui glorificáris in concílio Sanctórum, et eórum coronándo mérita, corónas dona tua: qui nobis in eórum praebes, et conversatióne exémplum, et communióne consórtium, et intercessióne subsidium: ut tantam habéntes impósitam nubem téstium, per patiéntiam currámus ad propósitum nobis certámen, et cum eis percipiámus immarcescibilem glóriae corónam. Per Iesum Christum Dóminum nostrum, cuius ságuine ministrátur nobis intróitus in aetérnum regnum.

Per quem maiestátem tuam treméntes adórant Angeli, et omnes Spirítuum caeléstium chori sócia exsultatióne concélebrant. Cum quibus et nostras voces, ut admítte iubeas, deprecámur, súpplíci confessióne dicéntes:

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God:

For you are praised in the company of your Saints and, in crowning their merits, you crown your own gifts. By their way of life, you offer us an example, by communion with them you give us companionship, by their intercession, sure support, so that, encouraged by so great a cloud of witnesses, we may run as victors in the race before us and win with them the imperishable crown of glory, through Christ our Lord.¹³⁴⁴

Through whom your majesty the Angels praise, the Dominations worship and the Powers stand in awe, the heavens and the heavenly hosts together with the blessed Seraphim in triumphant chorus unite to celebrate. And we beg you that you may be pleased to unite our voices with theirs, while we say with humble praise:

¹³⁴⁴ Adapted from G. DiPIPPA, “The New Prefaces of the EF Mass, Part 6: The Preface of All Saints and Patron Saints,” on *New Liturgical Movement*, 17 June 2020, <http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/06/the-new-prefaces-of-ef-mass-part-6.html> (14 February 2021).

De Ss. Sacramento

Praefatio de Sanctissimo Sacramento dici potest in festo Sanctissimi Corporis Christi, in Missis votivis de Sanctissimo Sacramento, et in Missis votivis de D.N.I.C. aeterno et summo Sacerdote.

Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutáre, nos tibi semper et ubíque grátias ágere: Dómine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus: per Christum Dóminum nostrum.

Qui, remótis carnálium victimárum inánibus umbris, Corpus et Sánguinem suum nobis in sacrificium commendávit: ut in omni loco offerátur nómini tuo, quae tibi sola complácuit, oblátio munda. In hoc ígitur inscrutábilis sapiéntiae, et imménsae caritátis mystério, idípsum quod semel in Cruce perfécit, non cessat mirabiliter operári, ipse ófferens, ipse et oblátio. Et nos, unam secum hóstiam efféctos, ad sacrum invítat convívium, in quo ipse cibus noster súmitur, recólitur memória Passiónis eius, mens implétur grátia, et futúrae gloriae nobis pignus datur.

Et ídeo cum Angelis et Archángelis, cum Thronis et Dominationibus, cumque omni milítia caeléstis exércitus, hymnum glóriae tuae cánimus, sine fine dicéntes:

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God, through Christ our Lord:

Who, with the vain shadows of carnal sacrifices removed, entrusted his Body and Blood to us as a sacrifice, that in every place there may be offered to your name that pure sacrifice that alone pleases you. Therefore, in this mystery of unsearchable wisdom and boundless charity, that very thing which he completed once in the Cross does not cease wondrously to have effect, for he himself is the one who offers and who is the offering. And he invites us who are made one victim with him to the sacred banquet, in which he is received as our food, the memory of his passion is recalled, the mind is filled with grace, and we are given the pledge of future glory.¹³⁴⁵

And so, with Angels and Archangels, with Thrones and Dominions, and with all the hosts and Powers of heaven, we sing the hymn of your glory as without end we acclaim:

¹³⁴⁵ Adapted from G. DiPIPPo, “The New Prefaces of the EF Mass, Part 5: The Preface of the Blessed Sacrament,” on *New Liturgical Movement*, 11 June 2020, <http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/06/the-new-prefaces-of-ef-mass-part-5.html> (14 February 2021).

De Dedicatione Ecclesiae

Praefatio de Dedicatione Ecclesiae dici potest in Missis de Dedicatione ecclesiae necnon in Missis de anniversario Dedicationis, exceptis Missis in Dedicatione S. Mariae ad Nives die 5 augusti et in Dedicatione S. Michaelis Archangeli die 29 septembris.

Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutáre, nos tibi semper et ubíque grátias ágere: Dómine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus:

Qui hanc oratiónis domum, quam aedificávimus, bonórum ómnium largítor inhábitas, et Ecclésiám, quam ipse fundásti, incessábili operatióne sanctíficas. Haec est enim vere domus oratiónis, visibílibus aedificiis adumbráta, templum habitatiónis glóriæ tuæ, sedes incommutábilis veritátis, sanctuárium aeternæ caritátis. Haec est arca, quæ nos a mundi eréptos dilúvio, in portum salutis indúcit. Haec est dilécta et única sponsa, quam acquisívit Christus ságuine suo, quam vivícat Spírítu suo, cuius in sinu renáti per grátiam tuam, lacte verbi páscimur, pane vitæ roborámur, misericordiæ tuæ subsidiis confovémur. Haec fidéliter in terris, sponso adiuvánte, mílitat, et perénriter in caelis, ipso coronánte, triúmphant.

Et ídeo cum Angelis et Archángelis, cum Thronis et Dominatió nibus, cumque omni milítia caeléstis exércitus, hymnum glóriæ tuæ cánimus, sine fine dicétes:

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God:

Who being the giver of all good things, dwells in this house of prayer which we have built, and sanctifies the Church, which you yourself founded, with unceasing action. For this is truly the house of prayer, represented by visible buildings, the temple wherein your glory dwells, the seat of unchanging truth, the sanctuary of eternal charity. This is the ark, which rescues us from the flood of the world, and carries us to the port of salvation. This is the beloved and only spouse, which Christ obtained with His own blood, whom he enlivens with His Spirit, in whose bosom we, being reborn through your grace, are fed with the milk of the word, strengthened with the bread of life and fostered with the aid of your mercy. Faithfully she strives upon the earth with the help of Her Spouse, and triumphs forever in heaven as He crowns Her.¹³⁴⁶

And so, with Angels and Archangels, with Thrones and Dominions, and with all the hosts and Powers of heaven, we sing the hymn of your glory as without end we acclaim:

¹³⁴⁶ Adapted from G. DiPIPPo, “The New Prefaces of the EF Mass, Part 7: The Preface of the Dedication of a Church,” on *New Liturgical Movement*, 25 June 2020, <http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/06/the-new-prefaces-of-ef-mass-part-7.html> (14 February 2021).

De Nuptiis

Praefatio de Nuptiis dici potest in Missis votivis “Pro Sponsis.”

Vere dignum et iustum est, aequum et salutáre, nos tibi semper et ubíque grátias ágere: Dómine, sancte Pater, omnípotens aetérne Deus:

Qui fédera nuptiárum blando concórdiae iugo et insolúbili pacis vinculo nexuísti, ut multiplicándis adoptiónum fíliis sanctórum connubiórum fecúnditas pudíca servíret. Tua enim, Dómine, providéntia, tuáque grátia ineffabílibus modis utrúmque dispénsas, ut, quod generátio ad mundi prodúxit ornátum, regenerátio ad Ecclésiae perdúcat augméntum, per Christum Dominum nostrum.

Per quem maiestátem tuam laudant Angeli, adórant Dominatiónes, tremunt Potestátes. Caeli caelorúmque Virtútes, ac beáta Séraphim, sócia exsultatióne concélebrant. Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admítti iúbeas, deprecámur, súpplíci confessióne dicéntes:

It is truly right and just, our duty and our salvation, always and everywhere to give you thanks, Lord, holy Father, almighty and eternal God:

For you have forged the covenant of marriage as a sweet yoke of harmony and an unbreakable bond of peace, so that the chaste and fruitful love of holy Matrimony may serve to increase the children you adopt as your own. By your providence and grace, O Lord, you accomplish the wonder of this twofold design: that, while the birth of children brings beauty to the world, their rebirth in Baptism gives increase to the Church, through Christ our Lord.¹³⁴⁷

Through whom your majesty the Angels praise, the Dominations worship and the Powers stand in awe, the heavens and the heavenly hosts together with the blessed Seraphim in triumphant chorus unite to celebrate. And we beg you that you may be pleased to unite our voices with theirs, while we say with humble praise:

¹³⁴⁷ Adapted from G. DiPIPPA, “The New Prefaces of the EF Mass, Part 4: The Preface of the Nuptial Mass,” on *New Liturgical Movement*, 10 June 2020, <http://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/06/the-new-prefaces-of-ef-mass-part-4.html> (14 February 2021).

APPENDIX V

ADDITIONAL PREFACES PROPOSED FOR USE IN THE *FORMA EXTRAORDINARIA*

Reflection upon the research presented in Chapter III has resulted in the selection of Eucharistic Prefaces presented here, proposed for use in the OF. These texts from *MR/2008* are well-suited for insertion into *MR/1962*. The nine texts in Section I are identical or almost identical to their sources.¹³⁴⁸ The five in Section II are minimally altered. None of the proposed texts are newly composed or centonized. These texts in particular display respect for and share in the history and sources of those in *MR/1962*.¹³⁴⁹

The texts selected exhibit a certain richness in their presentation of a particular point of thanksgiving proper to the season being celebrated while continuing the character of the texts in *MR/1962*. They add excellent quality texts appropriately useful where seasons lack a proper Preface in the EF. As well, they add some variety, but not so much as to lose the spiritual and pastoral advantage of commitment to memory by celebrant and faithful.

The Prefaces for Advent in *MR/2008* do not directly reflect the somewhat penitential nature of the season as it is known in the EF. However, the two texts proposed refer to watchfulness and hopefulness, which should lead one to personal purification. These fit quite well with the other elements of the Mass formularies for the season of Advent in *MR/1962*. The proposed text for the Nativity of the Lord is both profound in its meaning and resplendent in its verbiage. A second Nativity Preface provides moderate variety.

¹³⁴⁸ A. DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 22; WARD and C. JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 442.

There are several more texts from the OF that could be compatible with the EF based upon their sources and historicity but have not been included in the proposal for certain reasons, such as quantity.

¹³⁴⁹ See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 25.

The Preface of the Most Holy Trinity in *MR/1962*, for example, is found to have come from the Gregorian *Hadrianum* Supplement and therefore is most likely of Gallican origin; thirteen other Prefaces in *MR/2008* share this same source, four of which are proposed below.

The text chosen for the season of *Septuagesima* is taken from *MR/2008* Palm Sunday (also known as Preface III for the Passion of the Lord) and possesses a tone that turns one's thoughts to preparation for the coming Lenten season. Two noble texts are presented for the season of Lent. A beautiful ancient text for Passiontide is presented with an altered rubric for use during Passiontide when a proper Preface is not assigned so as not to displace use of the Preface of the Holy Cross. Three gracious texts are presented for the lengthy season of Eastertide.

Sundays and ferials *de Tempore* are represented by four text selections. They are intended to augment, rather than replace, the august *Praefatio de Sanctissima Trinitate*, typically used on non-festival Sundays, and the noble simplicity of the ancient *Praefatio communis* used on ferials.

Quo magis sets a method of adaptation of texts of Eucharistic Prefaces for use in the EF. If necessary, the Eschatocol is modified from source texts to be brought into congruence with those that have been received in *MR/1962*. This same method has been applied herein where appropriate.

The Latin titles of the texts themselves reflect a proposal of how they might appear inserted into *MR/1962*. English parenthetical titles reflect how these texts appear in *MR/2008usa*.¹³⁵⁰

¹³⁵⁰ See *MR/2008usa*.

1 – Texts with Little or No Change from the Sources

The following texts do not deviate from their sources. In some instances, there may have been a grammatical correction that did not affect the meaning and substance of the text as it appears in the source.

1.1 – De Adventu I (Preface I of Advent)¹³⁵¹

The Preface is said in Masses of Advent from the First Sunday of Advent to 16 December and in other Masses that are celebrated in Advent and have no proper Preface.

1.2 – De Adventu II (Preface II of Advent)¹³⁵²

The Preface is for Masses of Advent from the First Sunday of Advent to 16 December and in other Masses that are celebrated in Advent and have no proper Preface.

1.3 – De Nativitate Domini II (Preface III of the Nativity of the Lord)¹³⁵³

The Preface is for Masses of the Nativity of the Lord and of its Octave Day, and within the Octave, even in Masses that otherwise might have a proper Preface, with the exception of Masses that have a proper Preface concerning the divine mysteries of divine Persons. It is also used on weekdays of Christmas Time.

To achieve harmony with *de Nativitate Domini* in *MR/1962*, substitute eschatocol: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archángelis, cum Thronis et Dominationibus, cumque omni milítia caeléstis exércitus, hymnum glóriæ tuæ cánimus, sine fine dicétes....

1.4 – De Quadragesima II (Preface I of Lent)¹³⁵⁴

The Preface is for Masses of Lent, especially on Sundays when a more specific Preface is not prescribed.

To achieve harmony with *de Quadragesima* in *MR/1962*, substitute eschatocol with: Per quem maiestátem tuam laudant Angeli, adórant Dominationes, tremunt Potestates. Caeli caelórúmque Virtútes, ac beata Seraphim, Sócia exsultatióne concelebrant. Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admitti iúbeas, deprecámur, súplici confessióne dicétes....

1.5 – De Quadragesima III (Preface for the First Sunday of Lent)¹³⁵⁵

The Preface is for Masses of Lent, especially on Sundays when a more specific Preface is not prescribed.

To achieve harmony with *de Quadragesima* in *MR/1962*, substitute eschatocol with: Per quem maiestátem tuam laudant Angeli, etc., as above.

¹³⁵¹ *MR/2008*, no. 33, 442; *MR/2008usa*, no. 33, 386-387. Source: *Sacramentarium Veronese*. See MOHLBERG, *Sacramentarium Veronese*, 184.179. See A. WARD and C. JOHNSON, "The Sources of the Roman Missal (1975), II, Prefaces," in *Notitiae*, 23 (1987), 409ff.

¹³⁵² *MR/2008*, no. 34, 443; *MR/2008usa*, no. 34, 388-389. Source: *Sacramentarium Veronese*. See MOHLBERG, *Sacramentarium Veronese*, 1241. See DUMAS, "Les préfaces du nouveau Missel," 22, and WARD and JOHNSON, "Sources of the Roman Missal," 448.

¹³⁵³ *MR/2008*, no. 36, 445; *MR/2008usa*, no. 37, 394-395. Source: *Sacramentarium Veronese*. See MOHLBERG, *Sacramentarium Veronese*, 1260. See DUMAS, "Les préfaces du nouveau Missel," 22.

¹³⁵⁴ *MR/2008*, no. 39, 448; *MR/2008usa*, no. 39, 398-399. Source: *Gelasianum Vetus*. See MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*, 513. See DUMAS, "Les préfaces du nouveau Missel," 22, and WARD and JOHNSON, "Sources of the Roman Missal," 486.

¹³⁵⁵ *MR/2008*, 164; *MR/2008usa*, 78-80. Source: *Hadrianum Supplement*. See "Supplementum ad Sacramentarium Hadrianum," in DESHUSSES, *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, 1547. See DUMAS, "Les préfaces du nouveau Missel," 22; WARD and JOHNSON, "Sources of the Roman Missal," 507.

1.6 – De dominicis *per annum* I (Preface I of the Sundays in Ordinary Time)¹³⁵⁶

The Preface is for Sundays *per annum*.

1.7 – De dominicis *per annum* II (Preface IV of the Sundays in Ordinary Time)¹³⁵⁷

The Preface is for Sundays *per annum*.

To achieve harmony with the other Prefaces *per annum*, substitute eschatocol with: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archángelis, etc., as above.

1.8 - Communis II (Preface II of the Sundays in Ordinary Time)¹³⁵⁸

The Preface is for Masses that have no proper Preface, and for which a Preface related to a specific liturgical time is not indicated.

To achieve harmony with the other Prefaces *per annum*, substitute eschatocol with: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archángelis, etc. as above.

1.9 - Communis III (Common Preface IV)¹³⁵⁹

The Preface is for Masses that have no proper Preface, and for which a Preface related to a specific liturgical time is not indicated.

To achieve harmony with the other Prefaces *per annum*, substitute eschatocol with: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archángelis, etc. as above.

2 – Texts with Minimal Adaptation from the Sources

The following texts are minimally adapted from their sources. In some instances, there may have been a more significant grammatical correction or minor rephrasing that did not affect the meaning and substance of the text as it appears in the source.

2.1 – De Septuagesima (Palm Sunday [Preface III of the Passion of the Lord])¹³⁶⁰

The Preface is for the Sundays of *Septuagesima* and weekdays that do not have a proper Preface assigned.

To achieve harmony with *de Sancta Cruce* in MR/1962, substitute eschatocol with: Per quem maiestátem tuam laudant Angeli, etc., as above.

¹³⁵⁶ MR/2008, no. 52, 461; MR/2008usa, no. 52, 424-425. Source: *Gelasianum Vetus*. See MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*, 598. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 24, and WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 605.

¹³⁵⁷ MR/2008, no. 55, 464; MR/2008usa, no. 55, 430-431. Source: *Hadrianum Supplement*. See “Supplementum ad Sacramentarium Hadrianum,” in DESHUSSES, *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, (Prag. 122, 3), 1613. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 24, and WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 621.

¹³⁵⁸ MR/2008, no. 53, 462; MR/2008usa, no. 53, 426-427. Source: *Gelasianum Vetus*. See MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*, 549. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 24, and WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 611.

¹³⁵⁹ MR/2008, no. 75, 484; MR/2008usa, no. 75, 468-469. Source: *Sacramentarium Veronese*. See MOHLBERG, *Sacramentarium Veronese*, 561. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 25.

¹³⁶⁰ MR/2008, 219; MR/2008usa, no. 24, 142-143. Source: *Hadrianum Supplement*. See “Supplementum ad Sacramentarium Hadrianum,” in DESHUSSES, *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, 1585. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 23.

2.2 – De Passione Domini (Preface II of the Passion of the Lord)¹³⁶¹

The Preface is for Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week.

To achieve harmony with *de Sancta Cruce* in *MR/1962*, substitute eschatocol with: Per quem maiestatem tuam laudant Angeli, etc., as above.

2.3 – De Paschalis II (Preface II of Easter)¹³⁶²

The Preface is for use during Eastertide.

To achieve harmony with *de Paschalis* in *MR/1962*, substitute eschatocol with: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archangelis, etc., as above.

2.4 – De Paschalis III (Preface IV of Easter)¹³⁶³

The Preface is for use during Eastertide.

To achieve harmony with *de Paschalis* in *MR/1962*, substitute eschatocol with: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archangelis, etc., as above.

2.5 – De Paschalis IV (Preface V of Easter)¹³⁶⁴

The Preface is for use during Eastertide.

To achieve harmony with *de Paschalis* in *MR/1962*, substitute eschatocol with: Et ideo cum Angelis et Archangelis, etc., as above.

¹³⁶¹ *MR/2008*, no. 55, 464; *MR/2008usa*, no. 44, 408-409. Source: *Hadrianum Supplement*. See “Supplementum ad Sacramentarium Hadrianum,” in DESHUSSES, *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, 1584. See WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 409ff.

¹³⁶² *MR/2008*, no. 46, 455; *MR/2008usa*, no. 46, 412-413. Source: *Gelasianum Vetus*. See MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*, 466. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 23, and WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 565.

¹³⁶³ *MR/2008*, no. 48, 457; *MR/2008usa*, no. 48, 416-417. Source: *Gelasianum Vetus*. See MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*, 487. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 23, and WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 573.

¹³⁶⁴ *MR/2008*, no. 49, 458; *MR/2008usa*, no. 49, 418-419. Source: *Gelasianum Vetus*. See MOHLBERG, *Gelasianum Vetus*, 476. See DUMAS, “Les préfaces du nouveau Missel,” 23, and WARD and JOHNSON, “Sources of the Roman Missal,” 578.

APPENDIX VI

TRADITIONIS CUSTODES

Apostolic Letter Issued Motu Proprio by the Supreme Pontiff
FRANCIS

Traditionis Custodes

On the Use of the Roman Liturgy Prior to the Reform of 1970

Official translation¹³⁶⁵

[§1] Guardians of the tradition, the bishops in communion with the Bishop of Rome constitute the visible principle and foundation of the unity of their particular Churches.¹³⁶⁶ Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, through the proclamation of the Gospel and by means of the celebration of the Eucharist, they govern the particular Churches entrusted to them.¹³⁶⁷

[§2] In order to promote the concord and unity of the Church, with paternal solicitude towards those who in any region adhere to liturgical forms antecedent to the reform willed by the Vatican Council II, my Venerable Predecessors, Saint John Paul II and Benedict XVI, granted and regulated the faculty to use the Roman Missal edited by John XXIII in 1962.¹³⁶⁸ In this way they intended “to facilitate the ecclesial communion of those Catholics who feel attached to some earlier liturgical forms” and not to others.¹³⁶⁹

[§3] In line with the initiative of my Venerable Predecessor Benedict XVI to invite the bishops to assess the application of the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum* three years after its publication, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith carried out a detailed consultation of the bishops in 2020. The results have been carefully considered in the light of experience that has matured during these years.

[§4] At this time, having considered the wishes expressed by the episcopate and having heard the opinion of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, I now desire, with this Apostolic Letter, to press on ever more in the constant search for ecclesial communion. Therefore, I have considered it appropriate to establish the following:

¹³⁶⁵ https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/motu_proprio/documents/20210716-motu-proprio-traditionis-custodes.html (15 September 2021).

¹³⁶⁶ Cf. SECOND VATICAN ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, 21 November 1964, no. 23, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 27.

¹³⁶⁷ Ibid., no. 27; SECOND VATICAN ECUMENICAL COUNCIL, Decree concerning the pastoral office of bishops in the Church *Christus Dominus*, 28 October 1965, no. 11, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 677-678; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 833.

¹³⁶⁸ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, Apostolic Letter motu proprio *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, 2 July 1988, in *AAS*, 80 (1988), 1495-1498; BENEDICT XVI, Apostolic Letter motu proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, 7 July 2007, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 777-781; Apostolic Letter motu proprio *Ecclesiae unitatem*, 2 July 2009, in *AAS*, 101 (2009), 710-711.

¹³⁶⁹ *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, no. 5.

Art. 1. The liturgical books promulgated by Saint Paul VI and Saint John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of Vatican Council II, are the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite.

Art. 2. It belongs to the diocesan bishop, as moderator, promoter, and guardian of the whole liturgical life of the particular Church entrusted to him,¹³⁷⁰ to regulate the liturgical celebrations of his diocese.¹³⁷¹ Therefore, it is his exclusive competence to authorize the use of the 1962 Roman Missal in his diocese, according to the guidelines of the Apostolic See

Art. 3. The bishop of the diocese in which until now there exist one or more groups that celebrate according to the Missal antecedent to the reform of 1970:

§1. is to determine that these groups do not deny the validity and the legitimacy of the liturgical reform, dictated by Vatican Council II and the Magisterium of the Supreme Pontiffs;

§2. is to designate one or more locations where the faithful adherents of these groups may gather for the eucharistic celebration (not however in the parochial churches and without the erection of new personal parishes);

§3. to establish at the designated locations the days on which eucharistic celebrations are permitted using the Roman Missal promulgated by Saint John XXIII in 1962.¹³⁷² [7] In these celebrations the readings are proclaimed in the vernacular language, using translations of the Sacred Scripture approved for liturgical use by the respective Episcopal Conferences;

§4. to appoint a priest who, as delegate of the bishop, is entrusted with these celebrations and with the pastoral care of these groups of the faithful. This priest should be suited for this responsibility, skilled in the use of the *Missale Romanum* antecedent to the reform of 1970, possess a knowledge of the Latin language sufficient for a thorough comprehension of the rubrics and liturgical texts, and be animated by a lively pastoral charity and by a sense of ecclesial communion. This priest should have at heart not only the correct celebration of the liturgy, but also the pastoral and spiritual care of the faithful;

§5. to proceed suitably to verify that the parishes canonically erected for the benefit of these faithful are effective for their spiritual growth, and to determine whether or not to retain them;

§6. to take care not to authorize the establishment of new groups.

¹³⁷⁰ SC, no. 41; *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, no. 9; CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Instruction on certain matters to be observed or to be avoided regarding the Most Holy Eucharist *Redemptionis Sacramentum*, 25 March 2004, nos. 19-25, in *AAS*, 96 (2004) 555-557.

¹³⁷¹ Cf. *CIC*, c. 375, §1; c. 392.

¹³⁷² Cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, Decree *Quo magis* approving seven Eucharistic Prefaces for the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, 22 February 2020, and Decree *Cum sanctissima* on the liturgical celebration in honor of Saints in the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, 22 February 2020, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 26 March 2020, 6.

Art. 4. Priests ordained after the publication of the present Motu Proprio, who wish to celebrate using the *Missale Romanum* of 1962, should submit a formal request to the diocesan Bishop who shall consult the Apostolic See before granting this authorization.

Art. 5. Priests who already celebrate according to the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 should request from the diocesan Bishop the authorization to continue to enjoy this faculty.

Art. 6. Institutes of consecrated life and Societies of apostolic life, erected by the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, fall under the competence of the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies for Apostolic Life.

Art. 7. The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments and the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, for matters of their particular competence, exercise the authority of the Holy See with respect to the observance of these provisions.

Art. 8. Previous norms, instructions, permissions, and customs that do not conform to the provisions of the present *Motu Proprio* are abrogated.

Everything that I have declared in this Apostolic Letter in the form of *Motu Proprio*, I order to be observed in all its parts, anything else to the contrary notwithstanding, even if worthy of particular mention, and I establish that it be promulgated by way of publication in “L’Osservatore Romano”, entering immediately in force and, subsequently, that it be published in the official Commentary of the Holy See, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.

Given at Rome, at Saint John Lateran, on 16 July 2021, the liturgical Memorial of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, in the ninth year of Our Pontificate.

FRANCIS

APPENDIX VII

COME GIÀ

Letter of the Holy Father Francis to the Bishops of the Whole World
that Accompanies the Apostolic Letter *motu proprio Traditionis custodes*

Official translation¹³⁷³

Rome, 16 July 2021

Dear Brothers in the Episcopate,

[§1] Just as my Predecessor Benedict XVI did with *Summorum Pontificum*, I wish to accompany the *Motu proprio Traditionis custodes* with a letter explaining the motives that prompted my decision. I turn to you with trust and *parresia*, in the name of that shared “solicitude for the whole Church, that contributes supremely to the good of the Universal Church” as Vatican Council II reminds us.¹³⁷⁴

[§2] Most people understand the motives that prompted St. John Paul II and Benedict XVI to allow the use of the Roman Missal, promulgated by St. Pius V and edited by St. John XXIII in 1962, for the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The faculty — granted by the indult of the Congregation for Divine Worship in 1984¹³⁷⁵ and confirmed by St. John Paul II in the *Motu proprio Ecclesia Dei* in 1988¹³⁷⁶ — was above all motivated by the desire to foster the healing of the schism with the movement of Mons. Lefebvre. With the ecclesial intention

¹³⁷³ <https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/letters/2021/documents/20210716-lettera-vescovi-liturgia.html> (11 January 2022)

¹³⁷⁴ *Lumen Gentium*, no. 23, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 27.

¹³⁷⁵ Cf. CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Letter to the Presidents of the Conferences of Bishops *Quattuor abhinc annos*, 3 October 1984, in *AAS*, 76 (1984), 1088-1089.

¹³⁷⁶ *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*.

of restoring the unity of the Church, the Bishops were thus asked to accept with generosity the “just aspirations” of the faithful who requested the use of that Missal.

[§3] Many in the Church came to regard this faculty as an opportunity to adopt freely the Roman Missal promulgated by St. Pius V and use it in a manner parallel to the Roman Missal promulgated by St. Paul VI. In order to regulate this situation at the distance of many years, Benedict XVI intervened to address this state of affairs in the Church. Many priests and communities had “used with gratitude the possibility offered by the *Motu proprio*” of St. John Paul II. Underscoring that this development was not foreseeable in 1988, the *Motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* of 2007 intended to introduce “a clearer juridical regulation” in this area.¹³⁷⁷ In order to allow access to those, including young people, who when “they discover this liturgical form, feel attracted to it and find in it a form, particularly suited to them, to encounter the mystery of the most holy Eucharist,”¹³⁷⁸ Benedict XVI declared “the Missal promulgated by St. Pius V and newly edited by Blessed John XXIII, as an extraordinary expression of the same *lex orandi*,” granting a “more ample possibility for the use of the 1962 Missal.”¹³⁷⁹

[§4] In making their decision they were confident that such a provision would not place in doubt one of the key measures of Vatican Council II or minimize in this way its authority: the *Motu proprio* recognized that, in its own right, “the Missal promulgated by Paul VI is the ordinary expression of the *lex orandi* of the Catholic Church of the Latin rite.”¹³⁸⁰ The recognition of the Missal promulgated by St. Pius V “as an extraordinary

¹³⁷⁷ BENEDICT XVI, Letter to the Bishops on the occasion of the publication of the Apostolic Letter *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* on the use of the Roman Liturgy prior to the reform of 1970, 7 July 2007, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 796.

¹³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 797.

¹³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 779.

expression of the same *lex orandi*” did not in any way underrate the liturgical reform, but was decreed with the desire to acknowledge the “insistent prayers of these faithful,” allowing them “to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass according to the *editio typica* of the Roman Missal promulgated by Blessed John XXIII in 1962 and never abrogated, as the Extraordinary Form of the Liturgy of the Church.”¹³⁸¹ It comforted Benedict XVI in his discernment that many desired “to find the form of the sacred Liturgy dear to them,” “clearly accepted the binding character of Vatican Council II and were faithful to the Pope and to the Bishops.”¹³⁸² What is more, he declared to be unfounded the fear of division in parish communities, because “the two forms of the use of the Roman Rite would enrich one another.”¹³⁸³ Thus, he invited the Bishops to set aside their doubts and fears, and to welcome the norms, “attentive that everything would proceed in peace and serenity,” with the promise that “it would be possible to find resolutions” in the event that “serious difficulties came to light” in the implementation of the norms “once the *Motu proprio* came into effect.”¹³⁸⁴

[§5] With the passage of thirteen years, I instructed the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to circulate a questionnaire to the bishops regarding the implementation of the *Motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*. The responses reveal a situation that preoccupies and saddens me and persuades me of the need to intervene. Regrettably, the pastoral objective of my Predecessors, who had intended “to do everything possible to ensure that all those who truly possessed the desire for unity would find it possible to remain in this unity or to

¹³⁸¹ BENEDICT XVI, Apostolic Letter given *Motu proprio* “*Summorum Pontificum*,” 7 July 2007, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 779.

¹³⁸² BENEDICT XVI, Letter to the Bishops on the occasion of the publication of the Apostolic Letter “*Motu proprio data*” *Summorum Pontificum* on the use of the Roman Liturgy prior to the reform of 1970, 796.

¹³⁸³ *Ibid.*, 797.

¹³⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 798.

rediscover it anew,”¹³⁸⁵ has often been seriously disregarded. An opportunity offered by St. John Paul II and, with even greater magnanimity, by Benedict XVI, intended to recover the unity of an ecclesial body with diverse liturgical sensibilities, was exploited to widen the gaps, reinforce the divergences, and encourage disagreements that injure the Church, block her path, and expose her to the peril of division.

[§6] At the same time, I am saddened by abuses in the celebration of the liturgy on all sides. In common with Benedict XVI, I deplore the fact that “in many places the prescriptions of the new Missal are not observed in celebration, but indeed come to be interpreted as an authorization for or even a requirement of creativity, which leads to almost unbearable distortions.”¹³⁸⁶ But I am nonetheless saddened that the instrumental use of *Missale Romanum* of 1962 is often characterized by a rejection not only of the liturgical reform, but of the Vatican Council II itself, claiming, with unfounded and unsustainable assertions, that it betrayed the Tradition and the “true Church.” The path of the Church must be seen within the dynamic of Tradition “which originates from the Apostles and progresses in the Church with the assistance of the Holy Spirit” (*DV* 8). A recent stage of this dynamic was constituted by Vatican Council II where the Catholic episcopate came together to listen and to discern the path for the Church indicated by the Holy Spirit. To doubt the Council is to doubt the intentions of those very Fathers who exercised their collegial power in a solemn manner *cum Petro et sub Petro* in an ecumenical council,¹³⁸⁷ and, in the final analysis, to doubt the Holy Spirit himself who guides the Church.

¹³⁸⁵ BENEDICT XVI, Letter to the Bishops on the occasion of the publication of the Apostolic Letter “*Motu proprio data*” *Summorum Pontificum* on the use of the Roman Liturgy prior to the reform of 1970, ., 797-798.

¹³⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 796.

¹³⁸⁷ Cf. *Lumen Gentium*, no. 23.

[§7] The objective of the modification of the permission granted by my Predecessors is highlighted by the Second Vatican Council itself. From the *vota* submitted by the Bishops there emerged a great insistence on the full, conscious and active participation of the whole People of God in the liturgy,¹³⁸⁸ along lines already indicated by Pius XII in the encyclical *Mediator Dei* on the renewal of the liturgy.¹³⁸⁹ The constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* confirmed this appeal, by seeking “the renewal and advancement of the liturgy,”¹³⁹⁰ and by indicating the principles that should guide the reform.¹³⁹¹ In particular, it established that these principles concerned the Roman Rite, and other legitimate rites where applicable, and asked that “the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigor to meet present-day circumstances and needs.”¹³⁹² On the basis of these principles a reform of the liturgy was undertaken, with its highest expression in the Roman Missal, published in *editio typica* by St. Paul VI¹³⁹³ and revised by St. John Paul II.¹³⁹⁴ It must therefore be maintained that the Roman Rite, adapted many times over the course of the centuries according to the needs of the day, not only be preserved but renewed “in faithful observance of the Tradition.”¹³⁹⁵ Whoever wishes to celebrate with devotion according to earlier forms of the liturgy can find in the reformed

¹³⁸⁸ Cf. *Acta et Documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando*, Series I, Volumen II, 1960.

¹³⁸⁹ PIUS XII, Encyclical on the sacred liturgy *Mediator Dei*, 20 November 1947, in *AAS*, 39 (1949), 521-595.

¹³⁹⁰ *SC*, nos. 1, 14.

¹³⁹¹ *SC*, no. 3.

¹³⁹² *SC*, no. 4.

¹³⁹³ *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum*, editio typica, 1970.

¹³⁹⁴ *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum*, editio typica altera, 1975; editio typica tertia, 2002; (reimpressio emendata, 2008).

¹³⁹⁵ Cf. *SC*, no. 3.

Roman Missal according to Vatican Council II all the elements of the Roman Rite, in particular the Roman Canon which constitutes one of its more distinctive elements.

[§8] A final reason for my decision is this: ever more plain in the words and attitudes of many is the close connection between the choice of celebrations according to the liturgical books prior to Vatican Council II and the rejection of the Church and her institutions in the name of what is called the “true Church.” One is dealing here with comportment that contradicts communion and nurtures the divisive tendency — “I belong to Paul; I belong instead to Apollo; I belong to Cephas; I belong to Christ” — against which the Apostle Paul so vigorously reacted.¹³⁹⁶ In defense of the unity of the Body of Christ, I am constrained to revoke the faculty granted by my Predecessors. The distorted use that has been made of this faculty is contrary to the intentions that led to granting the freedom to celebrate the Mass with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962. Because “liturgical celebrations are not private actions, but celebrations of the Church, which is the sacrament of unity,”¹³⁹⁷ they must be carried out in communion with the Church. Vatican Council II, while it reaffirmed the external bonds of incorporation in the Church — the profession of faith, the sacraments, of communion — affirmed with St. Augustine that to remain in the Church not only “with the body” but also “with the heart” is a condition for salvation.¹³⁹⁸

[§9] Dear brothers in the Episcopate, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* explained that the Church, the “sacrament of unity,” is such because it is “the holy People gathered and governed under the authority of the Bishops.”¹³⁹⁹ *Lumen gentium*, while recalling that the Bishop of Rome is “the permanent and visible principle and foundation of the unity both

¹³⁹⁶ I Cor 1: 12-13.

¹³⁹⁷ Cf. SC, no. 26.

¹³⁹⁸ Cf. SC, no. 14.

¹³⁹⁹ Cf. SC, no. 6.

of the bishops and of the multitude of the faithful,” states that you the Bishops are “the visible principle and foundation of the unity of your local Churches, in which and through which exists the one and only Catholic Church.”¹⁴⁰⁰

[§10] Responding to your requests, I take the firm decision to abrogate all the norms, instructions, permissions and customs that precede the present *Motu proprio*, and declare that the liturgical books promulgated by the saintly Pontiffs Paul VI and John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of Vatican Council II, constitute the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite. I take comfort in this decision from the fact that, after the Council of Trent, St. Pius V also abrogated all the rites that could not claim a proven antiquity, establishing for the whole Latin Church a single *Missale Romanum*. For four centuries this *Missale Romanum*, promulgated by St. Pius V was thus the principal expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite, and functioned to maintain the unity of the Church. Without denying the dignity and grandeur of this Rite, the Bishops gathered in ecumenical council asked that it be reformed; their intention was that “the faithful would not assist as strangers and silent spectators in the mystery of faith, but, with a full understanding of the rites and prayers, would participate in the sacred action consciously, piously, and actively.”¹⁴⁰¹ St. Paul VI, recalling that the work of adaptation of the Roman Missal had already been initiated by Pius XII, declared that the revision of the Roman Missal, carried out in the light of ancient liturgical sources, had the goal of permitting the Church to raise up, in the variety of languages, “a single and identical prayer,” that

¹⁴⁰⁰ Cf. *Lumen Gentium*, no. 23.

¹⁴⁰¹ Cf. *SC*, no. 48.

expressed her unity.¹⁴⁰² This unity I intend to re-establish throughout the Church of the Roman Rite.

[§11] Vatican Council II, when it described the catholicity of the People of God, recalled that “within the ecclesial communion” there exist the particular Churches which enjoy their proper traditions, without prejudice to the primacy of the Chair of Peter who presides over the universal communion of charity, guarantees the legitimate diversity and together ensures that the particular not only does not injure the universal but above all serves it.”¹⁴⁰³ While, in the exercise of my ministry in service of unity, I take the decision to suspend the faculty granted by my Predecessors, I ask you to share with me this burden as a form of participation in the solicitude for the whole Church proper to the Bishops. In the *Motu proprio* I have desired to affirm that it is up to the bishop, as moderator, promoter, and guardian of the liturgical life of the Church of which he is the principle of unity, to regulate the liturgical celebrations. It is up to you to authorize in your Churches, as local Ordinaries, the use of the *Missale Romanum* of 1962, applying the norms of the present *Motu proprio*. It is up to you to proceed in such a way as to return to a unitary form of celebration, and to determine case by case the reality of the groups which celebrate with this *Missale Romanum*.

[§12] Indications about how to proceed in your dioceses are chiefly dictated by two principles: on the one hand, to provide for the good of those who are rooted in the previous form of celebration and need to return in due time to the Roman Rite promulgated by Saints Paul VI and John Paul II, and, on the other hand, to discontinue the erection of new personal

¹⁴⁰² PAUL VI, Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* on new Roman Missal, 3 April 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 222.

¹⁴⁰³ Cf. *Lumen Gentium*, no. 13.

parishes tied more to the desire and wishes of individual priests than to the real need of the “holy People of God.” At the same time, I ask you to be vigilant in ensuring that every liturgy be celebrated with decorum and fidelity to the liturgical books promulgated after Vatican Council II, without the eccentricities that can easily degenerate into abuses. Seminarians and new priests should be formed in the faithful observance of the prescriptions of the Missal and liturgical books, in which is reflected the liturgical reform willed by Vatican Council II.

[§13] Upon you I invoke the Spirit of the risen Lord, that he may make you strong and firm in your service to the People of God entrusted to you by the Lord, so that your care and vigilance express communion even in the unity of one, single Rite, in which is preserved the great richness of the Roman liturgical tradition. I pray for you. You pray for me.

FRANCISCUS

APPENDIX VII

RESPONSA AD DUBIA

Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments

Responsa ad dubia

To the Presidents of the Conferences of Bishops

4 December 2021

On certain provisions of the Apostolic Letter *Traditionis Custodes* issued Motu Proprio

By the Supreme Pontiff Francis¹⁴⁰⁴

Your Eminence / Your Excellency,

[§1] Following the publication by Pope Francis of the Apostolic Letter “Motu Proprio data” *Traditionis custodes* on the use of the liturgical books from prior to the reform of the Second Vatican Council, the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, which exercises the authority of the Apostolic See for material within its competence (cf. *Traditionis custodes*, no. 7), received several requests for clarification on its correct application. Some questions have been raised from several quarters and with greater frequency. Therefore, after having carefully considered them, having informed the Holy Father and having received his assent, the responses to the most recurrent questions are published herewith.

[§2] The text of the Motu Proprio and the accompanying Letter to the Bishops of the whole world clearly express the reasons for the decisions taken by Pope Francis. The first aim is to continue “in the constant search for ecclesial communion” (*Traditionis custodes*, Preamble) which is expressed by recognizing in the liturgical books promulgated by the Popes Saint Paul VI and Saint John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of the Second Vatican Council, the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite (cf. *Traditionis custodes*, no. 1). This is the direction in which we wish to move, and this is the meaning of the responses we publish here. Every prescribed norm has always the sole purpose of preserving the gift of ecclesial communion by walking together, with conviction of mind and heart, in the direction indicated by the Holy Father.

[§3] It is sad to see how the deepest bond of unity, the sharing in the one Bread broken which is His Body offered so that all may be one (cf. John 17:21), becomes a cause for division. It is the duty of the bishops, *cum Petro et sub Petro*, to safeguard communion, which, as the Apostle Paul reminds us (cf. I Corinthians 11:17-34), is a necessary condition for being able to participate at the Eucharistic table.

[§4] One fact is undeniable: The Council Fathers perceived the urgent need for a reform so that the truth of the faith as celebrated might appear ever more in all its beauty, and the People of God might grow in full, active, conscious participation in the liturgical

¹⁴⁰⁴ https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20211204_responsa-ad-dubia-traditionis-custodes_en.html (11 January 2022).

celebration (cf. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 14), which is the present moment in the history of salvation, the memorial of the Lord's Passover, our one and only hope.

[§5] As pastors we must not lend ourselves to sterile polemics, capable only of creating division, in which the ritual itself is often exploited by ideological viewpoints. Rather, we are all called to rediscover the value of the liturgical reform by preserving the truth and beauty of the Rite that it has given us. For this to happen, we are aware that a renewed and continuous liturgical formation is necessary both for Priests and for the lay faithful.

[§6] At the solemn closing of the second session of the Council (4 December 1963), St. Paul VI said (no. 11):

“The difficult, complex debates have had rich results. They have brought one topic to a conclusion, the sacred liturgy. Treated before all others, in a sense it has priority over all others for its intrinsic dignity and importance to the life of the Church and today we will solemnly promulgate the document on the liturgy. Our spirit, therefore, exults with true joy, for in the way things have gone we note respect for a right scale of values and duties. God must hold first place; prayer to him is our first duty. The liturgy is the first source of the divine communion in which God shares his own life with us. It is also the first school of the spiritual life. The liturgy is the first gift we must make to the Christian people united to us by faith and the fervor of their prayers. It is also a primary invitation to the human race, so that all may lift their now mute voices in blessed and genuine prayer and thus may experience that indescribable, regenerative power to be found when they join us in proclaiming the praises of God and the hopes of the human heart through Christ and the Holy Spirit.”

[§7] When Pope Francis (Address to the participants in the 68th National Liturgical Week, Rome, 24 August 2017) reminds us that “after this magisterium, after this long journey, We can affirm with certainty and with magisterial authority that the liturgical reform is irreversible” he wants to point us to the only direction in which we are joyfully called to turn our commitment as pastors.

[§8] Let us entrust our service “to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Ephesians 4: 3), to Mary, Mother of the Church.

[§9] From the offices of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, 4 December 2021, on the 58th anniversary of the promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

✠ Arthur Roche
Prefect

The Supreme Pontiff Francis, in the course of an Audience granted to the Prefect of this Congregation on 18 November 2021, was informed of and gave his consent to the publication of these Responsa ad dubia with attached Explanatory Notes.

Traditionis custodes

Art. 3. Episcopus, in dioecesibus ubi adhuc unus vel plures coetus celebrant secundum Missale antedecens instaurationem anni 1970....

[R¹] To the proposed question:

When it is not possible to find a church, oratory or chapel which is available to accommodate the faithful who celebrate using the *Missale Romanum* (*Editio typica* 1962), can the diocesan bishop ask the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments for a dispensation from the provision of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes* (art. 3, §2), and thus allow such a celebration in the parish church?

The answer is:

Affirmative.

Explanatory note.

The Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes* in art. 3, §2 requests that the Bishop, in dioceses where up to now there has been the presence of one or more groups celebrating according to the Missal prior to the reform of 1970, “designate one or more locations where the faithful adherents of these groups may gather for the Eucharistic celebration (not however in the parochial churches and without the erection of new personal parishes).” The exclusion of the parish church is intended to affirm that the celebration of the Eucharist according to the previous rite, being a concession limited to these groups, is not part of the ordinary life of the parish community.

This Congregation, exercising the authority of the Holy See in matters within its competence (cf. *Traditionis custodes*, no. 7), can grant, at the request of the diocesan Bishop, that the parish church be used to celebrate according to the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 only if it is established that it is impossible to use another church, oratory or chapel. The assessment of this impossibility must be made with the utmost care.

Moreover, such a celebration should not be included in the parish Mass schedule, since it is attended only by the faithful who are members of the said group. Finally, it should not be held at the same time as the pastoral activities of the parish community. It is to be understood that when another venue becomes available, this permission will be withdrawn.

There is no intention in these provisions to marginalize the faithful who are rooted in the previous form of celebration: they are only meant to remind them that this is a concession to provide for their good (in view of the common use of the one *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite) and not an opportunity to promote the previous rite.

Traditionis custodes

Art. 1. Libri liturgici a sanctis Pontificibus Paulo VI et Ioanne Paulo II promulgati, iuxta decreta Concilii Vaticani II, unica expressio “legis orandi” Ritus Romani sunt.

Art. 8. Normae, dispositiones, concessioniones et consuetudines antecedentes, quae conformes non sint cum harum Litterarum Apostolicarum Motu Proprio datarum praescriptis, abrogantur.

[R²] To the proposed question:

Is it possible, according to the provisions of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis Custodes*, to celebrate the sacraments with the *Rituale Romanum* and the *Pontificale Romanum* which predate the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council?

The answer is:

Negative.

The diocesan Bishop is authorized to grant permission to use only the *Rituale Romanum* (last *editio typica* 1952) and not the *Pontificale Romanum* which predate the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council. He may grant this permission only to those canonically erected personal parishes which, according to the provisions of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes*, celebrate using the *Missale Romanum* of 1962.

Explanatory note.

The Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes* intends to re-establish in the whole Church of the Roman Rite a single and identical prayer expressing its unity, according to the **liturgical books** promulgated by the Popes Saint Paul VI and Saint John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of the Second Vatican Council and in line with the tradition of the Church.

The diocesan Bishop, as the moderator, promoter and guardian of all liturgical life, must work to ensure that his diocese returns to a unitary form of celebration (cf. Pope Francis, Letter to the Bishops of the whole world that accompanies the Apostolic Letter Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes*).

This Congregation, exercising the authority of the Holy See in matters within its competence (cf. *Traditionis custodes*, no. 7), affirms that, in order to make progress in the direction indicated by the Motu Proprio, it should not grant permission to use the *Rituale Romanum* and the *Pontificale Romanum* which predate the liturgical reform, these are liturgical books which, like all previous norms, instructions, concessions and customs, have been abrogated (cf. *Traditionis Custodes*, no. 8).

After discernment, the diocesan Bishop is authorized to grant permission to use only the *Rituale Romanum* (last *editio typica* 1952) and not the *Pontificale Romanum* which predate the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council. This permission is to be granted only to canonically erected personal parishes which, according to the provisions of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes*, celebrate with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962. It should be remembered that the formula for the Sacrament of Confirmation was changed for the entire Latin Church by Saint Paul VI with the Apostolic Constitution *Divinae consortium naturae* (15 August 1971).

This provision is intended to underline the need to clearly affirm the direction indicated by the Motu Proprio which sees in the liturgical books promulgated by the Saints Pope Paul VI and Pope John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of the Second Vatican Council, the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite (cf. *Traditionis custodes*, n. 1).

In implementing these provisions, care should be taken to accompany all those rooted in the previous form of celebration towards a full understanding of the value of the celebration in the ritual form given to us by the reform of the Second Vatican Council. This should take place through an appropriate formation that makes it possible to discover how the

reformed liturgy is the witness to an unchanged faith, the expression of a renewed ecclesiology, and the primary source of spirituality for Christian life.

Traditionis custodes

Art. 3. Episcopus, in dioecesibus ubi adhuc unus vel plures coetus celebrant secundum Missale antecedens instaurationem anni 1970:

§ 1. certior fiat coetus illos auctoritatem ac legitimam naturam instaurationis liturgicae, normarum Concilii Vaticani II Magisteriique Summorum Pontificum non excludere;

[R³] To the proposed question:

If a Priest who has been granted the use of the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 does not recognize the validity and legitimacy of concelebration – refusing to concelebrate, in particular, at the Chrism Mass – can he continue to benefit from this concession?

The answer is:

Negative.

However, before revoking the concession to use the *Missale Romanum* of 1962, the bishop should take care to establish a fraternal dialogue with the Priest, to ascertain that this attitude does not exclude the validity and legitimacy of the liturgical reform, the teaching of the Second Vatican Council and the Magisterium of the Supreme Pontiffs, and to accompany him towards an understanding of the value of concelebration, particularly at the Chrism Mass.

Explanatory note.

Art. 3, §1 of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes* requires the diocesan Bishop to ascertain that the groups requesting to celebrate with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 “do not deny the validity and the legitimacy of the liturgical reform, dictated by Vatican Council II and the Magisterium of the Supreme Pontiffs.”

St. Paul forcefully reminds the community of Corinth to live in unity as a necessary condition to be able to participate at the Eucharistic table (cf. 1 Corinthians 11,17-34).

In the Letter sent to the bishops of the whole world to accompany the text of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes*, the Holy Father says: “Because ‘liturgical celebrations are not private actions, but celebrations of the Church, which is the *sacrament of unity*’ (cf. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 26), they must be carried out in communion with the Church. Vatican Council II, while it reaffirmed the external bonds of incorporation in the Church — the profession of faith, the sacraments, of communion — affirmed with St. Augustine that to remain in the Church not only ‘with the body’ but also ‘with the heart’ is a condition for salvation (cf. *Lumen Gentium*, n. 14)”.

The explicit refusal not to take part in concelebration, particularly at the Chrism Mass, seems to express a lack of acceptance of the liturgical reform and a lack of ecclesial communion with the bishop, both of which are necessary requirements in order to benefit from the concession to celebrate with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962.

However, before revoking the concession to use the Missale Romanum of 1962, the bishop should offer the Priest the necessary time for a sincere discussion on the deeper motivations that lead him not to recognize the value of concelebration, in particular in the Mass presided over by the bishop. He should invite him to express, in the eloquent gesture of concelebration, that ecclesial communion which is a necessary condition for being able to participate at the table of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

Traditionis custodes

Art. 3. Episcopus, in dioecesis ubi adhuc unus vel plures coetus celebrant secundum Missale antedecens instaurationem anni 1970....

§ 3. constituat, in loco statuto, dies quibus celebrationes eucharisticae secundum Missale Romanum a sancto Ioanne XXIII anno 1962 promulgatum permittuntur. His in celebrationibus, lectiones proclamantur lingua vernacula, adhibitis Sacrae Scripturae translationibus ad usum liturgicum ab unaquaque Conferentia Episcoporum approbatis;

[R⁴] To the proposed question:

In Eucharistic celebrations using the Missale Romanum of 1962, is it possible to use the full text of the Bible for the readings, choosing the pericopes indicated in the Missal?

The answer is:

Affirmative.

Explanatory note.

Art. 3, §3 of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes* states that the readings are to be proclaimed in the vernacular language, using translations of Sacred Scripture for liturgical use, approved by the respective Episcopal Conferences.

Since the texts of the readings are contained in the Missal itself, and therefore there is no separate Lectionary, and in order to observe the provisions of the Motu Proprio, one must necessarily resort to the translation of the Bible approved by the individual Bishops' Conferences for liturgical use, choosing the pericopes indicated in the *Missale Romanum* of 1962.

No vernacular lectionaries may be published that reproduce the cycle of readings of the previous rite.

It should be remembered that the present Lectionary is one of the most precious fruits of the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council. The publication of the Lectionary, in addition to overcoming the "plenary" form of the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 and returning to the ancient tradition of individual books corresponding to individual ministries, fulfills the wish of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 51: "The treasures of the Bible are to be opened up more lavishly, so that richer fare may be provided for the faithful at the table of God's word. In this way a more representative portion of the holy scriptures will be read to the people in the course of a prescribed number of years."

Traditionis custodes

Art. 4. Presbyteri ordinati post has Litteras Apostolicas Motu Proprio datas promulgatas, celebrare volentes iuxta Missale Romanum anno 1962 editum, petitionem formalem Episcopo dioecesano mittere debent, qui, ante concessionem, a Sede Apostolica licentiam rogabit.

[R⁵] To the proposed question:

Does the diocesan Bishop have to be authorized by the Apostolic See to allow priests ordained after the publication of the Motu Proprio *Traditionis custodes* to celebrate with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 (cf. *Traditionis custodies*, no. 4)?

The answer is:

Affirmative.

Explanatory note.

Article 4 of the Latin text (which is the official text to be referenced) reads as follows: «Presbyteri ordinati post has Litteras Apostolicas Motu Proprio datas promulgatas, celebrare volentes iuxta Missale Romanum anno 1962 editum, petitionem formalem Episcopo dioecesano mittere debent, qui, ante concessionem, a Sede Apostolica licentiam rogabit».

This is not merely a consultative opinion, but a necessary authorization given to the diocesan Bishop by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, which exercises the authority of the Holy See over matters within its competence. (Cf. *Traditionis custodes*, no. 7).

Only after receiving this permission will the diocesan Bishop be able to authorize Priests ordained after the publication of the Motu Proprio (16 July 2021) to celebrate with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962.

This rule is intended to assist the diocesan bishop in evaluating such a request: his discernment will be duly taken into account by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments.

The Motu Proprio clearly expresses the desire that what is contained in the liturgical books promulgated by Popes Saint Paul VI and Saint John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of the Second Vatican Council, be recognized as the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite: it is therefore absolutely essential that priests ordained after the publication of the Motu Proprio share this desire of the Holy Father.

All seminary formators, seeking to walk with solicitude in the direction indicated by Pope Francis, are encouraged to accompany future Deacons and Priests to an understanding and experience of the richness of the liturgical reform called for by the Second Vatican Council. This reform has enhanced every element of the Roman Rite and has fostered - as hoped for by the Council Fathers - the full, conscious and active participation of the entire People of God in the liturgy (cf. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* no. 14), the primary source of authentic Christian spirituality.

Traditionis custodes

Art. 5. Presbyteri, qui iam secundum Missale Romanum anno 1962 editum celebrant, ab Episcopo diocesano licentiam rogabunt ad hanc facultatem servandam.

[R⁶] To the proposed question:

Can the faculty to celebrate using the Missale Romanum of 1962 be granted *ad tempus*?

The answer is:

Affirmative.

Explanatory note.

The possibility of granting the use of the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 for a defined period of time - the duration of which the diocesan bishop will consider appropriate - is not only possible but also recommended: the end of the defined period offers the possibility of ascertaining that everything is in harmony with the direction established by the Motu Proprio. The outcome of this assessment can provide grounds for prolonging or suspending the permission.

[R⁷] To the proposed question:

Does the faculty granted by the diocesan Bishop to celebrate using the Missale Romanum of 1962 only apply to the territory of his own diocese?

The answer is:

Affirmative.

[R⁸] To the proposed question:

If the authorized Priest is absent or unable to attend, must the person replacing him also have formal authorization?

The answer is:

Affirmative.

[R⁹] To the proposed question:

Do Deacons and **instituted ministers** participating in celebrations using the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 have to be authorized by the diocesan Bishop?

The answer is:

Affirmative.

[R¹⁰] To the proposed question:

Can a priest who is authorized to celebrate with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 and who, because of his office (parish priest, chaplain, etc.), also celebrates on weekdays with the *Missale Romanum* of the reform of the Second Vatican Council, binate using the *Missale Romanum* of 1962?

The answer is:

Negative.

Explanatory note.

The Parish Priest or chaplain who - in the fulfilment of his office - celebrates on weekdays with the current *Missale Romanum*, which is the unique expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite, cannot binate by celebrating with the *Missale Romanum* of 1962, either with a group or privately.

It is not possible to grant bination on the grounds that there is no “just cause” or “pastoral necessity” as required by canon 905 §2: the right of the faithful to the celebration of the Eucharist is in no way denied, since they are offered the possibility of participating in the Eucharist in its current ritual form.

[R¹¹] To the proposed question:

Can a priest who is authorized to celebrate using the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 celebrate on the same day with the same Missal for another group of faithful who have received authorization?

The answer is:

Negative.

Explanatory note.

It is not possible to grant bination on the grounds that there is no “just cause” or “pastoral necessity” as required by canon 905 §2: the right of the faithful to the celebration of the Eucharist is in no way denied, since they are offered the possibility of participating in the Eucharist in its current ritual form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

- ABBOTT, W. (gen. ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II*, Piscataway, NJ, New Century Publishers, 1966.
- Acta Apostolicae Sedis, commentarium officiale*, Rome, 1909-1929, vol. 1, no. 1 - vol. 21, no. 5, Vatican City, 1929- ; vol. 21, no. 6- , Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1929- .
- Acta et documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1960- , 23 vols.
- Acta et documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando*, Series I (Antepreparatoria), Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1960, 4 vols.
- Acta et documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II apparando*, Series II (Praeparatoria), Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1965, 3 vols.
- Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1970- , 6 vols.
- ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO, *The Liturgy Documents: Essential Documents for Parish Worship*, 5th ed., vol. 1, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 2012.
- _____, *The Liturgy Documents Volume Two: Essential Documents for Parish Sacramental Rites and Other Liturgies, Second Edition*, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 2012.
- BEAL, J.P., J.A. CORIDEN and T.J. GREEN (eds.), *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, commissioned by THE CANON LAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA, New York, NY/Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 2000.
- BENEDICT XIV, Encyclical letter *Certiores effecti* concerning the distribution of communion, 3 November 1742, in *Fontes*, vol. 1, no. 331, 771-773.
- BENEDICT XV, Allocution to the consistory of Cardinals *Quandoquidem quae* concerning the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law, 4 December 1916, in *AAS*, 8 (1916), 465-478.
- _____, Apostolic constitution *Providentissima Mater Ecclesia* promulgating the Code of Canon Law, 27 May 1917, in *AAS*, 9 (1917), 5-8, English translation in E. PETERS (ed.), *The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2001, 21-24.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Humani generis redemptionem* on preaching the word of God, 15 June 1917, in *AAS*, 9 (1917), 305-317, English translation in C. CARLEN (ed.), *The Papal Encyclicals*, Wilmington, NC, McGrath Publishing Company, 1981, vol. 3, 153-159.
- _____, Apostolic Letter *motu proprio Cum iuris canonici* creating the Code Commission and the methods of making amendments to the Code, 15 September 1917, in *AAS*, 9 (1918), 483-484, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 1, 55-57.

- BENEDICT XVI, Post-synodal apostolic exhortation *Sacramentum caritatis* on the Eucharist, 22 February 2007, Libreria editrice Vaticana, 2007, English translation in *Origins*, 36 (2006-2007), 629-658.
- _____, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Summorum Pontificum* on the use of pre-conciliar liturgical forms, 7 July 2007, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 777-781, English translation in *Origins*, 37 (2007-2008), 129-132.
- _____, Letter to bishops *Con grande fiducia* accompanying the Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum*, 7 July 2007, in *AAS*, 99 (2007), 795-799, English translation in *Origins*, 37 (2007-2008), 132-134.
- _____, Televised homily at the concluding Mass of the 49th International Eucharistic Congress in Québec City, 22 June 2008, in *AAS*, 100 (2008), 485-488.
- _____, Address to the Congress on the heritage of the magisterium of Pius XII and the Second Vatican Council, 8 November 2008, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, English ed., 12 November 2008, 6.
- _____, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Ecclesiae Dei unitatem* on reconfiguring the Pontifical Commission, 2 July 2009, in *AAS*, 101 (2009), 710-711, English translation in *Origins*, 39 (2009-2010), 161-163.
- Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatum versionem*, prepared by R. GRYSON, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- BISHOP'S COMMITTEE ON THE LITURGY, *Thirty-Five Years of the BCL Newsletter, 1965-2000*, Washington, DC, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2004.
- CANADIAN CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *Normes complémentaires au Code de droit canonique de 1983/Complementary Norms to the 1983 Code of Canon Law*, Ottawa, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1996.
- CANADIAN CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, Second decree of the Canadian episcopate concerning use of the vernacular in the liturgy, 21 December 1964, in *Liturgical Renewal: Documents Issued by the Holy See and the Canadian Episcopate, 1963-1964*, Ottawa, Canadian Catholic Conference, 1965, 111-115.
- Canon Law Digest*, vols. 1-6, Milwaukee, WI/New York, NY, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1934-1969; vols. 7-10, Mundelein, IL, Canon Law Digest, 1975-1986; vols. 11- , Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1991- .
- Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, trans. H. SCHROEDER, Rockford, IL, TAN Books and Publishers, 1978.
- CAPARROS, E. et al. (eds.), *Code of Canon Law Annotated*, 2nd ed. revised, Montréal, Wilson & Lafleur Limitée, 2004.
- CAPPELLO, F., *Summa iuris canonici in usum scholarum concinnata*, ed. quarta accurate recognita, Rome, Apud aedes Universitatis Gregoriana, 1945.
- _____, *Tractatus canonico-moralis de sacramentis*, Rome, Marietti, 1926.
- CARLEN, C. (ed.), *The Papal Encyclicals*, Wilmington, NC, McGrath Publishing Company, 1981, 5 vols.

Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, Issued by Order of Pope Pius V, trans. with notes by J. MCHUGH and C. CALLAN, New York, NY/London, Joseph F. Wagner/B. Herder, 1945.

CICOGNANI, A.G., *Canon Law*, 2nd rev. ed., Philadelphia, PA, Dolphin Press, 1935.

Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum orientalium auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus, fontium annotatione auctus, Vatican City, Libreria editrice Vaticana, 1995, English translation *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, Latin-English Edition, New English Translation*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 2001.

Codex iuris canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus, fontium annotatione et indice analytico-alphabetico auctus, Libreria editrice Vaticana, 1989, English translation *Code of Canon Law: Latin-English Edition, New English translation*, prepared under the auspices of the CANON LAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1999.

Codex iuris canonici Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu digestus Benedicti Papae XV auctoritate promulgatus, Vatican City, Typis polyglottis Vaticanus, 1917, English translation E. PETERS (ed.), *The 1917 Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2001.

COMMISSION FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CODE OF CANON LAW, de dubiorum solutione, 9 December 1917, in *AAS*, 10 (1918), 77, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 1, 57.

Communicationes, Rome, PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR THE REVISION OF THE CODE OF CANON LAW (PONTIFICIA COMMISSIO CODICI IURIS CANONICI RECOGNOSCENDO), 1969-1983, vols. 1-15; PONTIFICAL COMMISSION FOR THE AUTHENTIC INTERPRETATION OF THE CODE OF CANON LAW (PONTIFICIA COMMISSIO CODICI IURIS CANONICI AUTHENTICE INTERPRETANDO), 1984-1988, vols. 16-20; PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF LEGISLATIVE TEXTS (PONTIFICIUM CONSILIUM DE LEGUM TEXTIBUS INTERPRETANDIS), 1989- , vol. 21- .

SACRED CONGREGATION FOR CLERGY, Decree *Litteris apostolicis*, on the obligation of celebrating the Mass *pro populo*, 25 July 1970, in *AAS*, 63 (1971), 943-944 and *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 380, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 283, 703.

CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Decree promulgating the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, 14 September 1984, in *Notitiae*, 20 (1984), 940-941, English translation in *Ceremonial of Bishops*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1989, 9.

_____, Circular letter *Quattuor abhinc annos* on the use of the 1962 Roman Missal, 3 October 1984, in *Communicationes*, 17 (1985), 3-4, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 11, 3-4.

_____, Circular letter *Paschalis sollemnitatis* on the preparation and celebration of the paschal feasts, 16 January 1988, in *Notitiae*, 24 (1988), 81-107, English translation in *Origins*, 17 (1988), 677, 679-687.

CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Decree *Celebrationes eucharisticae* promulgating the first *editio typica* of the *Missale*

Romanum as reformed after the Second Vatican Council, 26 March 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 554, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 213, 543.

_____, *General Introduction to the Lectionary for Mass*, in NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *Lectionary for Mass for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America, Second Typical Edition, Volume I: Sundays, Solemnities, Feasts of the Lord and the Saints*, Catholic Book Publishing Company, Totowa, NJ, 1998, 13-35.

_____, *Immensae caritatis*, 29 January 1973, in *AAS*, 65 (1973), 264-271.

_____, Notification on some aspects of the calendar and liturgical texts, 20 September 1977, available in Italian at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20000628_calendari_it.html (11 January 2022)

_____, Private reply regarding use of older rubrics, in *Notitiae*, 14 (1978), 301-302, no. 2, English translation in *DOL*, 481, footnote R¹¹.

_____, Private reply regarding use of older rubrics, in *Notitiae*, 14 (1978), 534-535, no. 10.

_____, Circular letter *Credo doveroso* on the use of female altar servers, 15 March 1994, in *Notitiae*, 30 (1994), 333-335, English translation in *Origins*, 23 (1993-1994), 777-779.

_____, Instruction *Varietates legitimae* on the Roman liturgy and inculturation, 25 January 1994, in *AAS*, 87 (1995), 288-314, English translation in *Origins*, 23 (1993-1994), 745, 747-756.

_____, Decree *Tertio ineunte millennio* promulgating the *editio typica tertia* of the *Missale Romanum*, 20 April 2000, in *Notitiae*, 38 (2002), 452-453.

_____, Private response to a question concerning *Versus apsidem* celebration in the *Novus Ordo*, 25 September 2000, prot. no. 2036/00/L, in *Sacred Music*, vol. 127, no. 3 (Fall, 2000), 22-23.

_____, Reply concerning the celebration of Mass *ad orientem*, 25 September 2000, in *Communicationes*, 32 (2000), 171-173, English translation in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, vol. 126 (2001), 47-48.

_____, Responses concerning the signs of reverence for the Eucharist, 7 November 2000, in *Communicationes*, 32 (2000), 173-174, English translation in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 126 (2001), 49-50.

_____, Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam* on the principles and norms for translation of liturgical texts, 28 March 2001, in *AAS*, 93 (2001), 685-726, English translation in *Origins*, 31 (2002-2002), 17, 19-32.

_____, Response as to which direction a priest should face during the Mass, 25 September 2001, in *Communicationes*, 22 (2000), 171-173, English translation in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 126 (2001), 47-48.

CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SACRAMENTS, Instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum* on certain matters to be observed or avoided regarding the Eucharist, 25 March 2004, in *AAS*, 96 (2004), 549-601, English translation in *Origins*, 33 (2003-2004), 801-822.

_____, Notification insertion of saints into the General Roman Calendar, 25 December 2006, *Notitiae*, 42 (2006) 618-619, accompanied by *Commentary*, in *Notitiae*, 42 (2006) 620-621.

_____, Confirmation for use of the Roman Missal, Third Edition, for use in dioceses of the United States of America, 26 March 2010, prot. no. 1464/06/L.

_____, Confirmation of adaptations to the Roman Missal, Third Edition, for use in dioceses of the United States of America, 24 July 2010, prot. no. 577/10/L.

_____, Reply concerning the position of the priest celebrant at Mass, n.d., in F.S. PEDONE and J.I. DONLON (eds.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2000*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 2000, 33-35.

CONGREGATION FOR EASTERN CHURCHES, Instruction applying the liturgical prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches, 6 January 1996, Vatican City, Libreria editrice Vaticana, 1996.

CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, Decree *Quo magis* on adding seven eucharistic prefaces to the Extraordinary Form, 20 February 2020, prot. no. 137/2009P – ED, available in Latin at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20200222_decreto-quo-magis_la.html (11 January 2022).

_____, *Note praevia* for presentation of the decree *Quo magis* on the liturgical celebration in honor of saints in the *Forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, undated, prot. no. 137/2009S – ED, English version available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20200222_nota-decreto-quomagis_en.html (11 January 2022).

_____, Decree *Cum sanctissima* on the liturgical celebration in honor of Saints in the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, 25 March 2020, available in Latin at http://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2020/03/25/2003_25h.html (11 January 2022).

_____, *Note praevia* for presentation of decree *Cum sanctissima*, English version available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20200222_nota-decreto-cumsanctissima_en.html (11 January 2022).

CONSILIUM AD EXSEQUENDAM CONSTITUTIONEM DE SACRA LITURGIA, Letter *Le sarei grato* to papal nuncios and apostolic delegates on the course to follow in reform of the liturgy, 25 March 1964, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 79, 217-218.

_____, *De oratione communi seu fidelium*, Vatican City, 1965.

_____, Declaration *Passim quandoque* on liturgical experimentation, 15 June 1965, in *Notitiae*, 1 (1965), 145, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 29, 116.

- CONSILIUM AD EXSEQUENDAM CONSTITUTIONEM DE SACRA LITURGIA, Letter *Le renouveau liturgique* to conferences of bishops on furthering the liturgical reform, 30 June 1965, in *Notitiae*, 1 (1965), 257-264, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 31, 117-122.
- _____, Letter *L'heureux developpement* of Cardinal G. Lercaro President of Consilium to presidents of conferences of bishops on the problems in the reform of the liturgy, 25 January 1966, in *Notitiae*, 2 (1966), 157-161, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 32, 122-125.
- _____, Normative decree granted to conferences of bishops in response to requests for the use of the vernacular, in *Notitiae*, 1 (1965), 9, English translation in BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 101-102.
- _____, Declaration *Cum recentioribus temporibus*, on the office and Mass in countries where Epiphany, Ascension and *Corpus Christi* are transferred to Sunday, 18 October 1968, in *Notitiae*, 4 (1968), 279, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 456, 1188.
- _____, Publication of liturgical texts for celebration of the World Day of Peace, 1969, December 1968, in *Notitiae*, 4 (1968), 366 and 367, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 498, 1283.
- CORIDEN, J., T.J. GREEN and D.E. HEINTSCHEL (eds.), *The Code of Canon Law, A Text and Commentary*, New York, NY/Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 1985.
- Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna, C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam Academiae/Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 93 vols., 1866, available at <http://www.earlymedievalmonasticism.org/Corpus-Scriptorum-Ecclesiasticorum-Latinorum.html> and <http://csel.sbg.ac.at/en/> (11 January 2022).
- EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE OF ENGLAND AND WALES, Statement on the New Roman Missal, 24 April 1975, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1975), 143-144.
- FINK, P. (ed.), *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- FLANNERY, A., (gen. ed.), *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*, 2nd ed., Northport, NY, Costello, 1996.
- _____, (gen. ed.), *Vatican II: More Post-Conciliar Documents*, vol. 2, New rev. ed., Northport, NY, Costello, 1998.
- FRANCIS, apostolic letter *motu proprio Magnum principium* modifying canon 838, 9 September 2017, in *AAS*, 109 (2017), 967-970, English translation available at <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2017/09/09/170909a.html> (11 January 2022).
- _____, Apostolic Letter given *motu proprio* *On the Pontifical Commission "Ecclesia Dei,"* 17 January 2019, available in English at http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/motu_proprio/documents/papa-francesco-motu-proprio-20190117_ecclesia-dei.html (11 January 2022).

- FRANCIS. Apostolic letter *motu proprio Competentias quasden decernere*, introducing changes to the *Code of Canon Law* and the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, 11 February 2022, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/motu_proprio/documents/20220211-motu-proprio-assegnare-alcune-competenze.html (7 July 2022).
- _____, Apostolic Constitution *Praedicate evangelium*, on the Roman Curia and its service to the Church and to the world, 19 March 2022, art. 93, available in Italian at <https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2022/03/19/0189/00404.html> (19 March 2022).
- _____, Apostolic Letter *Desiderio Desideravi*, on the liturgical formation of the People of God, 29 June 2022, English translation available at https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_letters/documents/20220629-lettera-ap-desiderio-desideravi.html (7 July 2022).
- GARNER, B. (ed.), *Black's Law Dictionary*, 10th ed., St. Paul, MN, Thomson Reuters, 2014.
- GASPARI, P. and J. SERÉDI (eds.), *Codicis iuris canonici fontes*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1926-1939, 9 vols.
- HARRISON, F., Letter to the Faithful of the Diocese of Syracuse, NY, on the Celebration of the Tridentine Mass, 28 December 1985, in *Origins*, 15 (1985-1986), 553-555.
- HURLEY, D., Letter from Representatives of English-speaking Episcopal Conferences Concerning the Provisions of *Quattuor abhinc annos*, 28 October 1984, in *Origins*, 14 (1984-1985), 334-335.
- INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, *Emendations in the Liturgical Books Following upon the New Code of Canon Law*, Washington, DC, International Commission on English in the Liturgy, 1984.
- _____, *New Eucharistic Prayers and Prefaces: English Translations and Notes to the Texts*, London, G. Chapman, 1969.
- JOHN XXIII, Address *Questa festiva* to Roman cardinals announcing an ecumenical council, 25 January 1959, in *AAS*, 51 (1959), 65-69, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 5 (1959), 398-399.
- _____, Order to amend the prayers regarding Jews on Good Friday, 17 March 1959, in *CLD*, vol. 5, 20.
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Rubricarum instructum* approving a new code of rubrics, 25 July 1960, in *AAS*, 52 (1960), 593-595, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 305-307.
- _____, Apostolic constitution *Humanae salutis* proclaiming the Second Vatican Council, 25 December 1961, in *AAS*, 54 (1962), 5-13, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 7 (1961), 353-361.
- _____, Apostolic constitution *Veterum sapientia* on the promotion of the study of Latin, 22 February 1962, *AAS*, 54 (1962), 139-145, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 8 (1962), 31-37.

- JOHN XXIII, Allocution *Gaudete mater ecclesia* at the commencement of the Second Vatican Council, 11 October 1962, in *AAS*, 54 (1962), 786-796, English translation in W. ABBOTT (gen. ed.), *The Documents of Vatican II*, Piscataway, NJ, New Century Publishers, 1966, 710-719.
- _____, Address at the close of the first session of the Second Vatican Council, 8 December 1962, in *AAS*, 55 (1963), 35-41, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 8 (1962-1963), 398-403.
- JOHN PAUL II, Apostolic constitution *Sacrae disciplinae leges* promulgating the new Code of Canon Law, 25 January 1983, in *AAS*, 75, pars II (1983), vii-xiv, English translation in *Code of Canon Law: Latin-English Edition, New English translation*, prepared under the allspices of the CANON LAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1999, xxii-xxxii.
- _____, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, 2 July 1988, in *AAS*, 80 (1988), 1495-1498, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 12, 805-808.
- _____, Apostolic letter *Vicesimus quintus annus* on the twenty-fifth anniversary of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 4 December 1988, in *AAS*, 81 (1989), 897-918, English translation in *Origins*, 19 (1989-1990), 17, 19-25.
- _____, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Ad tuendam fidem* modifying the Codes of Canon Law, 18 May 1998, in *AAS*, 90 (1998), 457-461, English translation in *Origins*, 28 (1998), 113-116.
- _____, Address to bishops of the United States on their *ad limina* visit, 9 October 1998, in *AAS*, 91 (1999), 351-356.
- _____, Homily at the canonization of Blessed Faustina Kowalska Declaring Divine Mercy Sunday, 30 April 2000, in *AAS*, 92 (2000), 670-674, English translation available at http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/homilies/2000/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_20000430_faustina.html (11 January 2022).
- _____, Apostolic letter *Spiritus et sponsa* on the fortieth anniversary of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 04 December 2003, in *AAS*, 96 (2004), 419-427, English translation at https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/2003/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_20031204_spiritus-et-sponsa.html (11 January 2022).
- KACZYNSKI, R. (ed.), *Enchiridion documentorum instaurationis liturgicae*, 3 vols., Turin, Marietti, 1975-1997.
- LEO XIII, Encyclical letter *Providentissimus Deus* on the study of sacred scripture, 18 November 1893, in *ASS*, 26 (1893-1894), 269-292, English translation in CARLEN, *Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 2, 325-339.
- LERCARO, G., Letter *Mi onoro di comunicare*, 29 February 1964, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 77, 214.
- LIBRERIA EDITRICE VATICANA, *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, English translation prepared under the auspices of the NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, Washington, DC, USCCB Publishing, 2000.

- MARZOA, A., J. MIRAS AND R. RODRIGUEZ-OCAÑA (eds.) and E. CAPARROS (gen. ed. of English translation), *Exegetical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, Montréal, Wilson & Lafleur, 2004, 8 vols.
- NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *Norms Governing Liturgical Calendars*, Liturgy Documentary Series, 6, Washington, D.C., Office of Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1984.
- NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *Pastoral Statement on Penance and Abstinence*, 1966, available at <https://www.usccb.org/prayer-and-worship/liturgical-year-and-calendar/lent/us-bishops-pastoral-statement-on-penance-and-abstinence> (11 January 2022).
- New American Bible with Revised New Testament*, Iowa Falls, IO, World Bible Publishers, 1986.
- O'BRIEN, T.C. (ed.), *Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979: Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1982.
- OCHOA, J., *Index verborum ac locutionum Codicis iuris canonici*, Vatican City, Libreria editrice lateranense, 1984.
- _____, *Leges Ecclesiae post Codicem Iuris Canonici editae*, Rome, Commentarium pro Religiosis, 1966- .
- OFFICE FOR THE LITURGICAL CELEBRATIONS OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF, Observance of Liturgical Norms and “Ars Celebrandi,” n.d. http://www.vatican.va/news_services/liturgy/details/ns_lit_doc_20100729_osservanza_en.html (11 January 2022).
- PALAZZINI, P., *Dictionarium Morale et Canonicum*, Rome, Officium libri catholici, 1962.
- PAUL VI, Address *Tempus iam advenit* to the council fathers at the end of the second session of the Second Vatican Council, 4 December 1963, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 31-40, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 9 (1964), 221-229.
- _____, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Sacram liturgiam* on putting into effect some prescriptions of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, 25 January 1964, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 139-144, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 20, 84-87.
- _____, Address to the members and *periti* of Consilium, 29 October 1964, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 993-996, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 81, 219-221.
- _____, Rescript, 21 November 1964, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 186.
- _____, Address to translators of liturgical texts, 10 November 1965, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 967-970, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 113, 272-274.
- _____, Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* on fast and abstinence, 17 February 1966, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 177-198, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 358, 936-943.
- _____, Apostolic letter motu proprio *Munus Apostolicum* extending the period of suspension for some council decrees, 10 June 1966, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 465-466, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 6, 259-260.

- PAUL VI, Apostolic letter *motu proprio De episcoporum muneribus*, 15 June 1966, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 467-472.
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae* on the implementation of the decrees of the Second Vatican Council, 6 August 1966, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 757-787, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 6, 264-298.
- _____, Address to the members and *periti* of Consilium, 13 October 1966, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 1145-1150, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 84, 223-226.
- _____, Concession allowing *ad experimentum* use of the vernacular in the canon of the Mass and in ordinations, 31 January 1967, in *Notitiae*, 2 (1967), 154, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 117, 278-279.
- _____, Address to the members and *periti* of Consilium, 19 April 1967, in *AAS*, 59 (1967), 418-421, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 86, 227-229.
- _____, Message (autograph) to all people “of good will,” urging their observance on 1 January of a World Day of Peace, 8 December 1967, in *AAS*, 60 (1967), 1097-1102, excerpt, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 497, 1282.
- _____, Address to the members and *periti* of Consilium, 14 October 1968, in *AAS*, 60 (1968), 732-737, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 92, 235-237.
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Mysteriorum paschalis* approving the general norms of the liturgical year and the new *Calendarium Romanum*, 14 February 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 222-226, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 440, 1152-1154.
- _____, Apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum* on the Roman Missal, 3 April 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 217-222, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 202, 458-461.
- _____, Address to the Consistory of Cardinals *Nostrum hoc consistorium*, 28 April 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 428-429, and *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 128, English translation in *The Pope Speaks*, 14 (1969-1970), 157-164, and in *DOL*, doc. 93, 238.
- _____, Address to the members and *periti* of Consilium on the occasion of its final plenary meeting, 10 April 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 272-274, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 99, 245-246.
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Ministeria quaedam* on first tonsure, minor orders and the subdiaconate, 15 August 1972, in *AAS*, 64 (1972), 529-534, English translation in *FLANNERY I*, 427-432.
- _____, Apostolic Exhortation *Marialis cultus* on rightly grounding and increasing Marian devotion, 2 February 1974, in *AAS*, 66 (1974), 113-168, and *Notitiae*, 10 (1974), 153-197, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 467, 1204-1227.
- _____, Address to a consistory of cardinals, 24 May 1976, in *AAS*, 68 (1977), 368-378, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 59, 176-180.
- _____, Epistle *Piscariensium civitas* to Cardinal J. Colombo, Archbishop of Milan, on the occasion of the 19th National Eucharistic Congress of Italy (Pescara, 11-18 September 1977), on the theme: The Lord’s Day is the Weekly Easter of the People

- of God, 4 August 1977, in *AAS*, 69 (1977), 565-567, in *Notitiae*, 13 (1977), 357-359 (excerpt), English translation in *DOL*, doc. 450, 1178-1179.
- PAUL VI, Address to pilgrims at Pescara, on Sunday as the weekly Easter of the people of God, 25 April 1978, in *Notitiae*, 14 (1978), 208, excerpt, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 452, 1181-1182.
- PIUS V, Apostolic constitution *Quo primum* promulgating the *Missale Romanum* of 1570, 14 July 1570, in P. GASPARI (ed.), *Codicis iuris canonici fontes*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1939, vol. 1, 241-243.
- PIUS VII, Decree *Apostolicae Sedis* of Cardinal Caprara, Legate in France, 9 April 1802, English translation in BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES, *Papal Teachings*, 103-104, marg. no. 126 (79).
- PIUS X, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Tra le sollecitudini* on the restoration of Church music, 22 November 1903, in *ASS*, 36 (1903-1904), 329-339, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 3-10.
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Arduum sane munus* on the codification of Canon Law, 19 March 1904, in *ASS*, 36 (1903-1904), 549-551, English translation in V.A. YZERMANS (ed.), *All Things in Christ: Encyclicals and Selected Documents of Saint Pius X*, Westminster, MD, Newman Press, 1954, 212-214.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Pascendi dominici gregis* on the doctrine of the modernists, 8 September 1907, in *ASS*, 40 (1907), 593-650, English translation in CARLEN, *Papal Encyclicals*, vol. 3, 71-98.
- _____, *Motu proprio De diebus festis*, 2 July 1911, in *AAS*, 3 (1911), 305.
- _____, Apostolic Constitution *Divino afflatu* de Nova psalterii in breviario Romano dispositione, 1 November 1911, in *AAS*, 3 (1911), decree, 633-638; rubrics 639-651, English translation available at <https://breviary.net/divino-afflatu.htm> (11 January 2022).
- _____, *Motu proprio Abhinc duos annos*, 23 October 1913, English translation in BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES, *Papal Teachings: The Liturgy*, trans. Daughters of St. Paul, Boston, MA, St. Paul Editions, 1962, 227, marg. prg. 347 [16, 72].
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Quanta semper cura* reordering the Congregation for Sacred Rites, 26 January 1914, in *AAS*, 6 (1914), 25-27.
- PIUS XI, Apostolic letter *Explorata res*, 2 February 1923, in *AAS*, 15 (1923), 103-107.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Quas primas* on the Kingship of Christ, 11 December 1925, in *AAS*, 17 (1925), 593-610, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 36-46.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Miserentissimus Redemptor* on the reparation due to the Sacred Heart, 8 May 1928, in *AAS*, 20 (1928), 165-178, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 47-57.

- PIUS XI, Apostolic constitution *Divini cultus* on the liturgy and Gregorian Chant, 20 December 1928, in *AAS*, 21 (1928), 33-41, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 58-63.
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio* *Gia da qualche* establishing the *Sectio historica* of the Congregation for Sacred Rites, 6 February 1930, in *AAS*, 22 (1930), 87-88.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Quadragesimo anno* commemorating the fortieth anniversary of Leo XIII's *Rerum novarum*, 15 May 1931, in *AAS*, 23 (1931), 177-228.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Divini Redemptoris* on atheistic communism, 19 March 1937, in *AAS*, 29 (1937), 65-106.
- PIUS XII, Allocution to the Lenten Preachers in Rome, 13 March 1943, in *AAS*, 35 (1943), 105-116.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Mystici Corporis* on the mystical body of Christ, 29 June 1943, in *AAS*, 35 (1943), 193-248, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 64-102.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Divino afflante Spiritu* on the promotion of biblical studies, 30 September 1943, in *AAS*, 35 (1943), 297-325. Partial English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 102-104.
- _____, Encyclical letter *Mediator Dei* on the sacred liturgy, 20 November 1947, in *AAS*, 39 (1947), 521-595, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 107-159.
- _____, Apostolic constitution *Christus Dominus* on the discipline for the Eucharistic fast, 6 January 1953, in *AAS*, 45 (1953), 15-24, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 178-185.
- _____, Allocution *Magnificate Dominum mecum* on various liturgical problems, 2 November 1954, in *AAS*, 46 (1954), 666-677, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 194-203.
- _____, Allocution to the first international congress of pastoral liturgy at Assisi-Rome, 22 September 1956, in *AAS*, 48 (1956), 711-725, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 233-245.
- _____, Apostolic letter *motu proprio* *Sacram communionem* extending the provisions for evening Mass and the eucharistic fast, 19 March 1957, in *AAS*, 49 (1957), 177-178, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 249-250.
- PONTIFICAL COMMISSION *ECCLESIA DEI*, *Rescriptum ex audientia Sanctissimi* concerning faculties entrusted to the Pontifical Commission, 18 October 1988, in *AAS*, 82 (1990), 533-534, English translation in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 77 (1989), 19-20.
- _____, Decree Erecting the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter as a Clerical Society of Apostolic Life of Pontifical Right, 18 October 1988, English translation in CANON LAW SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, *Newsletter*, 11 (1989), 27-28.

- PONTIFICAL COMMISSION *ECCLESIA DEI*, Private response concerning the celebration of the Tridentine Mass, 7 March 1989, in W. SCHUMACHER and L. JARREL (eds.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 1989*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1989, 5-7.
- _____, Private response concerning permission to celebrate according to the Roman Missal of 1962, 4 May 1989, in *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 1990*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1990, 1-5.
- _____, Guidelines for implementing the Apostolic Letter *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, 19 April 1991, in *Origins*, 21 (1991-1992), 144-145.
- _____, Private reply concerning use of the 1962 Roman Missal, n.d., in F. S. PEDONE and J. I. DONLON (eds.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 1998*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1998, 9-11.
- _____, *Instructio Universae ecclesiae ad exsequendas Litteras Apostolicas Summorum Pontificum* a S. S. Benedicto PP. XVI motu proprio datas, 30 April 2011, in *AAS*, 103 (2011), 413-420.
- PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF LEGISLATIVE TEXTS, *Acta et documenta Pontificiae commissionis Codici iuris canonici recognoscendo: congregatio plenaria diebus 20-29 octobris 1981 habita*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1991.
- _____, Authentic interpretation of c. 230 on the use of female altar servers, 6 June 1994, in *AAS*, 86 (1994), 541, English translation in E. CAPARROS et al. (eds.), *Code of Canon Law Annotated*, 2nd ed., revised, Montréal, Wilson & Lafleur Limitée, 2004, 1621.
- PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN UNITY, *Directoire pour l'application des principes et des normes sur l'oecumenisme*, 25 March 1994, in *AAS*, 85 (1993), 1039-1119, Vatican English version *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism*, Ottawa, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1993.
- Principia seu criteria generalia ad calendarium liturgicum instaurandum*, in *Notitiae*, 1 (1965), 150-152, English translation in BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 308.
- The Roman Catechism Translated and Annotated in accord with Vatican II and Post-conciliar Documents and the New Code of Canon Law*, trans. and annot. R. BRADLEY and E. KEVANE, Boston, MA, St. Paul Editions, 1985.
- SACRED CONGREGATION FOR BISHOPS (Pontifical Commission on Migrants and Travelers), Decree *Apostolatus maris*, on the pastoral care of seamen and ship passengers, 24 September 1977, in *AAS*, 69 (1977), 737-746, English translation (excerpt) in *DOL*, doc. 330, 840-842.
- SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction *Actio pastoralis*, 15 May 1969, 10d, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 810.
- SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Decree *Ordo lectionum* promulgating the *editio typica* of the order of readings for Mass, 25 May 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 548-549, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 231, 573.

- SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Instruction *Memoriale Domini* on the manner of distributing communion, 29 May 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 541-547, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 260, 643-646.
- _____, Instruction *Decreto Sacrae Congregationis Rituum* on the interim adaptation of particular calendars, 29 June 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 283, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 480, 1244.
- _____, Instruction *Decreto quo* on editions and use of the new Lectionary for Mass, 25 July 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 238-239, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 233, 586-587.
- _____, Instruction *Constitutione Apostolica* on the gradual carrying out of the apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum*, 20 October 1969, in *AAS*, 61 (1969), 749-753, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 209, 534-537.
- _____, Publication *Sacra Congregatio pro Clericis* of the text for the renewal of commitment to priestly service, 6 March 1970, in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 86-87, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 315, 787-788.
- _____, Decree *Celebrationes eucharisticae* promulgating the first *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum*, 26 March 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 554, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 213, 543.
- _____, Notification *In decreto* on the calendar for 1971, 17 May 1970, in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 193, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 443, 1167.
- _____, Instruction *Calendaria particularia* on the revision of particular calendars and of the propers for offices and Masses, 24 June 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 651-663, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 481, 1245-1256.
- _____, Instruction *Sacramentali communione* on extending the practice of communion under both kinds, 29 June 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 664-666; *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 322-324, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 270, 664-666.
- _____, Instruction (third) *Liturgicae instaurationes* on the orderly carrying out of the Constitution on the Liturgy, 5 September 1970, in *AAS*, 62 (1970), 692-704; English translation in *DOL*, doc. 52, 159-167.
- _____, Notification *Instructione de Constitutione* on the Roman Missal, the book of the liturgy of the hours, and the calendar, 14 June 1971, in *AAS*, 63 (1971), 712-715, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 216, 544-546.
- _____, Rescript permitting the use of the 1962 Missal in England and Wales, prot. no. 1897/71, 5 November 1971, in *CLD*, vol. 10, 147-148.
- _____, *Rituale Romanum, ex decreto sacrosancti oecumenici concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Paulus PP VI promulgatum, De Sacra Communione et de Cultu Mysterii Eucharistici extra Missam*, 21 June 1973, prot. no. 900/73, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1973.

SACRED CONGREGATION FOR DIVINE WORSHIP, Letter *Novo Calendario Romano* to bishops and general superiors of religious, to speed up preparation of the particular calendars of dioceses and religious institutes, as well as of proper texts for the Roman Missal and the Liturgy of the Hours, February 1974, in *Notitiae*, 10 (1974) 87-88, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 482, 1256-1257.

_____, Private response to Archbishop Plourde's request for permission to allow use of the 1962 Missal within the Archdiocese of Ottawa, 24 May 1974, in *La Documentation catholique*, 73 (1976), 242.

_____, Note *Instructio Eucharisticum mysterium* on the Mass of a Sunday or holyday anticipated on the preceding evening, May 1974, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1974), 222-223, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 448, 1177-1178.

_____, Notification *Conferentiarum Episcopali* on the obligatory nature of the Roman Missal of Paul VI, 28 October 1974, in *Notitiae*, 10 (1974), 353, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 219, 549.

_____, Introduction *Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with Children and for Masses of Reconciliation*, 1 November 1974, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1975), 7-12, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 250, 630-634.

_____, Decree *Cum Missale Romanum* promulgating the *editio typica altera* of the *Missale Romanum*, 27 March 1975, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1975), 295.

_____, Note *Passim quaeritur* on the music for inclusion in vernacular editions of the Roman Missal, May 1975, in *Notitiae*, 11 (1975), 129-132, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 538, 1350-1352.

SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE EVANGELIZATION OF PEOPLES, Rescript (Antilles) allowing the blessing of oils on the evening of the Wednesday of Holy Week, 14 January 1969, prot. no. 6444/68, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 7, 35-36, and in *DOL*, doc. 457, 1189.

SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE SACRAMENTS, Instruction *Quam plurimum* on private oratories, portable altars, Mass without servers and reserving the Blessed Sacrament in private chapels, 1 October 1949, *AAS*, 41 (1949), 493-511, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 3, 318-340.

CONGREGATION FOR THE SACRAMENTS AND DIVINE WORSHIP, Decree *Celebratio Baptismatis Domini* on the celebration of the Baptism of the Lord, 7 October 1977, in *AAS*, 69 (1977), 682, and *Notitiae*, 13 (1977), 477, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 460, 1192.

_____, Letter *Honori mihi duco* to presidents of the conferences of bishops on the norms for celebration of the World Day of Peace in 1978, 24 November 1977, in *Notitiae*, 13 (1977), 609, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 499, 1283.

_____, Norms *Calendaria et Propria* on particular calendars and the propers of Masses and offices, December 1977, in *Notitiae*, 13 (1977) 557-558, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 483, 1257.

CONGREGATION FOR THE SACRAMENTS AND DIVINE WORSHIP, Investigation into the use of the Latin language in the Roman liturgy and the 'Tridentine' Mass, 19 June 1980, in *Notitiae*, 17 (1981), 589-611. Partial English translation in *Origins*, 11 (1981-1982), 556-559.

_____, *Variationes in novas editiones librorum liturgicorum ad normam Codicis Iuris Canonici nuper promulgate introducendae*, 12 September 1983, in *Notitiae*, 19 (1983), 540-555, English translation as *Emendations in the Liturgical Books following upon the New Code of Canon Law*, Washington, DC, International Commission on English in the Liturgy, 1984.

SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE COUNCIL, Decree modifying the profession of faith of the Council of Trent, 20 January 1877, in *Fontes*, vol. 6, no. 4236, 597-598.

_____, Decree *Sacra Tridentina synodus* on the daily reception of holy communion, 22 December 1905, in *AAS*, 38 (1905-1906), 400-406, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 11-15.

_____, Decree *Post editum* modifying the fast for the infirm, 7 December 1906, in *AAS*, 39 (1906), 794-795.

_____, Decree of suppressed holy days of obligation, 28 December 1919, in *AAS*, 12 (1920), 42-43.

_____, Letter (private) Indults to bishops of the United States continued in effect, 5 January 1926, in *CLD*, vol. 1, 592.

_____, Letter (private) New faculty of bishops in the United States to dispense from fast and abstinence on legal holidays, 15 October 1931, in *CLD*, vol. 1, 584.

_____, Rescript (Diocese of Rottenburg) allowing the Sunday Mass on Saturday evening, 19 October 1965, prot. no. 101 727/D, in *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Länder Deutscher Zunge*, Mainz/Rhein, Verlag Kirchheim & Co. GmbH., 135 (1966), 253-254, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 445, 1171.

_____, Reply to a query on the Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini*, no. II, §2, 24 February 1967, in *AAS*, 59 (1967), 229, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 359, 943.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree *Quam singulari* concerning the age for admission to first communion, 8 August 1910, in *AAS*, 2 (1910), 577-583, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 17-22.

_____, Motu proprio *Urbis et Orbis evulgato* assigning changes to the General Roman Calendar, 24 July 1911, in *AAS*, 3 (1911), 350-351.

_____, Decree providing additional texts for use on All Souls' Day, 11 August 1915, in *AAS*, 7 (1915), 422-423.

_____, Response to a doubt concerning which texts to use on All Souls' Day, 28 February 1917, in *AAS*, 9 (1917), 186-187.

_____, Decree prescribing the new preface for the Mass for the Dead, 9 April 1919, in *AAS*, 11 (1919), 190.

- SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree prescribing the new preface for the feast of St. Joseph, 9 April 1919, in *AAS*, 11 (1919), 191.
- _____, Decree promulgating a new *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum*, 25 July 1920, in *AAS*, 12 (1920), 448-449.
- _____, Decree *Urbis et orbis* nonnulla festa cum officiis et missis propriis ad universam ecclesiam extenduntur, 26 October 1921, in *AAS*, 13 (1921), 543-544.
- _____, Private response to the Archbishop of Genoa concerning the celebration of a dialogue Mass, 4 August 1922, in *AAS*, 14 (1922), 505, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 1, 199-200.
- _____, Reply restricting the use of "Gothic" vestments, 9 December 1925, in *AAS*, 18 (1926), 58, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 1, 374-375.
- _____, Decree prescribing the texts for the celebration of the Divine Office and Mass of the feast of Christ the King, 12 December 1925, in *AAS*, 17 (1925), 655-668.
- _____, Decree prescribing the texts for the celebration of the Divine Office and Mass of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 29 January 1929, in *AAS*, 21 (1929), 44-77.
- _____, Declaration concerning the translation of liturgical prayers regarding Jews, 10 June 1948, in *AAS*, 40 (1948), 342, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 3, 575-576.
- _____, Decree, with accompanying rubrics, permitting the nocturnal celebration of the Easter Vigil for one year, 9 February 1951, in *AAS*, 43 (1951), 128-137, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 3, 34-35.
- _____, Decree *de solemnibus vigiliis Paschalis instauranda*, on restoring the Solemn Paschal Vigil, 9 February 1951, in *AAS*, 43 (1951), 128-129.
- _____, *Rubricae Sabbato sancto servandae si vigilia paschalis instaurata peragitur*, 9 February 1951, in *AAS*, 43 [1951], 130-137.
- _____, Decree, with accompanying rubrics, permitting the nocturnal celebration of the Easter Vigil for three additional years, 11 January 1952, in *AAS*, 44 (1952), 48-63, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 3, 35-37.
- _____, Decree *de facultativa celebratione instaurata Vigilae Paschalis ad triennium prorogate additis ordinationibus et rubricarum variationibus*, 11 January 1952, in *AAS*, 44 (1952), 48-49.)
- _____, Decree promulgating a new *editio typica* of the *Rituale Romanum*, 25 January 1952, in *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 66 (1952), 220.
- _____, Decree *Romana*, 3 June 1953, in *AAS*, 46 (1954), 68-71.
- _____, Decree and instruction *Liturgicus hebdomadae sanctae ordo instauratur* on the restoration of the orders of Holy Week, 16 November 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), 838-847, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 209-218.
- _____, Decree *Cum nostra hac aetate* promulgating a simplification of the rubrics, 23 March 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), 218-224, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 4, 25-33.

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Reply to questions concerning the simplification of rubrics, 2 June 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), 418-419.

_____, Decree *Maxima redemptionis nostrae mysteria* promulgating the *editio typica* of the restored order of Holy Week, with an accompanying instruction, 16 November 1955, in *AAS*, 47 (1955), 838-847, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 4, 49-61.

_____, Decree concerning the use of the simple form of the sacred rites of Holy Week, 15 March 1956, in *AAS*, 48 (1956), 153-154, English translation in *CLD*, 4, 61-62.

_____, Decree *Circa ordinem Hebdomadae Sanctae instauratum* ordinances and declarations concerning the restored order of Holy Week, 1 February 1957, in *AAS*, 49 (1957), 91-96, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 4, 62-67.

_____, Decree *Sanctissimam Eucharistiam* concerning the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament and the tabernacle, 1 June 1957, in *AAS*, 49 (1957), 425-426, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 4, 360-362.

_____, Declaration permitting use of "Gothic" vestments, 20 August 1957, in *AAS*, 49 (1957), 762, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 4, 262.

_____, Decree *Novum rubricarum* promulgating the new rubrical code, 26 July 1960, in *AAS*, 52 (1960), 596, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 5, 26-27, and in P. MURPHY, *The New Rubrics of the Roman Missal and Breviary: Translation and Commentary*, Surry Hills, New South Wales, The Catholic Press Newspaper Company, Ltd., 1960.

_____, Instruction *De calendariis particularibus* on the revision of calendars and propers according to the new code of rubrics, 14 February 1961, in *AAS*, 53 (1961), 168-180, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 443-453.

_____, Decree promulgating the new *editio typica* of the second part of the Roman Pontifical, 13 April 1961, in *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 76 (1962), 210.

_____, Declaration concerning the revised typical edition of the second part of the Roman Pontifical, 2 January 1962, in *AAS*, 54 (1962), 51, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 5, 153-155.

_____, Decree *Die 30 Iunii*, prescribing the collect *pro Papa* on 30 June 1964, the anniversary of Paul VI's coronation, 9 May 1964, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, 10 May 1964, 8, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 496, 1282.

_____, Instruction (first) *Inter oecumenici* on the orderly carrying out of the sacred liturgy, 26 September 1964, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 877-900, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 6, 73-99.

_____, Decree *Nuper edita instructione* promulgating the new *Ordo Missae* and the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae*, 27 January 1965, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 408-409, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 196, 449.

_____, Decree *Ecclesiae semper* promulgating the *editio typica* of the rites of concelebration and of communion under both kinds, 7 March 1965, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 410-412, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 222, 554-556.

- SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES, Decree promulgating the text of changes in the order of holy week *Quamplures Episcopi*, 7 March 1965, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 412-413, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 454, 1186.
- _____, Reply to Dom G. B. Franzoni, Rome, on the Divine Office, 8 November 1965, in *Notitiae*, 2 (1966), 182-183, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 420, 1079-1080.
- _____, Letter *Impetrata prius* to Cardinal P. Ciriaci, Prefect of the Congregation of the Council, regarding Sunday Mass on Saturday Evening, 25 December 1965, in *Notitiae*, 2 (1966), 14, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 444, 1170-1171.
- _____, Declaration *Da qualche tempo* repudiating arbitrary liturgical innovations, 29 December 1966, in *AAS*, 59 (1967), 85-86, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 35.
- _____, Instruction (second) *Tres abhinc annos* on the orderly carrying out of the Constitution on the Liturgy, 4 May 1967, in *AAS*, 59 (1967), 442-448, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 39, 135-140.
- _____, Decree *Per instructionem alteram* promulgating the text of changes in the *Ordo Missae*, 18 May 1967, in *Notitiae*, 3 (1967), 195, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 201, 456.
- _____, Declaration *Cum Dominica IV Adventus* on the evening Mass for 23 December 1967, 12 December 1967, in *Notitiae*, 3 (1967), 428, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 447, 1174-1175.
- _____, Decree *Prece eucharistica* promulgating three new Eucharistic Prayers and eight prefaces, 23 May 1968, in *Notitiae*, 4 (1968), 156, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 241, 608-609.
- _____, Decree *anni liturgici ordinatione* promulgating the *editio typica* of the *Calendarium Romanum*, 21 March 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 163-164, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 441, 1154-1155.
- _____, (CONSILIUM), *General Norms for the Liturgical Year and the Calendar*, 21 March 1969, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1969, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 442, 1155-1167.
- _____, Decree *Ordine Missae* promulgating the *editio typica* of the *Ordo Missae* and General Instruction of the Roman Missal, 6 April 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 147, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 203, 461.
- _____, Instruction *Decreto Sacrae Congregationis Rituum* on the interim adaptation of particular calendars, 29 June 1969, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 283, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 480, 1244.
- _____, Response to query regarding titles of church buildings, in *Notitiae*, 5 (1969), 404, no. 8, English translation in *DOL*, 1163, footnote R¹¹.
- SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE CONSISTORY, Decree providing norms for sacred preaching, 28 June 1917, in *AAS*, 9 (1917), 335-341, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 1, 622-630.

- SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE, Instruction *De arte sacra* on sacred art, 30 June 1952, in *AAS*, 44 (1952), 542-546, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 174-178.
- _____, Instruction *De disciplina circa ieiunium eucharisticum servanda* on the new discipline for the Eucharistic fast, 6 January 1953, in *AAS*, 45 (1953), 47-51, English translation in SEASOLTZ, *The New Liturgy*, 185-189.
- _____, *Litterae*, 22 March 1923, in *AAS*, 15 (1923), 151-152.
- SACRED CONGREGATION FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH, Letter (private) Indult to ordinaries in the United States to dispense workingmen and their families from abstinence, 15 March 1895, in *CLD* vol. 1, 591-592.
- _____, Private response on permission for vernacular in various parts of the Mass, 24 February 1958, in *CLD*, vol. 5, 423.
- ST. PETER'S PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE CENTRE OF CANON LAW STUDIES, *Studies in Church Law*, Bangalore, St. Peter's Pontifical Institute Centre of Canon Law Studies, 2005.
- Schemata Constitutionum et Decretorum de quibus disceptabitur in Concilii sessionibus*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1962-1963, 4 vols.
- SCHROEDER, H.J., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, Rockford, IL, TAN Books and Publishers, 1978.
- SEASOLTZ, R.K., *The New Liturgy: A Documentation, 1903-1965*, New York, NY, Herder and Herder, 1966.
- SECOND ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN, Constitution *Sacrosanctum concilium* on the Sacred Liturgy, 4 December 1963, in *AAS*, 56 (1964), 97-138, English translation in *FLANNERY I*, 1-36.
- _____, Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen gentium* on the Church, 21 November 1964, in *AAS*, 57 (1965), 5-75, English translation in *FLANNERY I*, 350-426.
- _____, Declaration *Nostra aetate* of the relation of the Church to non-Christian religions, 28 October 1965, in *AAS*, 58 (1966), 740-744, English translation in *FLANNERY I*, 738-742.
- SECOND PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, Pastoral Letter, 27 October 1833, in H. NOLAN (ed.), *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Volume I, 1792-1940*, Washington, DC, United States Catholic Conference, 1984, 67-81.
- SECRETARIAT FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY, *Ad totam ecclesiam* Ecumenical Directory, Part I, 14 May 1967, in *AAS*, 59 (1967), 574-592, English translation in *CLD*, vol. 6, 716-734.
- SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter *Mi onore di comunicare* to Cardinal G. Lercaro President of Consilium on its responsibilities, 29 February 1964, in KACZYNSKI, *Enchiridion documentum*, vol. 1, 45, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 77, 214.

- SECRETARIAT OF STATE, Letter *Compio il venerato incarico* to Cardinal A.M. Larraona, Prefect of the Congregation of Rites, on the respective competencies of the congregation and of Consilium, 7 January 1965, in KACZYNSKI, *Enchiridion documentum*, vol. 1, 116, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 82, 221.
- _____, Letter *Ho l'onore* informing Cardinal Lercaro President of Consilium, of Pope Paul VI's concession allowing the preface at Mass to be in the vernacular, 27 April 1965, in *Notitiae*, 1 (1965), 149, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 110, 269.
- _____, Letter of Cardinal J. Villot to Bishop C. Manziana, on the occasion of the 28th National Liturgical Week of Italy, on the theme: The Lord's Day is the Lord of Days (Pescara, 29 August – 2 September 1977), August 1977, in *Notitiae*, 13 (1977), 468-471, excerpt, English translation in *DOL*, doc. 451, 1179-1181.
- _____, Note concerning the change to the Good Friday prayer for the Jews, 4 February 2008, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, vol. 148, no. 31 (6 February 2008), 1, English translation in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly English ed., 41 (13 February 2008), 12.
- _____, Communique following the publication of the new prayer for the Jews for the 1962 edition of the Roman Missal, 4 April 2008, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly English ed., 41 (9 April 2008), 8.
- The Sixteen Documents of Vatican II and the Instruction on the Liturgy*, Magister Books, Boston, MA, St. Paul Editions, 1966.
- SIXTUS V, Apostolic constitution *Immensa aeterni Dei* reorganizing the Roman curia, 22 January 1588, in *Bullarium Romanum*, vol. 8, 985-999.
- TANNER, N., G. ALBERIGO and H. JEDIN, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, London/Washington, DC, Sheed and Ward/Georgetown University Press, 1990, 2 vols.
- UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, "Authorization to Reprint Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary," in IDEM, *Newsletter*, 47 (July 2011), 25.
- _____, *Complementary norms to the 1983 Code of Canon Law*, <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/canon-law/complementary-norms/index.cfm> (11 January 2022).
- _____, *The General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, Washington, DC, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011.
- VERMEERSCH, A., *Epitome iuris canonici cum commentariis ad scholas et ad usum privatum*, Bruges, H. Dessain, 1949, 3 vols.
- VOGEL, C., *Introduction aux Sources de l'Histoire du Culte Chrétien au Moyen Âge*, Spoleto, 1965.
- _____, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. by W. STOREY and N. RASMUSSEN, Washington, DC, The Pastoral Press, 1986.
- VORGRIMLER, H. (gen. ed.), *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, Freiburg, Herder and Herder, 1967-1969, 5 vols.

WOYWOD, S., *A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, revised by C. SMITH, New York, NY, J.F. Wagner, 1948, 2 vols.

MISSALS AND LITURGICAL BOOKS

ANDRIEU, M. (ed.), *Le Pontifical romain au moyen âge I: Le Pontifical Romain du XIII^e siècle*, Studi e testi, 86, Vatican City, 1939, reprint 1984.

BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES (eds.), *Liber Usualis with Introduction and Rubrics* in English, Tournai, Desclée, 1938.

Breviarium Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Rome, Apud Paulum Manutium, 1568. Facsimile reprint: A. M. Triacca, *Breviarium Romanum*. Editio princeps (1568), Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999.

DUMAS, A., and J. DESHUSSES, *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis*, CCL, 159-159^A, Turnhout, 1980.

Caeremoniale Episcoporum Clementis VIII, Innocentii et Benedicti XIII iussu editum Benedicti XIV et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum, editio tertia post typicam, Rome, Marietti, 1948.

Caeremoniale Episcoporum, ex decreto sacrosancti Oecumenici concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Ioannis Pauli pp. II promulgatum, editio typica, 14 September 1984, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1984, English translation *Ceremonial of Bishops*, International Commission for English in the Liturgy, 1989.

Calendarium Romanum, editio typica, 21 March 1969, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1969.

CHAVASSE, A., *Le sacramentaire gélasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316) sacramentaire presbytéral en usage dans les titres romains au VII^e siècle*, Tournai, Desclée and Co., 1958.

Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Volume I: Sacramentary, Approved for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See, prepared by INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing Company, 2012.

Collection of Masses of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Volume II: Lectionary, Approved for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See, prepared by INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing Company, 2012.

DESHUSSES, J. (ed.), *Le sacramentaire Grégorien: Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, 3 vols., Spicilegium Friburgense, no. 16, Editions Universitaires, Fribourg, 1971-1979.

Gates of Prayer, the New Union Prayerbook: Weekdays, Sabbaths and Festivals, Services and Prayers for Synagogue and Home, New York, NY, Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1975.

- Graduale, Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae de tempore et de sanctis, SS. D. N. Pii X Pontificis Maximi iussu restitutum et editum ad exemplar editionis typicae concinnatum et rhythmicis signis a Selesmensibus monachis diligenter ornatum*, Paris, Desclée, 1952.
- Leccionario "Edición Hispanoamérica" reformado según los decretos del Concilio Vaticano II y promulgado por S. S. el papa Pablo VI*, New York, NY, Central Católico Hispano del Nordeste, 1988.
- Lectionary for Mass for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America, Second Typical Edition*, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing, 1998, 5 vols.
- Lectionnaire de semaine*, Paris, Desclée, 1982.
- Lectionnaire pour les messes du dimanche*, Paris, Desclée, 1980.
- LEFEBVRE, D., *Saint Andrew Daily Missal with Vespers for Sundays and Feasts*, St. Paul MN, E.M. Lohmann, 1945.
- LIETZMANN, D., *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem aachener urexemplar*, Münster, Aschendorff, 1967.
- Misal Romano renovado por decreto del concilio ecuménico Vaticano II promulgado por la autoridad del papa Pablo VI y revisado por el papa Juan Pablo II, para el uso en las diócesis de los Estados Unidos de América, aprobado por la conferencia de obispos Católicos de los Estados Unidos y confirmando por la Sede Apostólica*, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing, 2018.
- Missae Defunctorum ex Missali Romano desumptae accedit ordo absolutionis praesente et absente corpore ex Rituali Romano*, New York, NY, Benziger Brothers, 1962.
- Missale Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum*, Rome, Apud heredes Bartholomei Faletti, Ioannem Variscum et Socios, 1570. Facsimile reprint: A. M. TRIACCA, *Missale Romanum, Editio princeps (1570)*, Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012.
- Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentum restitutum, S. Pii V Pontificis Maximi iussu editum, aliorum pontificum cura recognitum, a Pio X reformatum et Benedicti XV auctoritate vulgatum, editio IV iuxta typicam Vaticanam*, Regensburg, Friderici Pustet, 1922.
- Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentum restitutum, S. Pii V Pontificis Maximi iussu editum, aliorum pontificum cura recognitum, a Pio X reformatum et Benedicti XV auctoritate vulgatum, editio IV iuxta typicam Vaticanam*, New York, NY, Benziger Brothers, 1944.
- Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentum restitutum, S. Pii V Pontificis Maximi iussu editum Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII et Leonis XIII auctoritatem recognitum et novis missis ex indulto Apostolico hucusque concessis auctum*, Mechelen, H. Dessain, 1913.
- Missale Romanum ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio Prima Iuxta Typicam*, Rome, Mame, 1962, Appendix, 1-19.

- Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum, Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum, iuxta typicam tertiam emendatam*, Downers Grove, IL, Midwest Theological Forum, 2015.
- Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio prima iuxta typicam*, Paris, Mame, 1962.
- Missel Romain*, Paris, Desclée, 1974.
- Mszał Rzymski dla diecezji polskich*, Poznań, Pallottinum, 1986.
- MOHLBERG, L.C. *Das fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum in alemanischer Überlieferung*, LQF Quellen I-II, Münster, 1918.
- MOHLBERG, L.C., L. EIZENHÖFER and P. SIFRIN, *Sacramentarium Veronese*, RED Series Maior, Fontes I, Rome, Herder, 1978.
- O'CONNELL, J.B. and J. MARTIN (eds.), *The Missal Containing All the Masses for Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation*, Chicago, IL, Catholic Press, 1955.
- Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae instauratus, editio typica*, Vatican City, Typis polyglottis Vaticana, 1956.
- Pontificale Romanum pars secunda, editio typica emendata*, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1961.
- Ritus Servandus in celebratione Missae*, in *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, Editio prima iuxta typicam*, Paris, Mame, 1962,
- Ritus servandus in concelebratione Missae et ritus communionis sub utraque specie*, 7 March 1965, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1965, English translation in *Rubrics for Celebrating Mass*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1965.
- Roman Missal for the United States of America*, New York, NY, Benziger Brothers, 1966.
- Roman Missal, Missale Romanum, ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum summorum pontificum cura recognitum cum versionibus lingua Anglica exaratis et a coetu episcoporum civitatum Foederatarum Americae Septentrionalis rite approbatis actis et Apostolica Sede confirmatis*, New York, NY, Catholic Book Publishing, 1964.
- Roman Missal Renewed by Decree of the Most Holy Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican Promulgated by Authority of Pope Paul VI and Revised at the Direction of Pope John Paul II*, Totowa, NJ, Catholic Book Publishing, 2011.
- Roman Missal Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI, Lectionary for Mass, English Translation Approved by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See*, New York, NY, Catholic Book Publishing Company, New York, NY, 1970.

Roman Missal Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI, The Sacramentary, Approved for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Confirmed by the Apostolic See, New York, NY, Catholic Book Publishing, 1985.

Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults in The Roman Ritual, Revised by Decree of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council and Published by Authority of Pope Paul VI, approved for use in the dioceses of the United States of America by the National Conference of Catholic Bishop and confirmed by the Holy See, Prepared by INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, New York, NY, Catholic Book Publishing Company, 1988.

Sacramentarium Bergomense: manoscritto del secolo IX della Biblioteca di S. Alessandro in Colonna in Bergamo, transl. A. PAREDI, Bergamo, Edizioni Monumenta Bergomensia, 1962.

SIFFRIN, P. (ed.), *Sacramentarium Veronese (Leonianum)*, Cod. Bibl. Capit. Veron. LXXXV[80], Rome, Casa Editrice Herder, 1958.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, *The Roman Ritual, Renewed by Decree of the Most Holy Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican and Promulgated by authority of Pope John Paul II, Exorcisms and Related Supplications, for Use in the Dioceses of the United States of America*, Washington, DC, 2017, revision of 1998 *editio typica* emended in 2004.

Variationes in ordinem hebdomadae sanctae inducendae, 7 March 1965, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1965.

Variationes in ordinem Missae inducendae ad normam Instructionis S.R.C., die 4 Maii 1967, 18 May 1967, Vatican City, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1967.

VOGEL, C. and R. ELZE (eds.), *Le Pontifical romano-germanique du X^e siècle*, Vatican City, 1963.

WARD, A. and C. JOHNSON (eds.), *Pontificale Romanum, reimpressio editionis iuxta typicam anno 1962 publici iuris factae*, Rome, CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1999.

WILSON, H. (ed.), *The Gelasian Sacramentary: Liber sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1894.

BOOKS

ABBO, J.A. and J.D. HANNON, *The Sacred Canons*, rev. ed., St. Louis, MO, B. Herder, 1957, 2 vols.

ADAM, A., *Foundations of Liturgy: An Introduction to Its History and Practice*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1992.

ADAM, L., *Das Kirchenjahr*, Hamburg, Verlag Ewald Becker, 1964.

AILLET, M., *The Old Mass and the New: Explaining the motu proprio Summorum Pontificum of Pope Benedict XVI*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2010.

- ALIKIN, V., *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering: Origin, Development and Content of the Christian Gathering in the First to Third Centuries*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 102, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 2010.
- ALLEN, H.T., *On Common Ground: The Story of the Revised Common Lectionary*, Norwich, Norfolk, Canterbury Press, 1998.
- ALTING VON GEUSAU, L., and H. VAUGHAN, *Liturgy in Development*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1965.
- AMIOT, F., *History and the Mass*, Faith and Fact Books 109, London, Burns & Oates, 1959.
- ARINZE, F., *Cardinal Reflections: Active Participation and the Liturgy*, Chicago/Mundelein, IL, Hillenbrand Books, 2005.
- AUF DER MAUR, H. *Feierrz im Rhythmus der Zeit I: Herrerlfeste in Wuche umi jahr, Gottesdienst der Kirche: Handbuch der Liturgiewissenschaft*, Teil 5, Regensburg, 1983.
- AUGUSTINE, C.A., *Liturgical Law: A Handbook of the Roman Liturgy*, St. Louis, MO/London, B. Herders, 1931.
- BALDOVIN, J.F., *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2008.
- BARAÚNA, G., J. LANG and P. ARNS, *The Liturgy of Vatican II: A Symposium in Two Volumes, Volume II*, Chicago, IL, Franciscan Herald Press, 1966.
- BAUDOT, J.L., *The Lectionary: Its Sources and History*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1910.
- BAUMSTARK, A., *On the Historical Development of the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2011.
- BEAUDUIN, L., *Liturgy and the Life of the Church*, trans. V. MICHEL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1929.
- BENEDICT XVI, *Light of the World: The Pope, the Church and the Signs of the Times, A Conversation with Peter Seewald*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius, 2010.
- BISHOP, E., *Liturgia Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1918.
- BONNEAU, N., *The Sunday Lectionary: Ritual Word, Paschal Shape*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1998.
- BOSELLI, G., *The Spiritual Meaning of the Liturgy: School of Prayer, Source of Life*, trans. B. HUDOCK, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2014.
- BOTTE, B., *From Silence to Participation: An Insider's View of Liturgical Renewal*, trans. J. SULLIVAN, Washington, DC, The Pastoral Press, 1988.
- _____, *The Ordinary of the Mass*, Paris/Louvain, Cerf/Mont Césa, 1953.
- BOUYER, M., *The Liturgical Environment: What the Documents Say*, 2nd ed., Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2004.

- BOUYER, L., *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. C. UNDERHILL QUINN, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- _____, *Liturgical Piety*, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1955.
- _____, *Liturgy and Architecture*, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.
- _____, *The Liturgy Revived: A Doctrinal Commentary of the Conciliar Constitution on the Liturgy*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1965.
- _____, *The Memoirs of Louis Bouyer: From Youth and Conversion to Vatican II, the Liturgical Reform and After*, trans. J. PEPINO, Kettering, OH, Angelico Press, 2015.
- BRADSHAW, P.F., *Early Christian Worship: A Basic Introduction to Ideas and Practice, Second Edition*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2010.
- _____, *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997.
- _____, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2009.
- _____, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd ed., New York, NY, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- BRADSHAW, P.F., and M.E. JOHNSON, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2012.
- _____, and M.E. JOHNSON, *The Origin of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons in Early Christianity*, Alcuin Club Collection 86, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2011.
- BUGNINI, A., *The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948-1975*, trans. M. O'CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- _____, *The Simplification of the Rubrics: Spirits and Practical Consequences of the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, March 23, 1955*, Collegeville, MN, Doyle and Finegan, 1955.
- _____, and C. BRAGA (eds.), *The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy*, trans. V. MALLON, New York, NY, Benziger, 1965.
- BURSELL, R., *Liturgy, Order and the Law*, New York, NY/Oxford, Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press, 1996.
- BUX, N., *Benedict XVI's Reform: The Liturgy between Innovation and Tradition*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2012.
- CABIÉ, R. et al., *The Church at Prayer, Volume II: The Eucharist, New Edition*, trans. M.J. O'CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1986.
- CABIÉ, R., *History of the Mass*, trans. L. JOHNSON, Beltsville, MD, The Pastoral Press, 1992.
- CALDECOTT, S. (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1998.

- CANTALAMESSA, R. (ed.), *Easter in the Early Church: An Anthology of Jewish and Early Christian Texts*, trans. J.M. QUIGLEY and J.T. LIENHARD, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1993, nos. 116-116b.
- _____, *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza: Le tradizioni pasquali della Bibbia e della primitiva Chiesa*, Turin, 1971, 109-115.
- CASPERS, C., G. LUKKEN and G. ROUWHORST, *Bread of Heaven: Customs and Practices Surrounding Holy Communion, Essays in the History of Liturgy and Culture*, Liturgia Condenda, no. 3, Kampen, Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1995.
- _____, and M. SCHNEIDERS, *Omnes Circumstantes: Contributions towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy Presented to Herman Wegman on the Occasion of His Retirement from the Chair of History of Liturgy and Theology in the Katholieke Theologische Universiteit Utrecht*, Kampen, J.H. Kok, 1990.
- CENTRE INTERNATIONAL D'ÉTUDES LITURGIQUES, *Altar and Sacrifice: The Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of Historical, Canonical and Theological Studies of the Roman Liturgy*, London, Saint Austin Press, 1998.
- _____, *Theological and Historical Aspects of the Roman Missal: The Proceedings of the Fifth International Colloquium of Historical, Canonical and Theological Studies on the Roman Catholic Liturgy*, London, CIEL UK, 2000.
- CHADWICK, H., *The Early Church: The Story of Emergent Christianity from the Apostolic Age to the Dividing Ways between the Greek East and the Latin West*, New York, NY, Penguin, 1993.
- CHAVESSE, A., *Le Sacramentaire gelasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316) Sacramentaire presbyteral en usage dans les titres romains au VIIe siècle, Bibliothèque de théologie I, Serie IV: Histoire de la théologie I*, Tournai, Desclée, 1958.
- CHIRON, Y., *Annibale Bugnini: Reformer of the Liturgy*, trans. J. PEPINO, Brooklyn, NY, Angelico Press, 2018.
- CHUPUNGO, A., *Cultural Adaptation of the Liturgy*, New York, NY, Paulist Press, 1982.
- _____, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997-2000, 5 vols.
- _____, *What, Then, is Liturgy? Musings and Memoir*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2010.
- DA CORONATA, M., *Institutiones iuris canonici ad usum utriusque cleri et scholarum*, Taurini, Marietti, 1936.
- CRICHTON, D., *Christian Celebration: The Mass*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.
- CRICHTON, J., *The Church's Worship: Considerations on the Liturgical Constitution of the Second Vatican Council*, London, G. Chapman, 1964.
- CROSS, F. L., *1 Peter: A Paschal Liturgy?* London, Mowbray and Company, 1954.
- CROUAN, D., *The History and the Future of the Roman Liturgy*, trans. M. MILLER, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2005.

- CROUAN, D., *The Liturgy after Vatican II: Collapsing or Resurgent?* San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2001.
- CUMMINGS, O., *Liturgical Snapshots: Reflections on the Richness of Our Worship Tradition*, Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 2012.
- DEGROCCO, J., *A Pastoral Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 2011.
- DALMAIS, I.H., P.M. GY, P. JOUNEL AND A.-G. MARTIMORT, *The Church at Prayer, Volume I: Principles of the Liturgy, New Edition*, trans. M.J. O'CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1987.
- DAVIES, M., *Apologia pro Marcel Lefebvre Part I 1905-1976*, Kansas City, MO, Angelus Press, 1979.
- _____, *Apologia pro Marcel Lefebvre Part II 1977-1979*, Kansas City, MO, Angelus Press, 1983.
- _____, *Apologia pro Marcel Lefebvre Part III 1979-1982*, Kansas City, MO, Angelus Press, 1988.
- _____, *Liturgical Revolution, Volume One: Cranmer's Godly Order*, Dickinson, TX, The Angelus Press, 1980.
- _____, *Liturgical Revolution, Volume Two: Pope John's Council*, Dickinson, TX, The Angelus Press, 1980.
- _____, *Liturgical Revolution, Volume Three: Pope Paul's New Mass*, Dickinson, TX, The Angelus Press, 1980.
- _____, *Liturgical Time Bombs in Vatican II: The Destruction of Catholic Faith through Changes in Catholic Worship*, Rockford, IL, TAN Books and Publishers, 2003.
- _____, *A Short History of the Roman Mass*, Charlotte, NC, TAN Books and Publishers, 1997.
- DAY, J., and M. VINZENT, *Papers Presented at the Conferences on Early Roman Liturgy to 600 (14.11.2009 and 27.2.2010) at Blackfriars Hall, Oxford, UK*, International Conference on Patristic Studies, Studia Patristica 71, Leuven, Peeters, 2014.
- DELEHAYE, H., *Les origines du culte de martyres*, 2nd ed. rev., Brussels, Bollandites, 1933.
- DENYSENKO, N., *Liturgical Reform after Vatican II: The Impact on Eastern Orthodoxy*, UPCC Book Collections on Project MUSE, Baltimore, MD/Minneapolis, MN, Project Muse/Fortress Press, 2015.
- DENZIGER, H., (ed.), *Enchiridion symbolorum: Definitionum et declarationem de rebus fidei et morum, edition XXXIV emendata*, Barcelona, Herder, 1967.
- DEVINE, G., *Liturgical Renewal: An Agonizing Reappraisal*, Staten Island, NY, Alba House, 1973.
- DIAT, N., *God or Nothing: A Conversation on Faith* (Interview with Cardinal Robert Sarah), trans. M. MILLER, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2015.

- DIAT, N., *The Power of Silence: Against the Dictatorship of Noise* (Interview with Cardinal Robert Sarah), trans. M. MILLER, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2017.
- Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments, with Introduction and Notes by R. Hugh Connolly*, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1929.
- DIX, G., *The Shape of the Liturgy*, New York, NY, Continuum, 1945.
- DOBSZAY, L., *The Bugnini-Liturgy and the Reform of the Reform*, Front Royal, VA, Catholic Church Music Associates, 2003.
- _____, *The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite*, New York, NY, T&T Clark International, 2010.
- DOLD, A., *Sursum Corda. Hochgebet aus alten lateinischen Liturgien*, Salzburg, 1954.
- DONGHI, A., *Actions and Words: Symbolic Language and the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997.
- DOORLY, M., *No Place for God: The Denial of the Transcendent in Modern Church Architecture*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2007.
- DOUGLAS, J. D. *The Concise Dictionary of the Christian Tradition: Doctrine, Liturgy, History*, Grand Rapids, MI, Regency Reference Library, 1989.
- D'SOUZA, V., (ed.), *In the Service of Truth and Justice, Festschrift in Honour of Prof. Augustine Mendonça, Professor Emeritus*, Bangalore, Centre of Canon Law Studies, St. Peter's Pontifical Institute, 2008, 449-465.
- DUCHESNE, L., *Origines du culte chrétien: étude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne, cinquième édition*, Paris, Ancienne Librairie Fontemoing, et Co., 1920.
- DUMVILLE, D., *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England: Four Studies*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History 5, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Boydell Press, 1992.
- DURIEUX, P., *The Eucharist: Law and Practice*, Faribault, MN, O. Dolphin, 1926.
- EISENHOFER, L. and J. LECHNER, *The Liturgy of the Roman Rite*, New York, NY, Herder and Herder, 1961.
- ELLARD, G., *Christian Life and Worship: A Religion Text for Colleges*, New York, NY, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1933.
- _____, *The Mass of the Future*, Milwaukee, WI, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1948.
- _____, and E. O'HARA, *The Mass in Transition*, Milwaukee, WI, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956.
- EMMEL, V., *The Development of Liturgy in the Local Church*, Ann Arbor, MI, University Microfilms International, 1981.
- EMMINGHAUS, J., *The Eucharist: Essence, Form, Celebration*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997.

- ESPELAGE, A. (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 1994-2000*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 2002.
- EVERY, G., *The Mass: Meaning, Mystery and Ritual*, Huntington, IN, Our Sunday Visitor, 1978.
- FAGGIOLI, M., *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2012.
- FARRELL, C., *The Sacraments Today: Their Meaning and Celebration*, Liguori, MO, Liguori Publications, 1978.
- FERRONE, R., *Liturgy, Sacrosanctum Concilium: Rediscovering Vatican II*, New York, NY, Paulist Press, 2007.
- FEULNER, H-J, *Liturgies in East and West: Ecumenical Relevance of Early Liturgical Development: Acts of the International Symposium Vindobonense I, Vienna, November 17-20, 2007*, Österreichische Studien zur Liturgiewissenschaft und Sakramententheologie, Bd. 6. Zurich/Berlin, Lit Verlag, 2013.
- FINCH, R.G., *The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament: A Study of the Three-Year Cycle of the Readings from the Law and the Prophets as a Contribution to New Testament Chronology*, London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1939.
- FINN, P. and J. SCHELLMAN, *Shaping English Liturgy: Studies in Honor of Archbishop Denis Hurley*, Washington, DC, Pastoral Press, 1990.
- FISHER, S., A Canonical Examination of the Principles Governing the Celebration of the “Tridentine Mass” Since 1969, Master’s Thesis, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law, Saint Paul University, 2004.
- FLANNERY, A., *The Liturgy: Renewal and Adaptation*, Dublin, Scepter Books, 1968.
- FOLEY, E., *From Age to Age: How Christians Have Celebrated the Eucharist, Revised and Expanded*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2008.
- _____, J.F. BALDOVIN, M. COLLINS and J.M. PIERCE (eds.), and THE CATHOLIC ACADEMY OF LITURGY, *A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2011.
- _____, N.D. MITCHELL and J.M. PIERCE (eds.), *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2007.
- FOLSOM, C., “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” in A. CHUPUNGO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997, 245-314.
- FORTESCUE, A., *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy*, London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1937.
- _____, J.B. O’CONNELL, and A. REID, *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described: Fifteenth Edition Revised and Updated in the Light of Pope Benedict XVI’s Summorum Pontificum*, New York, NY, Bloomsbury, 2009.

- FRERE, W.H., *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy: The Kalendar*, Eugene, OR, Wipf & Stock, 1930.
- _____, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy: The Roman Epistle/Lectionary*, Eugene, OR, Wipf & Stock, 1935.
- _____, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy: The Roman Lectionary*, Eugene, OR, Wipf & Stock, 1934.
- GAMBER, K., *The Modern Rite: Collected Essays on the Reform of the Liturgy*, Farnborough, St. Michael's Abbey Press, 2002.
- _____, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background*, San Juan Capistrano, CA, Una Voce Press, 1993.
- GASSNER, J., *The Canon of the Mass: Its History, Theology and Art*, St. Louis, MO, Herder, 1949.
- GELDHOF, J., (ed.) *Mediating Mysteries, Understanding Liturgies, On Bridging the Gap between Liturgy and Systematic Theology*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 278, Leuven, Peeters, 2015.
- GIAMPIETRO, N., *The Development of the Liturgical Reform as Seen by Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli from 1948 to 1970*, Fort Collins, CO, Roman Catholic Books, 2009.
- GIHR, N., *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, Dogmatically, Liturgically and Aesthetically Explained*, New York, NY, Magisterium Press, 1902-2015.
- GLENDINNING, C.J., "Summorum Pontificum" and the Use of the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite: A Canonical Analysis in Light of the Current Liturgical Law, Doctoral Dissertation, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law, Saint Paul University/Ann Arbor, MI, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2010.
- GROB, J., A Major Revision of the Discipline of Exorcism: A Comparative Study on the Liturgical Laws in the 1614 and 1998 Rites of Exorcism, Doctoral Dissertation, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law, Saint Paul University, 2007.
- GUÉRANGER, P., *L'année liturgique*, Paris, Oudin, 1911, available as an electronic book at <https://archive.org/details/lanneliturgiqu06gu/page/n7/mode/2up> (11 January 2022).
- GY, P.-M., *The Reception of Vatican II: Liturgical Reforms in the Life of the Church*, The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology 34, Milwaukee, WI, Marquette University Press, 2003.
- GRAULICH, M. (ed.), *Zehn Jahre Summorum Pontificum, Versöhnung mit der Vergangenheit: Weg in die Zukunft*, Regensburg, Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2017.
- HALLIGAN, N., *The Sacraments and Their Celebration*, Eugene, OR, Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1986.
- HALLINAN, P., *How to Understand Changes in the Liturgy*, Atlanta, GA, Georgia Bulletin Publications, 1964.

- HAZELL, M., *Index Lectionum: A Comparative Table of Readings from the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman Rite, Index Lectionem: A Comparative Table of Readings from the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman Rite*, Scotts Valley, CA, Lectionary Study Press, 2016.
- HELLEMANS, S. and J. WISSINK (eds.), *Towards a New Catholic Church in Advanced Modernity: Transformations, Visions, Tensions*, Tilburg Theological Studies v. 5. Zürich, Lit, 2012.
- HERBERMAN, C., E. PACE, C. PALLÉN, et al. (eds.), *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine and History of the Catholic Church in Fifteen Volumes*, New York, NY, Robert Appleton Company, 1909. Also available at <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05399b.htm> (11 January 2022).
- HIPPOLYTUS, *Commentaire sur Daniel*, trans. M. Lefèvre, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1947.
- HITE, J. and D.J. WARD, *Readings, Cases, Materials in Canon Law: A Textbook for Ministerial Students*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- HOFINGER, J. (ed.), *Liturgy and the Missions: The Nymegen Papers*, London, Burns & Oates, 1960.
- HOFFMAN, M., *The Ritual Law of the Church, with Its Application to the Communion and Baptismal Offices to Which is Added Notes upon Orders: The Articles and Canons of 1603*, New York, NY, Pott-Young, 1872.
- HUCK, G., *Liturgy with Style and Grace*, Third Edition, Revised, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 2018.
- HUELS, J.M., *Disputed Questions in the Liturgy Today*, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 1988.
- _____, *Liturgical Law: An Introduction*, American Essays in Liturgy 4, Washington, DC, Pastoral Press, 1987.
- _____, *Liturgy and Law: Liturgical Law in the System of Roman Catholic Canon Law*, Montréal, Wilson & Lafleur, 2006.
- _____, *More Disputed Questions in the Liturgy*, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 1996.
- _____, *One Table, Many Laws: Essays on Catholic Eucharistic Practice*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1986.
- HUGHES, K., (ed.), *How Firm a Foundation: Voices of the Early Liturgical Movement*, Chicago, IL, Liturgical Training Publications, 1990.
- HUGHES, P., *The Church in Crisis: A History of the General Councils 325-1870*, Garden City, NJ, Hanover House, 1961.
- HULL, G., *The Banished Heart: Origins of Heteropraxis in the Catholic Church*, New York, NY, T&T Clark, 2010.
- INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY, *ICEL: The First Years*, Washington, DC, International Commission on English in the Liturgy, 1981.

- IRWIN, K., *The Sacraments: Historical Foundation and Liturgical Theology*, New York, NY/Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 2016.
- JACKSON, J., *Nothing Superfluous: An Explanation of the Symbolism of the Rite of St. Gregory the Great*, Lincoln, NE, Redbrush, 2016.
- JASPER, R.C.D. and G.J. CUMING, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd rev. ed., New York, NY, Pueblo Publishing Company, 1987.
- JOHNSON, M.E. (ed.), *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2010.
- _____, *Sacraments and Worship*, 1st ed., The Sources of Christian Theology, Louisville, KY, John Knox Press, 2011.
- JOHNSTON, W., *Care for the Church and Its Liturgy: A Study of Summorum Pontificum and the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2013.
- JONES, C., G. WAINWRIGHT, E. YARNOLD and P. BRADSHAW (eds.), *The Study of Liturgy*, rev. ed., New York, NY, Oxford University Press, 1992.
- JORGENSEN, S., *Rekindling the Passion: Liturgical Renewal in Your Community*, San José, CA, Resource Publications, 1993.
- JOUNEL, P., *The Rite of Concelebration of Mass and Communion under Both Species*, New York, NY, Desclée, 1967.
- JUNGMANN, J.A., *The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great*, trans. F. BRUNNER, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1959.
- _____, *The Mass: An Historical, Theological and Pastoral Survey*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1976.
- _____, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum Sollemnia)*, 2 vols., Allen, TX, Christian Classics/Thomas More Publishing, 1986.
- _____, *Public Worship: A Survey*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, ca. 1957.
- KAPPES, C.W., *The Chronology, Organization, Competencies and Composition of Consilium ad exsequendam constitutionem de sacra liturgia*, Doctoral Dissertation, Rome, Pontificio ataneo di S. Anselmo de urbe, 2009.
- _____, *The Missa Normativa of 1967; Its History and Principles as Applied to the Liturgy of the Mass*, Doctoral Dissertation, Rome, Pontificium Athenaeum S. Anselmi de urbe, 2012.
- KASPER, W., *Theology and Church*, London, SCM Press, 1989.
- KAVANAGH, A., *Elements of Rite: A Handbook of Liturgical Style*, New York, NY, Pueblo, 1982.
- KAYNE, J., *The First Apology of Justin Martyr Addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius*, Edinburgh, John Grant, 1912.
- KING, A., *Liturgies of the Past: Rites of Western Christendom*, Milwaukee, WI, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1959.

- KING, A., *Notes on the Catholic Liturgies*, London, Longmans, Green, 1930.
- KLAUSER, T., *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, London, Oxford University Press, 1969.
- _____, *The Western Liturgy To-Day*, Contemporary Studies in Theology 8, London, Mowbray, 1963.
- KOCIK, T., *The Reform of the Reform? A Liturgical Debate, Reform or Return*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius, 2003.
- KOENKER, E.B., *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- KOROLEVSKI, C., *Living Languages in Catholic Worship: An Historical Inquiry*, trans. D. ATTWATER, London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1957.
- KRAMER, P.L., *The Suicide of Altering the Faith in the Liturgy*, Terryville, CT, The Missionary Association, 2006.
- KROESEN, J. and V. SCHMIDT, *The Altar and Its Environment, 1150-1400*, Studies in the Visual Cultures of the Middle Ages, vol. 4, Turnhout, Brepols, 2009.
- KUENZEL, L., *A Manual of the Ceremonies of Low Mass*, New York, NY, Frederick Pustet, 1920.
- KUNZLER, M., *The Church's Liturgy*, New York, NY/London, Continuum, 1995.
- _____, *Die "Tridentinische" Messe, Aufbruch oder Rückschritt?* Paderborn, Bonifatius, 2008.
- KWASNIEWSKI, P., *Noble Beauty, Transcendent Holiness: Why the Modern Age Needs the Mass of the Ages*, Kettering, OH, Angelico Press, 2017.
- _____, *Resurgent in the Midst of Crisis: Sacred Liturgy, the Traditional Latin Mass and Renewal in the Church*, Kettering, OH, Angelico Press, 2014.
- LAMBERTS, J., and INTERNATIONAL LITURGICAL COLLOQUIUM, *The Active Participation Revisited/La Participation Active: 100 ans Après Pie X et 40 ans Après Vatican II*, Textes et Études Liturgiques 19, Leuven, Peeters, 2004.
- LANG, U.M., *Authentic Liturgical Renewal in Contemporary Perspective*, New York, NY/London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.
- _____, *Ever Directed Towards the Lord: The Love of God in the Liturgy of the Eucharist Past, Present and Hoped For*, New York, NY/London, T&T Clark, 2007.
- _____, *The Genius of the Roman Rite: Historical, Theological and a Pastoral Perspectives on Catholic Liturgy*, Chicago, IL, Hillenbrand Books, 2010.
- _____, *Turning Towards the Lord: Orientation in Liturgical Prayer*, San Francisco, IL, Ignatius Press, 2004.
- LARGO, G., *Community and Liturgy: An Historical Overview*, Washington, DC, University Press of America, 1980.

- LAST, C. *Remembering the Future: Vatican II and Tomorrow's Liturgical Agenda*, New York, NY, Paulist Press, 1983.
- LEGG, J. (ed.), *Tracts on the Mass*, Henry Bradshaw Society, vol. 27, London, Harrison and Sons, 1904.
- LEVY, I., G. MACY and K. Van AUDALL, *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition vol. 26, Leiden, NL/Boston, MA, E.J. Brill, 2012.
- LEWIS, C., *The Silent Recitation of the Canon of the Mass*, Bay St. Louis, MS, Divine Word Missionaries, 1962.
- LEWIS, G., *The Bible, the Missal and the Breviary: Or, Ritualism Self-Illustrated in the Liturgical Books of Rome, Containing the Text of the Entire Roman Missal, Rubrics and Prefaces Volume 2, Primary Source Edition*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1853.
- LIKODIS, J. and K.D. WHITEHEAD, *The Pope, the Council and the Mass: Answers to the Questions the "Traditionalists" Have Asked*, rev. ed., Steubenville, OH, Emmaus Road Publishing, 2006.
- LITURGICAL CONFERENCE, *Preaching the Liturgical Renewal: Instructional Sermons and Homilies*, Parish Worship Program, Montréal, Palm Publishers, 1964.
- LONG, A.D., *Development of the Roman Missal: Fostering Growth of the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms*, Master's Thesis, Dayton, OH: University of Dayton, August 2016.
- LORET, P., *The Story of the Mass from the Last Supper to the Present Day*, Liguori, MO, Liguori Publications, 1982.
- LUKKEN, G., *Original Sin in the Roman Liturgy: Research into the Theology of Original Sin in the Roman Sacramentaria and the Early Baptismal Liturgy*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1973.
- LUSTIGER, J.-M., *Dare to Believe*, trans. N. MARANS, New York, NY, Crossroad, 1986.
- LYSIK, D. et al. (eds.), *The Liturgy Documents, A Parish Resource*, 4th ed., vol. 1, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 2004.
- _____, *The Liturgy Documents, A Parish Resource*, 4th ed., vol. 2, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 1999.
- MADRID, P AND P. VERE, *More Catholic than the Pope: An Inside Look at Extreme Traditionalism*, Huntington, IN, Our Sunday Visitor Publishing, 2004.
- MAHONEY, E., *Questions and Answers II: Precepts, Being Answers to Questions on the Divine and Natural Law: The Laws of the Church, Regulations for Clerics and Religious and the Externals of Worship, in so far as They are Covered by the Canon Law and the Decrees of the Sacred Congregations*, London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1949.

- MANN, J., *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue: A Study in the Cycles of the Readings from Torah and Prophets, as Well as from Psalms, and in the Structure of the Midrashic Homilies. Volume 1, The Palestinian Triennial Cycle: Genesis and Exodus, with a Hebrew Section Containing Manuscript Material of Midrashim to These Books*, The Library of Biblical Studies, New York, NY, Ktav Publishing House, 1971.
- MANNION, M.F., *Masterworks of God: Essays in Liturgical Theory and Practice*, Chicago/Mundelein, IL, Hillenbrand Books, 2004.
- MARINI, F., (ed.), *Comparative Sacramental Discipline in the CCEO and CIC*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 2003.
- MARINI, P., *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal 1963-1975*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2007.
- _____, *Serving the People of God: Remembering Sacrosanctum Concilium*, trans. A. SPATAFORA, Ottawa, Novalis, 2006.
- MARX, P., *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1957.
- MARTIMORT, A.-G., *The Church at Prayer: An Introduction*, trans. M.J. O'CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1987, 4 vols.
- _____, I.H. DALMAIS and P. JOUNEL, *The Church at Prayer, Volume IV: The Liturgy and Time, New Edition*, trans. M.J. O'CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1985.
- _____, *L'église en prière*, Paris, Desclée, 1961.
- MAZZA, E., *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, trans. M. O'CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1999.
- MCBRIDE, A., *A Short History of the Mass*, Cincinnati, OH, St. Anthony Messenger Press, 2006.
- MCMANUS, F.R., *The Congregation of Sacred Rites*, Washington, DC, Catholic University Press, 1954.
- _____, *Handbook for the New Rubrics*, Baltimore, MD, Halcion Press, 1961.
- _____, *Sacramental Liturgy*, New York, NY, Herder and Herder, 1967.
- _____, (ed.), *Thirty Years of Liturgical Renewal: Statements of the Bishops Committee on the Liturgy*, Washington, DC, United States Catholic Conference, 1987.
- McFARLAND, J., *Announcing the Feast: The Entrance Song in the Mass of the Roman Rite*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2011.
- MCNASPY, C., *What a Modern Catholic Believes about Worship*, Chicago, IL, Thomas More Press, 1973.
- METZGER, M., *History of the Liturgy: The Major Stages*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997.

- MISSIKA, J.-L. and D. WOLTON, *Choosing God, Chosen by God: Conversations with Cardinal Jean-Marie Lustiger*, trans. R. HOWELL BELINSKI, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 1991.
- MOELLER, E.E., *Corpus praefationum*, in J.P. MIGNE (ed.), *Patrologia cursus completus: Series Latina*, 217 vols., Paris, Garnier Frères and J.P. MIGNE, 1844-1864, 161-161d, Turnhout, Brepols, 1980.
- MORRISEY, F.G., *Papal and Curial Pronouncements: Their Canonical Significance in Light of the Code of Canon Law*, 2nd ed., revised and updated by M. THERIAULT, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law, Saint Paul University, 2002.
- MUELLER, J.B., *Handbook of Ceremonies for Priests and Seminarians*, St. Louis, MO, B. Herder and Company, 1943.
- MURPHY, J., *The Mass of the Liturgical Reform*, Milwaukee, WI, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956.
- MURPHY, P., *The New Rubrics of the Roman Missal and Breviary: Translation and Commentary*, Surry Hills, New South Wales, The Catholic Press Newspaper Company, Ltd., 1960.
- NICHOLS, A., *Looking at the Liturgy: A Critical View of Its Contemporary Form*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 1996.
- NOBEL, M., *Die wissenschaftliche Ausbildung der Priesterkandidaten in der lateinischen Kirche unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Partikulargesetzgebung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Hamburg, Verlag Dr. Kovac, 2008.
- NOCENT, A., *A Rereading of the Renewed Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1994.
- NOLAN, H. (ed.), *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Volume I 1792-1940*, Washington, DC, United States Catholic Conference, 1984.
- O'CONNELL, J.B., *Active Sharing in Public Worship: A Commentary on the Chief Purpose of the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, London, Burns & Oates, 1964.
- _____, *The Celebration of Mass: Three Complete Volumes in One*, Milwaukee, WI, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1959.
- _____, *Church Building and Furnishing the Church's Way: A Study in Liturgical Law*, London, Burns & Oates, 1955.
- _____, *Simplifying the Rubrics of the Roman Breviary and Missal*, London, Burns & Oates, 1956.
- OSTIDEK, A. (ed.), *The Voice of the Church: A Forum on Liturgical Translation*, Washington, DC, United States Catholic Conference, 2001.
- OTTAVIANI, A., et al., *A Brief Critical Study of the New Order of Mass*, Kansas City, MO, Angelus Press, 2001.
- OURY, G., *La Messe de S. Pie V a Paul VI*, Solesmes, Abbaye Saint-Pierre de Solesmes, 1975.

- OVERATH, J., CONSOCIATIO INTERNATIONALIS MUSICAE SACRAE and CHURCH MUSIC ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II: Proceedings of the Fifth International Church Music Congress, Chicago-Milwaukee, August 21-28, 1966*, Rome, Consociatio internationalis musicae sacrae, 1969.
- PALAZZO, E., *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. M. BEAUMONT, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1998.
- PARSCH, P., *The Liturgy of the Mass*, St. Louis, MO/London, Herder, 1940.
- PAXTON, F., *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University Press, 1990.
- PECKLERS, K., *Dynamic Equivalence: The Living Language of Christian Worship*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2003.
- _____, *The Genius of the Roman Rite: On the Reception and Implementation of the New Missal*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2010.
- PEIL, R., *A Handbook of the Liturgy*, New York, NY, Herder and Herder, 1960.
- PENNINGTON, M.B., *The Eucharist Yesterday and Today*, New York, NY, Crossroads, 1984.
- PFAFF, R., *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History*, ACLS Humanities E-Book, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, <https://login.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/login?url=http://books.scholarsportal.info.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/viewdoc.html?id=/ebooks/ebooks2/cambridge/2010-09-30/9780521808477> (11 January 2022).
- PRCELA, J., *Joseph, Husband of the Immaculate Mary*, Victoria, BC, FriesenPress, 2016.
- PRISTAS, L., *The Collects of the Roman Missals: A Comparative Study of the Sundays in Proper Seasons before and after the Second Vatican Council*, New York, NY, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- PUNIET, J. de, *The Mass: Its Origin and History*, London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1931.
- RATZINGER, J., *The Feast of Faith: Approaches to a Theology of the Liturgy*, trans. G. HARRISON, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 1986.
- _____, *Milestones: Memoirs 1927-1977*, trans. E. LEIVA-MERIKAKIS, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 1998.
- _____, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. J. SAWARD, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius, 2000.
- _____, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*, trans. H. TRAUB, G. THORMANN and W. BARZEL, New York, NY, Paulist Press, 1966.
- _____, and V. MESSORI, *The Ratzinger Report: An Exclusive Interview on the State of the Church*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 1985.

- REED, M. R., *Into the Vault of the Saints: The Exterior Crypts of Saint-Denis in Paris and Saint-Germain in Auxerre*, Master's Thesis, Baton Rouge, LA, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, May 2011.
- REHAK, M., *Der außerordentliche Gebrauch der alten Form des Römischen Ritus: Kirchenrechtliche Skizzen zum motu proprio Summorum Pontificum vom 07.07.2007*, Münchener Theologische Studien III, Kanonistische Abteilung 64, St. Ottilien Archabbey, EOS Verlag, 2009.
- REID, A. (ed.), *Liturgy in the Twenty-first Century: Contemporary Issues and Perspectives*, New York, NY/London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.
- _____, (ed.), *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger: Proceedings of the July 2001 Fontgombault Liturgical Conference*, Farnborough, Hampshire, St. Michael's Abbey Press, 2001.
- _____, *The Nature of the Liturgical Movement and the Principles of Liturgical Reform*, Ann Arbor, MI, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2002, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/301631674/?pq-origsite=primo> (11 January 2022).
- _____, *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*, 2nd ed., San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2005.
- _____, *T&T Clark Companion to Liturgy: The Western Catholic Tradition*, London/New York, NY, T&T Clark/Bloomsbury, 2016.
- REINHOLD, H.A., *Dynamics of Liturgy*, New York, NY, Macmillan, 1961.
- REYNOLDS, R., K. CUSHING and R. GYUG, *Ritual, Text and Law: Studies in Medieval Canon Law and Liturgy Presented to Roger E. Reynolds: Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West*, Aldershot, Hampshire, Ashgate, 2004.
- RICHSTATTER, T., *Liturgical Law Today: New Style, New Spirit*, Chicago, IL, Franciscan Herald Press, 1977.
- RINCÓN-PÉREZ, T., *La liturgia e I sacramenti nel diritto della Chiesa*, Subsidia Canonica 12, Rome, EDUSC, 2014.
- ROCK, D., *Hierurgia, or, The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass with Notes and Dissertations Elucidating Its Doctrines and Ceremonies and Numerous Illustrative Plates in Two Parts, Volume 1 of 2*, London, Joseph Booker, 1833.
- _____, *Hierurgia, Or, Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Relics and Purgatory, Besides Those Other Articles of Doctrine Set Forth in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, Expounded; and the Use of Holy Water, Incense and Images, the Ceremonies, Vestments and Ritual Employed in Its Celebration among the Latins, Greeks and Orientals*, London, C. Dolman, 1851.
- RORDORF, W. (ed.), *Sabbat und Sonntag in der Alten Kirche Traditio Christiana*, ii, Zürich, Theologischer Verlag, 1972, no. 110.

- RORDORF, W. *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*, Philadelphia, PA, Westminster Press, 1968.
- ROTHE, W.F., *Liturgische Versöhnung: Ein kirchenrechtlicher Kommentar zum motu proprio "Summorum Pontificum" fuer Studium und Praxis*, Augsburg, Dominus Verlag, 2009.
- ROY, N. and J. RUTHERFORD (eds.), *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy: Proceedings of the First Fota International Liturgy Conference, 2008*, Fota Liturgy Series, Dublin/New York, NY, Four Courts Press, 2010/2011.
- RUTHERFORD, J.E. and J. O'BRIEN (eds.), *Benedict XVI and the Roman Missal*, Dublin/New York, NY, Four Courts Press, 2013.
- RYAN, M., *Has the New Liturgy Changed You?* New York, NY, Paulist Press, 1967.
- RYAN, R., and J. HUELS, *The 2004 Instruction Redemptionis Sacramentum on Abuses in the Celebration of the Eucharist, Background, Analysis, Reception and Interpretation*, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law, Saint Paul University, 2009.
- THE SACERDOTAL COMMUNITIES OF SAINT-SEVERIN OF PARIS AND SAINT-JOSEPH OF NICE, *The Liturgical Movement: Volume 115 of the Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism*, trans. L. SHEPPARD, New York, NY, Hawthorn Books, 1964.
- ST. PAUL CENTER FOR BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, *Reading Salvation: Word, Worship and the Mysteries*, Letter & Spirit v. 1, Steubenville, OH, Emmaus Road Publishing, 2005.
- SCHLOEDER, S., *Architecture in Communion: Implementing the Second Vatican Council through Liturgy and Architecture*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 1998.
- SEASOLTZ, R.K., *New Liturgy; New Laws*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1980.
- _____, *A Sense of the Sacred: Theological Foundations of Christian Architecture and Art*, New York, NY, Continuum, 2005.
- SENN, F.C., *A Stewardship of the Mysteries*, New York, NY, Paulist Press, 1999.
- _____, *Christian Worship and Its Cultural Setting*, Philadelphia, PA, Fortress Press, 1983.
- _____, *Embodied Liturgy: Lessons in Christian Ritual*, Baltimore, MD/Minneapolis, MN, Project MUSE/Fortress Press, 2016.
- _____, *Introduction to Christian Liturgy*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 2012.
- _____, *Creation: A Liturgical Worldview*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 2000.
- _____, *New Eucharistic Prayers: An Ecumenical Study of Their Development and Structure*, New York, NY, Paulist Press, 1987.
- _____, *The People's Work: A Social History of the Liturgy*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress Press, 2006.
- SHEEHY, G. et al. (eds.), *The Canon Law Letter & Spirit: A Practical Guide to the Code of Canon Law*, prepared by the CANON LAW SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND in association with the CANADIAN CANON LAW SOCIETY, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1995.

- SHEPPARD, L., *Blueprint for Worship: An Interpretation of the Liturgical Constitution of Vatican II*, Westminster, MD, The Newman Press, 1964.
- _____, (ed.), *The New Liturgy: A Comprehensive Introduction to the New Liturgy as a Whole and to Its Calendar, Order of Mass, Eucharistic Prayers, the Roman Canon, Prefaces and the New Sunday Lectionary*, Glasgow, Robert MacLehose and Company, Ltd., 1970.
- _____, (ed.), *True Worship*, Baltimore, MD, The Helicon Press, 1963.
- SMITH, P., *Theoretical and Practical Understanding of the Integral Reordering of Canon Law*, Roman Catholic Studies, vol. 16, Lewiston, NY/Queenston, Edwin Mellen Press, 2002.
- _____, *The Integral Reordering of Law with Application to Religious Law*, Doctoral Dissertation, Ottawa, Faculty of Canon Law/Ann Arbor, MI, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, Saint Paul University, 2000.
- SMOLARSKI, D.C., *The General Instruction of the Roman Missal, 1969-2002, A Commentary*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2003.
- SOLOVĚI, M., *The Byzantine Divine Liturgy: History and Commentary*, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press, 1970.
- SORIA-JIMÉNEZ, A., “*Los principios de interpretación del motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*,” Doctoral Dissertation, Madrid, Ediciones Cristiandad S.A., 2014.
- SPINKS, B., *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*, SCM Studies in Worship and Liturgy, London, SCM Press, 2013.
- STAPPER, R., *Catholic Liturgics*, Paterson, NJ, St. Anthony Guild Press, 1935.
- STEUART, B., *The Development of Christian Worship: An Outline of Liturgical History*, London, Longmans, Green, 1953.
- STRANGFELD, J., *Das Dankgebet der Kirche*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1952.
- STRAPPER, R. and D. BAIER, *Catholic Liturgics*, Patterson, NJ, St. Anthony Guild Press, 1938.
- STUART, E., *Some Thoughts on Low Masses Addressed to Members of Convocation*, 3rd ed., Nineteenth Century Collections Online, British Politics and Society, London, G.J. Palmer, 1863.
- SOUBIGOU, L., *A Commentary on the Preface and the Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Missal*, Collegeville, MN, Liturgical Press, 1971.
- _____, *Les Préfaces de La Liturgie Étudiées, Prêchées, Méditées*, Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1967.
- TAFT, R., *Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding*, NPM Studies in Church Music and Liturgy, Washington, DC, Pastoral Press, 1984.
- _____, *The Diptychs*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 238, Rome, Pontificium Institutum studiorum orientalium, 1991.

- TAFT, R., *History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta 200, 238, 261, Rome, Pontificium Institutum studiorum orientalium, 1975.
- _____, *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond*, Collected Studies CS493, Aldershot, Hampshire, Variorum, 1995.
- _____, *The Liturgy of the Hours: The Origins of the Divine Office in East and West and Its Meaning for Today*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1986.
- TALLEY, T. I., *The Origins of the Liturgical Year, Second Edition*, Collegeville, MN, 1991, 13-17.
- THOMAS, E., *The Lay Folk's History of the Liturgy*, London, Rivington, 1929.
- THOMPSON, B. (ed.), *A Bibliography of Christian Worship*, ATLA Bibliography Series, no. 25, Metuchen, NJ/London, The American Theological Library Association and The Scarecrow Press, 1989.
- TIERNEY, M., *The Council and the Mass*, Wilkes-Barre, PA, Dimension Books, 1965.
- TURNER, P., *Let Us Pray: A Guide to the Rubrics of Sunday Mass*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2006.
- _____, *Whose Mass Is It? Why People Care So Much about the Catholic Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2015.
- TUZIK, R. (ed.), *How Firm a Foundation: Leaders of the Liturgical Movement*, Chicago, IL, Liturgy Training Publications, 1990.
- URO, R., *Ritual and Christian Beginnings: A Socio-Cognitive Analysis*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.
- VAGAGGINI, C., *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform*, New York, NY, Alba House, 1967.
- VALLE, N., *From Adaptation to Inculturation: The Development of the Concept of Liturgical Inculturation*, Doctoral Dissertation, Rome, Pontificia studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1999.
- VAN DIJK, S. and J.H. WALKER, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century*, Westminster, MD, The Newman Press, 1960.
- VARRO, M.T., *On the Latin Language in Twenty-five Books*, Book VI, London, William Heineman, 1938.
- WACHS, J., *Obsequium in the Church: Sacred Tradition, Second Vatican Council, 1983 Code and Sacred Liturgy*, Montréal, Wilson & Lafleur, 2014.
- WAGNER, J., *The Church and the Liturgy*, Concilium vol. 2, Glen Rock, NJ, Paulist Press, 1965.
- WALTON, J.R., *Feminist Liturgy: A Matter of Justice*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000.
- WARD, A. and C. JOHNSON (eds.), *The Prefaces of the Roman Missal: A Source Compendium with Concordance and Indices*, Rome, Vatican Polyglot Press, 1989.

- WAUGH, E., *A Bitter Trial: Evelyn Waugh and John Carmel Cardinal Heenan on the Liturgical Changes*, exp. ed., San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2011.
- WEAVER, M. and R. APPLEBY (eds.), *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press, 1995.
- WERNER, E., *The Sacred Bridge: Liturgical Parallels in Synagogue and Early Church*, New York, NY, Schocken Books, 1970.
- WHITE, J.F., *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today*, 2nd ed., Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2003.
- WHITE, S., *Art, Architecture, and Liturgical Reform*, New York, NY, Pueblo, 1990.
- WHITEHEAD, K., *Mass Misunderstandings: The Mixed Legacy of the Vatican II Liturgical Reforms*, South Bend, IN, St. Augustine's Press, 2009.
- _____, (ed.), *Sacrosanctum Concilium and the Reform of the Liturgy: Proceedings from the 29th Annual Convention of the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars, Kansas City, MO, 22-24 September 2006*, Chicago, IL, University of Scranton Press, 2009.
- WIELUNSKI, G., *Participation of a Layperson in Exercising Liturgical Functions*, Doctoral Dissertation, Rome, Pontificia studiorum Universitas a Sancto Thoma Aquinate in Urbe, 1996.
- WERNZ, F., *Ius canonicum*, Rome, Apud aedes Universitatis Gregorianae, 1927.
- WIJLENS, M., *Sharing the Eucharist: A Theological Evaluation of the Post Conciliar Legislation*, Latham, MD, University Press of America, 2000.
- WILLIS, G., *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy*, Alcuin Club Collections no. 50, London, SPCK, 1968.
- _____, *A History of Early Roman Liturgy to the Death of Pope Gregory the Great*, Subsidia Henry Bradshaw Society 1, London, Boydell Press, 1994.
- WOESTMAN, W.H., *Canon Law of the Sacraments for Parish Ministry*, Ottawa, Saint Paul University, 2007.
- ZUALDI, F., *The Sacred Ceremonies of Low Mass*, 11th ed., Dublin, Browne and Nolan, 1928.

ARTICLES

- ABBASS, J., "The Eucharist: A Comparative Study of the Eastern and Latin Codes," in *Studies in Church Law*, 7 (2011), 47-84.
- ALBRIGHT, M.J., "Sacrifice as the Key to Understanding the Difference and Relationship Between the Priesthood of the Baptized and of the Ordained," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 19 (2015), 310-337.
- AMMASSARI, A. "Alle origini del calendario natalizio," in *Euntes Docete*, 45, (1992) 11-16.

- ARINZE, F., "Active Participation in the Sacred Liturgy," in F. ARINZE, *Cardinal Reflections: Active Participation and the Liturgy*, Chicago/Mundelein, IL, Hillenbrand Books, 2005, 15-25.
- VON ARX, W., "Zur Wiederzulassung der tridentinischen Messe," in *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung*, 175 (2007), 517-519.
- AUGÉ, M., "Due 'forme' per uno stesso rito?" in *Rivista liturgica*, 96 (2009), 687-695.
- _____, "Le collette di Avvento-Natale-Epiphania nel Messale Romano," in *Rivista Liturgica*, 59 (1972), 614-627.
- _____, "A Theology of the Liturgical Year," in A. CHUPUNGO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 317-330.
- _____, "The Liturgical Year in the First Four Centuries," in A. CHUPUNGO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 135-155.
- _____, "The Liturgical Year in the Roman Rite," in A. CHUPUNGO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 177-210.
- _____, "La revalorización del *ieiunium paschale*," in *Ecclesia Orans*, 9 (1992), 277-286.
- AUVRAY, P., and X. LÉON-DUFOUR, "Giorno del Signore," in *Dizionario di teologia biblica*, Turin, Marietti, 1972, 473-480.
- BACCINI, G., "Balancing Liturgical Form and Reform: An Interview with Archbishop Piero Marini," in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly English ed., vol. 41 (14 May 2008), 10.
- BALDOVIN, J.F., "An Active Presence: The Liturgical Vision of Vatican II 50 Years Later," in *America*, vol. 208, no. 18 (2013), 11-14.
- _____, "Klaus Gamber and the Post-Vatican II Reform of the Roman Liturgy," in *Studia Liturgica*, 33 (2003), 223-239.
- _____, "Reflections on *Summorum Pontificum*," in *Worship*, 83 (2009), 98-112.
- _____, "The Roots of Reform: Context and Background for Vatican II," in *The Hymn*, vol. 64, no. 4 (2013), 7-12.
- _____, "What We Have Done, What We Have Failed to Do: Assessing the Liturgical Reforms of Vatican II," in *Theological Studies*, 76 (2015), 201-203.
- BAROFFIO, B., "Le orationi dopo la comunione del Tempo di Avvento," in *Rivista Liturgica*, 59 (1972), 649-662.
- BENEDICTINE MONKS OF SOLESMES, *Papal Teachings: The Liturgy*, trans. Daughters of St. Paul, Boston, MA, St. Paul Editions, 1962.

- BENOFY, S., "The Day the Mass Changed: How It Happened and Why, Part I" in *Adoremus Bulletin: Society for the Renewal of the Sacred Liturgy*, Lacrosse, WI, Adoremus, vol. 15, no. 10 (February, 2010), <https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/view.cfm?recnum=9377> (11 January 2022).
- _____, "The Day the Mass Changed: How It Happened and Why, Part II" in *Adoremus Bulletin: Society for the Renewal of the Sacred Liturgy*, Lacrosse, WI, Adoremus, vol. 16, no. 1 (March, 2010), <https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/view.cfm?recnum=9378> (11 January 2022).
- BIANCHI, E., "Die Rückkehr des tridentinischen Missale," in A. GERHARDS (ed.), *Ein Ritus-zwei Formen: Die Richtlinie Papst Benedikts XVI zur Liturgie*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Basel, Herder Verlag, 2008, 103-121.
- BICCINI, G., "Interview with Cardinal Darío Castrillón Hoyos: A Two-fold Use of the One Roman Rite," in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly English ed., 41 (9 April 2008), 4.
- BISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON THE LITURGY, "Ten Questions on the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the *Missale Romanum*," in *BCL Newsletter*, 43 (2007), 26-28.
- _____, "Twenty Questions on the Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum*," in *BCL Newsletter*, 43 (2007), 23-26.
- BOTTE, B., "Les origines de la noel et de l'Épiphanie: Étude historique," in *Textes et études: liturgiques sous la direction de D. B. Capelle*, Louvain, Abbaye du Mont César, 1932, 61-67.
- BOUYER, L., "La préface et le *sanctus*," in *La Maison-Dieu*, 87 (1966), 97-110.
- BRAGA, C., "Appendix: The Apostolic Letter 'Sacram Liturgiam,'" in BUGNINI and C. BRAGA (eds.), *The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy*, trans. V. MALLON, New York, NY, Benziger, 1965, 289-294.
- BRAND, E.L., "Reflections on the Ecumenical Aspects of the Liturgical Movement," in *Worship*, 51 (1977), 49-55.
- BROADBENT, H., "Obeying the Voice of the Lord: Sacrifice and Worship," in *Usus Antiquior*, 2 (January 2011), 13-31.
- BROVELLI, F., "Le orazioni del Tempo di Avvento e di Natale," in *Il Messale Romano del Vaticano II: Orazionale e Lezionario*, (coll. *Quaederni di Rivista Liturgica* 6) Turin-Leumann, (1984), 1:97-136.
- BROWN, M. and P. Vere, "Custom and the 1962 Roman Missal," in A. ESPELAGE (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2001-2005*, Alexandria, VA, Canon Law Society of America, 2006, 26-29.
- BUFFER, T., "The American Liturgical Movement, Social Justice and Architectural Change," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Spiritual Renewal*, 20 (2016), 241-267.
- BUGNINI, A., "Pius XII et Liturgia," in *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 72 (1958), 375-379.

- BURKE, R.L., "Sacred Liturgy and Asceticism: Respect for the *Ius Divinum*," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 17 (2013), 3-30.
- CABIÉ, R., "L'affaire du 'motu proprio' du 25 janvier 1964," in *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, 109 (2008), 41-52.
- _____, "The Celebration of the Eucharist in the West and the Council of Trent to Vatican II," in A.G. MARTIMORT, *The Church at Prayer Volume II: The Eucharist*, Collegeville, MN, 1987, 173-185.
- CALABUIG, I., "The Liturgical Cult of Mary in the East and in the West," in A. CHUPUNCO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 219-297.
- CALLEWAERT, C., 'L'oeuvre liturgique de s. Grégoire: La Septuagésime et l'Alléluia' in *Sacris Erudiri, Fragmenta Liturgica Collecta a Monachis Sancti Petri de Aldenbrugge in Steenbrugge ne Pereant*, The Hague, Steenbrugis, 1962, 635-653.
- CAMERON-MOWAT, A., "Summorum Pontificum: A Response," in *The Pastoral Review*, 3 (2007), 4-11.
- CAPELLE, B., "The Origins of the Roman Preface of the Virgin," in *Review of Ecclesiastical History*, 38 (1942), 46-47.
- CARIEDO, A., "Il lezionario del Tempo di Avvento: Nell'attesa della tua venuta," in *Il Messale Romano del Vaticano II: Orazionale e Lezionario*, (coll. *Quaederni di Rivista Liturgica* 6) Turin-Leumann, (1984), 1:39-70.
- CARVALHAES, C and P. GALBREATH, "The Season of Easter," in *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 65 (2011), 5-16.
- CASSETI, C., "Liturgische Versöhnung, Ein Kommentar zum *motu proprio* 'Summorum Pontificum'," in *Theologisches*, 37 (2007), 267-268.
- CATHEY, B., "The Legal Background of the Erection and Alleged Suppression of the Society of St. Pius X," in M. DAVIES, *Apologia pro Marcel Lefebvre, 1905-1976*, Kansas City, MO, Angelus Press, 1979, 443-444.
- CERNERA, A. and E. KORN, "The Latin Liturgy and the Jews," in *America*, vol. 197, no. 10 (8 October 2007), 10-13.
- CHUPUNCO, A., "A Definition of Liturgy," in A. CHUPUNCO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997, 3-10.
- _____, "History of the Roman Liturgy until the Fifteenth Century," in A. CHUPUNCO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997, 95-113.
- _____, "The Liturgical Year: The Gospel Encountering Culture," in *Studia Liturgica*, vol. 40, (2010) 46-64.
- CIAPPI, L., "Santissimo Corpo e Sangue di Cristo," in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 275-278.
- _____, "Variationes in Calendarium Romanum Inductee," in *Notitiae*, 6 (1970), 191.

- CLARK, J., "The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History," in *American Historical Review*, 116 (2011), 500-502.
- CODY, A., "The Didache: An English Translation," in C. JEFFORD (ed.), *The Didache in Context, Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1995.
- COLEMAN, I.G., "The Rubrics of Revelation: A Liturgical Reading," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 21 (2017), 290-318.
- COLLOMB, P. "A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique*, 107 (2012), 1083-1084.
- CONES, B., "Mass Instruction, Opponents of the Modern Liturgy Could Use a History Lesson, Says This Scholar of the Church's Prayer. An Interview with Father Robert Taft, S.J.," in *U.S. Catholic*, vol. 74, no. 12 (2009), 26.
- "Consultation, Témoignage et vœu sur le nouvel *Ordo Missae*," in *La pensée catholique*, 122 (1969), 44-47.
- CORDILEONE, S.J., "We are Bound to Give Thanks to God Always: Worship That is Right and Just," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 20 (2016), 3-18.
- CORRADA DEL RIO, A., "Falling in Love with the Liturgy," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 16 (2012), 2-8.
- COWDREY, H., "Pope Gregory VII (1703-85) and the Liturgy," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 55 (April 2004), 55-83.
- CRICHTON, J.D., "An Historical Sketch of the Roman Liturgy," in L. SHEPPARD, *True Worship*, Baltimore, MD, Helicon Press, 1963, 72-76.
- CRUM, M., "Our Approach to the Liturgical Year," in *Worship*, 51 (1977), 24-32.
- DANEELS, G., "Liturgy Forty Years after the Second Vatican Council," in K. PECKLERS (ed.), *Liturgy in a Postmodern World*, New York, NY/London, Continuum, 2003, 7-26.
- DE PAOLIS, V., "Canonical Observations on the New Regulations of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith," in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 4 (1997), 26-35.
- DE ROSA, G., "*Oremus et pro Iudaeis*," in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 159 (March 2008), 490-491.
- DEARIE, J., and D. CODAY, "A Short History of the 'Liturgy Wars': Vatican Authority over Translations of Liturgical Texts," in *National Catholic Reporter*, vol. 53, no. 25 (2017), 12.
- DI NOIA, J.A., "Divine Worship and the Liturgical Vitality of the Church," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 19 (2015), 109-115.
- DIGNES, W.D., "'We Are What You Were': Roman Catholic Traditionalism in America," in M.J. WEAVER and R.S. APPLEBY (eds.), *Being Right, Conservative Catholics in America*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press, 1995, 241-269.
- DIRKS, A., "Appendix: The Revision of the Calendar," in BUGNINI, *The Commentary and Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy*, 285-288.

- DOBSZAY, L., "Holy Week: Critical Reflections on the Bugnini Liturgy," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 126, no. 1 (1999), 9.
- _____, "Ordo Antiquus: The 'Tridentine' Movement and 'Reform of the Reform'," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 128, no. 3 (2001), 11-30.
- _____, "Perspectives on Organic Development," in *Usus Antiquior*, 3 (July 2012), 130-136.
- DOE, N., "The Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum Coetibus*: An Anglican Juridical Perspective," in *Ecclesiastical Law Journal*, 12 (2010), 304-323.
- DONAHUE, J., "Cup or Chalice? The Large Implications of a Small Change," in *Commonweal*, vol. 139, no. 11 (2012), 10.
- DUBOIS, J., "Les Saints du nouveau calendrier: Tradition et critique historique," in *La Maison Dieu*, 100 (1969), 157-178.
- DUMAS, A., "Les oraisons du nouveau missel romain," in *Questions Liturgiques*, 25 (1971), 263-70.
- _____, "Les préfaces du nouveau Missel," in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 85 (1971), 16-28.
- _____, "Les sources du nouveau Missel romain, in *Notitiae*, 1 (1971), 37-42; 74-77; 94-95; 134-136; 276-280.
- DUNN, B., "Liturgical and Canonical Challenges Associated with the New General Instruction of the Roman Missal," in *Studia Canonica*, 42 (2008), 87-118.
- Editorial on praying *ad orientem* and *versus populum*, in *Notitiae*, 29 (1993), 245-249, English translation in *Sacred Music*, vol. 120, no. 4 (1993), 14-17.
- "Les etapes préparatoires du schema de la constitution sur la liturgie," in *La Maison Dieu*, 155 (1983), 31-53.
- FAGGIOLI, M., "Pope Paul VI and the Seeds of Discord," in *National Catholic Reporter*, vol. 48, no. 26 (2012), 16.
- _____, "*Quaestio Disputata: Sacrosanctum Concilium* and the Meaning of Vatican II," in *Theological Studies*, 71 (2010), 437-52.
- FERRONE, R., "The Substantial Unity of the Roman Rite," in *Pastoral Music*, vol. 39, no. 3 (March 2015), 13-16.
- FEULNER, H.-J., "Anglican Use of the Roman Rite? The Unity of Liturgy in the Diversity of Its Rites and Forms," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Reform*, 17 (2013), 31-72.
- FINK-WAGNER, U., "Johannes XXIII, das Latein und der alte Ritus," in *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung*, 175 (2007), 477-478.
- FINIGAN, T., "Mutual Enrichment in Theory and Practice," in *Usus Antiquior*, 2 (January 2011), 61-68.
- FINOCCHIARO, A., "Problematiche aperte nel web sul *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*" in *Rivista liturgica*, 94 (2007), 947-975.

- “Five Years since the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*,” States News Service, 6 November 2012, Academic OneFile, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A307519382/AONE?u=otta77973&sid=AONE&xid=2d689020> (11 January 2022).
- FLANNERY, A., “The New Liturgical Calendar,” in *Doctrine and Life*, 19 (1969), 323-328.
- FOLDVARY, M.I., “The Variants of the Roman Rite: Their Legitimacy and Revival,” in *Usus Antiquior*, vol. 3, no. 2 (July 2012), 121-129.
- FOLEY, M. “The Reform of the Calendar and the Reduction of Liturgical Recapitulation,” in A. REID (ed.), *Liturgy in the Twenty-first Century: Contemporary Issues and Perspectives*, London/New York, NY, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, 321-341.
- FOLSOM, C., “The Great Divorce: The Reason for Our Liturgical Malaise,” in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 22 (2018), 2-15.
- _____, “The Inseparable Link Between Holiness and Worship,” in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 16 (2012), 82-85.
- _____, “Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” in A. CHUPUNGCO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997.
- FONTANA, M., “Building Beautiful Churches for the Right Reasons,” in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly English ed., 41 (9 January 2008), 9.
- FOSTER, J. “Canonical Reflections on *Universae ecclesiae*, the instruction on the Application of *Summorum Pontificum*,” in *The Jurist*, 73 (2013), 89-129.
- _____, “A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal ed. by E. FOLEY, N.D. MITCHELL and J.M. PIERCE, (Review),” in *The Jurist*, vol. 70, no. 2 (2010), 511-512.
- FOX, M., “Beauty and the Roman Liturgy,” in *Sacred Music*, vol. 134, no. 3 (2007) 56-57.
- FRANCESCONI, G., “Per una lettura teologico-liturgica dei prefazi di Avvento-Natale-Epiphania del Messale Romano,” in *Rivista Liturgica*, 59 (1972), 628-648.
- FRANKLIN, R.W., “The Liturgical Schism,” in *Worship*, 62 (1988), 448-451.
- _____, “Guéranger and Pastoral Liturgy: A Nineteenth Century Context,” in *Worship*, 50 (1976), 146-162.
- _____, “Guéranger and Variety in Unity,” in *Worship*, 51 (1977), 378-399.
- _____, “The Nineteenth Century Liturgical Movement,” in *Worship*, 53 (1979), 12-39.
- FRIEL, D.M., “The Propriety of the Propers: Toward the Independence of Liturgical Chant and Popular Hymnody,” in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 18 (2014), 165-197.
- “Full Participation before All Else,” in *National Catholic Reporter*, vol. 43 (20 July 2007), 24.
- FUNK, V., “Some Lessons Learned,” in *Pastoral Music*, vol. 40, no. 5 (2016), 13-20.

- GELDHOF, J., "The Early and Late Schillebeeckx OP on Rituals, Liturgies and Sacraments," in *Usus Antiquior*, 1 (July 2010), 135-150.
- GERHARDS, A., "Die Sorge der Papiste: Das *motu proprio* Benedikts XVI zur Wiedezulassung der alten Liturgie," in *Herder-Korrespondenz*, 61 (2007), 398-403.
- GIANAZZA, P., "La Preghiera per gli Ebrei Nella Liturgia di Rito Romano," in *Rivista Liturgia*, 95 (2008), 155-176.
- GILLIGAN, C.M., "Ars Celebrandi as Asceticism," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 16 (2012), 114-129.
- GIRAUDO, C., "La liturgia nel solco della tradizione: Riflessioni in margine al *motu proprio* 'Summorum Pontificum'," in *Rivista Liturgia*, 95 (2008), 253-273.
- GLEESON, B., "Eucharistic Presidency Its Meaning and Function," in *The Australasian Catholic Record*, 87 (April 2010), 203-214.
- GLENDINNING, C.J., "Adopting Pre-Conciliar Liturgical Practices in the Celebration of the Ordinary Form of the Mass," in S. EUART and S.M. VERBEEK (eds.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2009*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 2009, 61-67.
- _____, "The Development of the Liturgical Reform as Seen by Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli from 1948 to 1970 (Review)," in *Studia Canonica*, 44 (2010), 548-549.
- _____, "The Genius of the Roman Rite: On the Reception and Implementation of the New Missal (Review)," in *Studia Canonica*, 43 (2009), 578-580.
- _____, "The Old Mass and the New: Explaining the *motu proprio* (Review)," in *Studia Canonica*, 45 (2011), 550-553, 571.
- _____, "Reforming the Liturgy, A Response to the Critics (Review)," in *Studia Canonica*, 42 (2008), 556-559.
- _____, "The Significance of the Liturgical Reforms Prior to the Second Vatican Council in Light of *Summorum Pontificum*," in *Studia Canonica*, 44 (2010), 293-342.
- _____, "*Universae ecclesiae*: Text and Commentary," in *Studia Canonica*, 45 (2011), 355-402.
- _____, "Use of Female Altar Servers in Liturgical Celebrations Using the Extraordinary Form," in J. KOURY, S. VERBEEK, et al. (eds.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2008*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 2008, 77-79.
- GRACE, M., "Eucharistic Fasting: A Review of Its Practice and Evaluation of Its Benefit," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 17 (2013), 225-246.
- GRIBBIN, A.J., "Immemorial Custom and the *Missale Romanum* of 1962 (*usus antiquior*)," in *Usus Antiquior*, 3 (January 2012), 15-35.
- GRILLO, A., "Ende der Liturgiereform? Das *motu proprio* 'Summorum Pontificum'," in *Stimmen der Zeit*, 225 (2007), 730-740.

- GULETSKY, I. "The Mass as the Liturgical Calendar and Computus," in *Min-Ad: Israel Studies in Musicology Online*, 13 (2015/2016), 1-18.
- GY, P-M., "La troisième Instruction pour une juste application de la Constitution conciliaire sur la Liturgie," in *La Maison-Dieu*, 104 (1970), 167-171.
- HAMILTON, L., "The Rituals of Renaissance: Liturgy and Mythic History in The Marvels of Rome," in *Medieval Encounters: Jewish, Christian and Muslim Culture in Confluence and Dialogue*, 17 (2011), 417-438.
- HARRISON, B., "Postconciliar Eucharistic Liturgy, Planning a 'Reform of the Reform'," in T. KOCIK, *The Reform of the Reform? A Liturgical Debate: Reform or Return*, San Francisco, CA, Ignatius Press, 2003, 170-193.
- HAUNERLAND, W., "Ein Ritus in zwei Ausdrucksformen? Hintergründe und Perspektiven zur Liturgiefeier nach dem *motu proprio 'Summorum Pontificum'*," in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, 58 (2008), 179-203.
- HEMMING, L.P., "Responses to Critics: The Questions," in *Usus Antiquior*, 2 (January 2011), 1-12.
- HERZ, M., "Justice Byron White and the Argument that the Greater Includes the Lesser," in *BYU LAW REVIEW*, (1994), Provo, UT, Brigham Young University Law School, 227-281.
- HILBERATH, B.J., "The Latin Mass: Ecumenical Remarks on '*Summorum Pontificum*'," in *Theology Digest*, 53 (2006), 229-237.
- _____, "Es geht um mehr als nur um das Messbuch," in *Una sancta*, 62 (2007), 231-240.
- HILL, R., "A Chat with Ratzinger," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 124, no. 1 (1997), 18-20.
- HOLETON, D.R., "Ecumenical Liturgical Consensus: A Bumpy Road to Christian Unity, Presidential Address," in *Studia Liturgica*, 38 (2008), 1-16.
- HON TAI-FAI, S., "Sacramental Theology from the Perspective of the Liturgical Movement," in *Theology Annual*, 12 (1990-1991), 1-44.
- HUCK, G., "What We Have Done and What We Have Failed to Do: 40 Years after Vatican II's Call to Liturgical Renewal, We've Still Got a Long Way to Go," in *National Catholic Reporter*, vol. 40, no. 11 (2004), 11-13.
- HUEBSCHER, M., "Numbering My Days: How the Liturgical Calendar Rearranged My Life," in *The Catholic Library World*, 87 (2016), 128.
- HUELS, J.M., "Assessing the Weight of Documents on the Liturgy," in *Worship*, 74 (2000), 117-135.
- _____, "Back to the Future," in *CLSAP*, 59 (1997), Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 1-25.
- _____, "Der Außerordentliche Gebrauch Der Alten Form Des Römischen Ritus: Kirchenrechtliche Skizzen Zum *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum Vom 07.07.2007*," in *Studia Canonica*, 43 (2009), 573-574.

- HUELS, J.M., "A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal," in *Worship*, 82 (2008), 433-445.
- _____, "A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal: A New English Translation," in *Studia Canonica*, 46 (2012), 277-278.
- _____, "Communion under Both Kinds on Sundays: Is It Legal?" in *The Jurist*, 42 (1982), 70-106.
- _____, "False Opinions on the Use of the Tridentine Rite," in *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions*, 2001, 51-52.
- _____, "Liturgical Issues in the Diocese," in *Studia Canonica*, 33 (1999), 83-112.
- _____, "Participation by the Faithful in the Liturgy, 1903-1962," in *The Jurist*, 48 (1988), 608-637.
- _____, "Privilege, Faculty, Indult, Derogation: Diverse Uses and Disputed Questions," in *The Jurist*, 63 (2003), 213-252.
- _____, "Reconciling the Old with the New: Canonical Questions on *Summorum Pontificum*," in *The Jurist*, 68 (2008), 92-113.
- _____, "Summorum Pontificum: Texte et commentaire," in IDEM, *Liturgie et droit: Le droit liturgique dans le système du droit Canonique de l'Église catholique*, Montréal, Wilson & Lafleur, 2007, 267-283.
- _____, and W. WOESTMAN, "Canon 846: Presuming Permission for Pre-Vatican II Rites," in A. ESPELAGE, (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 1994-2000*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 231-235.
- HURD, B, "The Prayer of the Faithful," in *Liturgy*, vol. 8 no. 3 (1 January 1990), 52-59.
- "Investigatio de usu linguae Latinae in liturgia Romana et de missa quae tridentina appellari solet," in *Notitiae*, 18 December 1981, 589-617.
- "Jarring History of the Liturgy Wars (Editorial)," in *National Catholic Reporter*, vol. 42, no. 33 (2006), 24.
- JEDIN, H., "Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Römischen Messbuches," in *Liturgisches Leben*, VI (1939), 30-66.
- JENNY, H., "Chapter V: The Liturgical Year II; The Proper of Time," in BUGNINI, A. and C. BRAGA (eds.), *The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy*, trans. V. MALLON, New York, NY, Benziger, 1965, 232-240.
- JOHN THE DEACON, "Epistula ad Senarium, 12" in J.P. MIGNE, *Patrologia cursus completes: Series Latina*, 217 vols., Paris, Garnier and J.P. MIGNE, 1844-1864, vol. 59, 399-408.
- JOHNSON, C., "From Organic Growth to Liturgico-Plasticity: Reconceptualizing the Process of Liturgical Reform," in *Theological Studies*, 76 (2015), 87-111.
- JOHNSON, M.E., "The Loss of a Common Language: The End of Ecumenical-Liturgical Convergence, The Kavanagh Lecture Delivered October 10, 2006," in *Studia Liturgica*, 37 (1 March 2007), 55-72.

- JOHNSTON, W.H., "Pope Benedict XVI on the Postconciliar Liturgical Reform: An Essay in Interpretation," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 17 (2013), 118-138.
- JOUNEL, P., "From the Council of Trent to Vatican II," in A.-G. MARTIMORT, et al., *The Church at Prayer, Volume I: Principles of the Liturgy, New Edition*, trans. M.J. O'CONNELL, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1987, 63-84.
- _____, "Implementing the Liturgy Constitution," in *Doctrine and Life*, 15 (1965), 88-103.
- _____, "Le jeûne pascal," in *La Maison-Dieu*, 45 (1956), 87-92.
- _____, "L'organisation de l'année liturgique," in *La Maison Dieu*, 100 (1969), 139-156.
- _____, "Principles of Liturgical Reform," in *Doctrine and Life*, 15 (1965), 138-155.
- _____, "The Veneration of the Saints," in BUGNINI, A. and C. BRAGA (eds.), *The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy*, trans. V. MALLON, New York, NY, Benziger, 1965, 240-242.
- JOYNES, C., "The Sound of Silence," in *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 65 (2011), 18-29.
- KASPER, W., "Striving for Mutual Respect in Modes of Prayer," in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly English ed., 41 (16 April 2008), 8-9.
- KELLER, P.J., "How Catholic is the Sacred Liturgy? or: A Mass for the Masses," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 17 (2013), 212-224.
- KELLY, T., "Art and Architecture of Faith," in *The Australasian Catholic Record*, 86 (October 2009), 416-425.
- KERLIN, M., "Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange: Defending the Faith from *Pascendi dominici gregis* to *Humani Generis*," in *U.S. Catholic Historian*, vol. 25, no. 1 (Winter, 2007), 97-113.
- KICZEK, S., "Pope Benedict XVI's *Summorum Pontificum*: Reconciling Conflicting Values," in *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, 8 (2009), 37-64.
- KINGSLAND, J., "The Rite Decision," in *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, 109 (2008), 54-61.
- KIRBY, M.D., "Toward a Definition of Liturgical Chant," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 136, no. 2 (2009), 5-39.
- KLOCKNER, M., "Wie Liturgie verstehen? Anfragen an das *motu proprio* 'Summorum Pontificum' Papst Benedikts XVI," in *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 50 (2008), 268-305.
- KOCH, K., "Zwei formen des einen Römischen Messritus," in *Schweizerische Kirchenzeitung*, 175 (2007), 481-485.
- KOCIK, T.M., "Mutual Enrichment between the Two Forms of the Roman Rite," in A. REID (ed.), *Liturgy in the Twenty-first Century: Contemporary Issues and Perspectives*, London/ New York, NY, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016, 19-50.

- KOČIK, T.M., "The Reform of the Reform," in A. REID, *Liturgy in the Twenty First Century*, 19-50.
- _____, "The 'Reform of the Reform' in Broad Context, Re-engaging the Living Tradition," in *Antiphon, A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 12 (2008), 26-44 and in *Usus Antiquior*, 3 (July 2012), 102-114.
- KOMANCHAK, J.A., "Interpreting the Council, Catholic Attitudes toward Vatican II," in M.J. WEAVER and R.S. APPLEBY (eds.), *Being Right: Conservative Catholics in America*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press, 1995, 17-36.
- KOWAL, W., "Custom as an Expression of the Canonical Creativity of a Community of the Faithful," in *CLSAP*, 81 (2019), 217-233
- KRASNICKI, T., "The Propers for the Feast of All Saints: A Commentary," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 137, no. 1 (Spring, 2010), 47-54.
- LAFFERTY, M., "Translating Faith from Greek to Latin: Romanitas and Christianitas in Late Fourth-Century Rome and Milan," in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 11 (2003), 21-62.
- LANE, T., "The Jewish Temple is Transfigured in Christ, and the Temple Liturgies are Transfigured in the Sacraments," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 19 (2015), 14-28.
- LANG, U.M., "Augustine's Conception of Sacrifice in City of God Book X and the Eucharistic Sacrifice," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 19 (2015), 29-51.
- _____, "From the Editor," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 17 (2013), 2.
- LECLERQ, H., "Septuagésime" in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie Chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 15.1 (1950), cols. 1262-1266.
- LENTI, V., "Liturgical Reform and the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Rites," in *Worship*, 68 (1994), 417-426.
- LEO THE GREAT, "Tractatus 40, *De ieiunio Quadragesimae* 2," in *Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina*, 226 vols., Turnhout, 1953-2020.
- LILLES, A., "Vigilant for the Bridegroom in the Night of Faith: Beyond Conscious Participation in the Liturgy," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 16 (2012), 100-113.
- "Liturgy Reform: No Going Back (Editorial)," in *National Catholic Reporter*, vol. 44 (28 December 2007), 24.
- LOVRIEN, M. "Before All Else, Full, Conscious and Active Participation," in *Pastoral Music*, vol. 32, no. 2 (2007), 22-26.
- LOEW, J., "The New Instruction," in *Worship*, 33 (1958-59), 2-13.
- LÓPEZ-MARTÍN, J., "El origen del domingo: Estado actual de la cuestión," in *Salmanticensis*, 38, 3º (1991), 285-293.

- LÜDECKE, N., "Kanonistische Anmerkungen zum *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*," in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, 58 (2008), 3-34, English translation, "Canonical Remarks on the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*, in *Antiphon, A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 13 (2009), 193-227.
- ŁAWRESZUK, M., "Christian Church Services in the Fourth Century on the Basis of the 'Apostolic Constitutions,'" in *Elpis*, 14 (2014), 133-153.
- _____, "Ars celebrandi," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 139, no. 4 (2012), 3-6.
- MAHRT, W., "*Summorum Pontificum*, (Editorial)" in *Sacred Music*, vol. 134, no. 3 (2007), 3-5.
- MAMIE, P., "Letter to Mgr. Lefebvre Communicating His Decision to Suppress the SSPX," in *La Documentation Catholique*, 72 (1975), 615, col. 1, English translation in Davies, *Apologia, Part I*, 51 and 52.
- MANNION, M.F., "The Catholicity of the Liturgy: Shaping a New Agenda," in S. CALDECOTT (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic, Renewing the Liturgical Movement*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1998, 11-48.
- MARINI, G., Address at the Year for Priests Clergy Conference in Rome, 6 January 2010, in *Origins*, 39 (2009-2010), 521-526.
- MARR, R.-J., "René Girard and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: Reassessing the 20th Century Liturgical Reform," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 20 (2016), 191-212.
- MARSILI, S., "I segni del mistero di Cristo: Teologia liturgica dei sacramenti," in *Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae: Subsidia* 42, Rome, Edizioni Liturgiche, 1987, 377.
- MARTIMORT, A.G., "Adaptation liturgique," in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 79 (1965), 3-16.
- _____, "La réforme des rubriques," in *La Maison-Dieu*, 42 (1955), 5-28.
- MARX, N., "The Revision of the Prefaces in the Missal of Paul VI," in M. JOHNSON (ed.), *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West*, Collegeville, MN, Liturgical Press, 349-382.
- MATTHIESEN, M.M., "The Justice of Christ Become Fruitful: Aquinas and Guardini on the *Iustitia* of Worship," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 20 (2016), 96-122.
- MAZZA, E., "I messali di Paolo VI e Giovanni XXIII, Un confronto," in *La Rivista del clero Italiano*, 88 (2008), 680-703.
- MCBRIEN, R.P., "Assessing the Liturgical Reform of Vatican II: According to Fr. Taft, Liturgical Pioneers Drew Inspiration from Russian Orthodox Emigres to France," in *National Catholic Reporter*, vol. 44, no. 22 (2008), 25.
- MCDONALD, A., "The Mass: Attention to Detail," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 137, no. 1, (2010), 65-67.
- MCGINTY, G., "The Reform of the Church Calendar," in *Doctrine and Life*, 19 (1969), 594-601.

- McMANUS, F.R., "Additional Revisions in the New Rite of Mass," in *Worship*, 39 (1965), 226-237.
- _____, "The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: Commentary, Part One," in *Worship*, 38 (1964), 314-374.
- _____, "The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy: Commentary, Part Two," in *Worship*, 38 (1964), 450-496.
- _____, "From the *Rubricae generales* and *Ritus servandus* of 1570 to the *Institutio generalis* of 1969," in K. Hughes (ed.), *Finding Voice to Give God Praise*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1998, 214-221.
- _____, "The Implementation and Goals of Liturgical Reform," in *Worship*, 39 (1965), 480-487.
- _____, "The Juridical Power of the Bishop in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," in *Concilium*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1965), 18-26.
- _____, "The Law, the Liturgy and Participation," in *The Jurist*, 20 (1960), 42-54.
- _____, "Liturgical Law," in A. CHUPUNGO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997, 399-420.
- _____, "The New Pontifical," in *Worship*, 36 (1962), 272-280.
- _____, "The New Rite of Mass, Part I," in *Worship*, 39 (1965), 67-88.
- _____, "The New Rite of Mass, Part II," in *Worship*, 39 (1965), 139-165.
- _____, "The Restored Liturgical Catechumenate," in *Worship*, 36 (1962), 536-549.
- MEDINA ESTEVEZ, J.A., "Commentary on the Instruction *Redemptionis Sacramentum*: Participating in the Sacred Liturgy," in F. ARINZE, *Cardinal Reflections: Active Participation and the Liturgy*, Chicago/Mundelein, IL, Hillenbrand Books, 2005, 27-43.
- MESZAROS, A., "The Mystery of the Ascension and the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar," in *Antiphon, A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 19 (2015), 243-264.
- METZGER, M., "The History of the Eucharistic Liturgy in Rome," in A. CHUPUNGO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume III: The Eucharist*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1999, 103-131.
- MIESZCZAK, S., "Post-conciliar Changes in Liturgy," in *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny*, 66 (2013), 331-349.
- MITCHELL, N., "The Amen Corner: Remembering the Jewish People in Christian Prayer," in *Worship*, 82 (2008), 357-371.
- _____, "The Amen Corner: *Summorum Pontificum*," in *Worship*, 81 (2007), 548-565.
- MOHRMANN, C., "Epiphania," in *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, 4 vols, 2nd ed., Rome, Edizione di Storia e Letteratura, 1961, vol. 1, 255-267.

- MOLE, J., "Cardinal Ratzinger: Pastoral Concerns with the Liturgy," in *Catholic Insight*, vol. 12, no. 4 (2004), 34.
- MONACO, J.A., "Shattering the Idols: Postmodernism and the Liturgical Self as *Homo Adorans*," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 22 (2018), 38-58.
- MOON, R., "Do You Follow the Liturgical Calendar? Why or Why Not? (Under Discussion: Topics in the Current Debate)," in *Christianity Today*, vol. 55, no. 11 (2011), 16.
- MOORE, G., "Receiving the Revised Translation of the Roman Missal," in *The Australasian Catholic Record*, 88 (July 2011) 325-336.
- MORRILL, B.T. and S.K. ROLL, "The Duties and Ministries in the Mass" in E. FOLEY, N.D. MITCHELL and J.M. PIERCE (eds.), *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2007, 199-223.
- MORRISEY, F.G., "The Renewal of Sacramental Canon Law after the Second Vatican Council," in *Église et Théologie*, 5 (1974), 347-373.
- _____, "Ten Years of Liturgical Legislation (1963-1973)," in *Studia Canonica*, 2 (1973) 289-308.
- MOSNA, C.S., "Storia della domenica dalle origini fino agli inizi del V secolo: Problema delle origini e sviluppo, culto e riposo, aspetti pastorali e liturgici," in *Analecta gregoriana*, 170, Rome, Gregorian University, 1969, 42-60.
- MURRAY, P., "The Canon of the Mass," in *The Furrow*, 6 (October 1955), 633-646.
- MUSCHALEK, G., "Die Rehabilitierung der Alten Messe durch Benedikt XVI," in *Forum Katholische Theologie*, 23 (2007), 300-316.
- MUSCHALEK, G., "Was die Alte Messe bringt," in *Theologisches*, 37 (2007), 322-330.
- NEUHAUS, R.J., "While We're at It," in *First Things*, 168 (December 2006), 61.
- NICKEL, E., "Rogation Days, Ember Days and the New Evangelization," in *Antiphon, A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 16 (2012), 21-36.
- NOCENT, A., "The Roman Lectionary for Mass," in A. CHUPUNGCO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume III: The Eucharist*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1999, 177-188.
- _____, "Il Tempo della Manifestazione," in M. AUGÉ, et al. (eds.), *Anamnesis, VI: L'anno liturgico*, Genoa, Marietti, 1988, no. 6, 187.
- NOE, V., "PREFACE," IN WARD, A. and C. JOHNSON, "Sources of the Roman Missal," in *Notitiae*, 23 (1987), 413-937.
- O'COLLINS, G., "Vatican II on the Liturgical Presence of Christ," in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 77 (2012), 3-17.
- O'CONNELL, J.B., "The General Instruction of the Roman Missal," in *The Clergy Review*, 54 (1969), 817-821; 884-894.
- O'DONNELL, P., "Place as the Locus of Memory: Conserving the Cultural Patrimony of the Church," in *The Australasian Catholic Record*, 86 (October 2009) 426-439.

- O'DONOGHUE, N.X., "The Farnés and Ratzinger Dialogue on *The Spirit of the Liturgy*," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 20 (2016), 75-95.
- _____, "The Shape of the History of the Eucharist," in *New Blackfriars*, 93 (2012), 71-83.
- OFFERMANN, B., "Die heutige liturgischen Sonderprüfationen," in *Theologie und Glaube*, 46 (1956), 204-215.
- OLVER, M.S.C., "A Note on the Silent Canon in the Missal of Paul VI and Cardinal Ratzinger," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 20 (2016), 40-51.
- O'MALLEY, J.W., "Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?" in *Theological Studies*, 67 (2006), 3-33.
- "On seeing the Emperor Naked (Editorial)," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 127, no. 3 (Fall, 2000), 3.
- "One Bad Translation Begets Another (Editorial)," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 120, no. 4 (1993), 3-4.
- "One Rite; Two Forms: The Liturgical Life of St. John Cantius: Interview with Fr. Dennis Kolinski, S.J.C.," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 134, no. 3 (2007), 16-21.
- PASCHER, J., "Relation between Bishop and Priests According to the Liturgical Constitution," in *Concilium*, vol. 1, no. 2 (1965), 14-17.
- PAVLICK, E.-J., "John Paul II's Statements on Music in the Church: A Fulfillment of the Theology of Vatican II," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 137, no. 1 (2010), 6-24.
- PAWLIKOWSKI, J.T. and J. BANKI, "Praying for the Jews: Two Views on the New Good Friday Prayer," in *Commonweal*, 135 (14 March 2008), 10-12.
- PECKLERS, K., "History of the Roman Liturgy from the Sixteenth Until the Twentieth Century," in A. CHUPUNGO (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume I: Introduction to the Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1997, 153-178.
- PHAM, J.-P., "Latin in the Liturgy Today: Theological, Canonical and Pastoral Reflections," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 125, no. 3 (1998), 10-18.
- PHILIPPART, D., "How Are the Sunday Readings Chosen? Glad You Asked: Q&A on Church Teaching," in *U.S. Catholic*, vol. 70, no. 8 (2005), 45.
- PICKSTOCK, C., "A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages," in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 65 (2014), 111-119.
- PINKUS, L.M., "The Psychosociological Aspect of the Liturgy," in A. CHUPUNGO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume II: Fundamental Liturgy*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1998, 175-187.
- POTERACK, K., "Creativity and the Liturgy," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 137, no. 1 (2010), 81-82.
- _____, "Last Word, Whither '*Summorum Pontificum*'?" in *Sacred Music*, vol. 135, no. 1 (2008), 62-63.
- _____, "New Liturgical Movement" in *Sacred Music*, vol. 125, no. 2 (1998), 4.

- POTERACK, K., "The Vernacular: A Reassessment." in *Sacred Music*, vol. 125, no. 3 (1998), 3-4.
- "Praying *ad orientem versus* (Editorial)," in *Notitiae*, 29 May 1993, 245-249, English translation by J. ZUHLSDORF, in *Sacred Music*, vol. 120, no. 4 (1993), 14-17.
- PRISTAS, L., "Parachuted into Lent: The Suppression of *Septuagesima*," in *Usus Antiquior*, 1 (July 2010), 95-109.
- _____, "Theological Principles that Guided the Redaction of the Roman Missal (1970)," in *The Thomist*, 67 (2003), 157-195.
- _____, "Extraordinary Masses for Ordinary Time," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 134, no. 3 (2007), 24-27.
- RAMIS, G., "The Liturgical Year in the non-Roman West," in A. CHUPUNGO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 211-218.
- RANJITH, M., "Towards an *Ars Celebrandi* in Liturgy," address presented at the Gateway Liturgical Conference in St. Louis, 8 November 2008, in *Adoremus: Online Edition*, vol. XV, no. 1 (March 2009) <https://adoremus.org/2009/03/toward-an-ars-celebrandi-in-liturgy/> (11 January 2022).
- RATZINGER, J., "Announcements and Prefatory Notes of Explanation," in H. VORGRIMLER (gen. ed.), *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, Freiburg, Herder and Herder, 1967-1969, 5 vols., vol. 1, 297-305.
- _____, "Catholicism after the Council," in *The Furrow*, 18 (1967), 3-23.
- _____, "Ten Years of the *motu proprio Ecclesia Dei*" in *Sacred Music*, vol. 125, no. 2 (1998), 4-7.
- _____, "Theological Problems of Church Music," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 135, no. 1, (2008), 5-14.
- RAVASI, G., "*Oremus et pro Iudaeis* of the Good Friday Liturgy," in *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly English ed., 41 (12 March 2008), 4-5.
- READ, G., "Comment on '*Ecclesia Dei*,'" in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 77 (1989), 21-26.
- _____, "Comment on Replies of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments," in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 126 (2001), 51-53.
- _____, "The Diocesan Bishop as Chief Liturgist: Milwaukee Cathedral," in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 128 (2001), 63-70.
- _____, "The *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*," in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 151 (2007), 9-21.
- _____, "The Roman Missal: The New General Instruction," in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 126 (2001), 44-46.
- _____, "*Summorum Pontificum*: Some Questions and Issues," in *CLSGBI Newsletter*, 152 (2008), 32-36.

- REHRAUER, A., "Current Issues in Liturgical and Sacramental Law," in *Canon Law Society of America Proceedings*, 2 (2000), 245-262.
- REID, A., "The Fathers of Vatican II and the Revised Mass: Results of a Survey," in *Antiphon, A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 10 (2006), 170-190.
- _____, "From Rubrics to *Ars Celebrandi*: Liturgical Law in the 21st Century," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 17 (2013), 139-167.
- _____, "The New Liturgical Movement after the Pontificate of Benedict XVI," Address to the Church Music Association of America Annual Conference, St. Paul, Minnesota, 15 October 2013, http://www.academia.edu/4789468/The_New_Liturgical_Movement_after_the_Pontificate_of_Benedict_XVI (11 January 2022).
- _____, "The Reformed Liturgy: A 'Cadaver Decomposed?'" Louis Bouyer and Liturgical *Ressourcement*," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 16 (2012), 37-51.
- RENZ, C.J., "Liturgical Piety: Awe and Beauty in a New Liturgical Movement," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 19 (2015), 284-309.
- RICHSTATTER, T., "Changing Styles of Liturgical Law," in *The Jurist*, 38 (1978), 415-425.
- ROCCASALVO, J.L., "Quality, Form, Function and Beauty in the Liturgy," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 138, no. 3 (2011), 6-16.
- Roll, S., "Botte Revisited: A Turning Point in the Research of the Origins of Christmas and Epiphany," in *Questions liturgique*, 74, no. 3-4 (1993), 153-170.
- RORDORF, W., "Origine et signification de la célébration du dimanche dans le christianisme primitif: État actuel de la recherche," in *La Maison-Dieu*, 148, (1981), 103-122.
- ROTELLE, J.E., "Liturgy and Authority," in *Worship*, 47 (1973), 514-526.
- ROTHER, W.F., "Wie groß ist eine Gruppe? Eine kirchenrechtliche Anmerkung zu 'Summorum Pontificum' und dessen praktischer Umsetzung," in *Una Voce Korrespondenz*, 37 (2007), 365-373.
- ROUILLARD, P., "The Cult of the Saints in the East and the West," in A. CHUPUNCO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 299-316.
- ROUTHIER, G., "Vatican II: Relevance and Future," in *Theological Studies*, 74 (2013), 537-554.
- RUBENSTEIN, J., "Liturgy against History: The Competing Visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury," in *Speculum, A Journal of Medieval Studies*, 74 (April 1999), 279-309.
- SANCHEZ-GIL, A.S., "Gli innovativi profili Canonici del *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* sull'uso della Liturgia Romana anteriore alla riforma del 1970," in *Ius Ecclesiae*, 19 (2007), 689-708.
- SANTOGROSSI, A., "Presumption of Law, Fiction of Law and Ecumenism," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 18, (2014), 144-164.

- SCHMITZ, R.M., "Round Table: The Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest and the Recent Developments Concerning the *motu proprio, Summorum Pontificum*," in *Usus Antiquior*, 3 (July 2012), 144-146.
- SCHRADER, D., "The Revision of the Feast of Christ the King," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 18 (2014), 227-253.
- SCHULER, R.J., "Archbishop Annibale Bugnini," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 117, no. 3 (1990), 3-4.
- _____, "Cardinal Ratzinger and the Liturgy," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 124, no. 1 (1997), 4.
- SEASOLTZ, R.K., "Liturgy and Ecclesiastical Law," in E. Foley, N.D. Mitchell and J.M. Pierce (eds.), *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2007, 28-45.
- SENN, F.C., "The Bible and the Liturgy," in *Liturgy*, vol. 19, no. 3 (2004), 5-12.
- _____, "Review of Liturgical Work in North America since 2006," in *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie*, 51 (2012), 99-115.
- _____, "Review of Liturgical Work in North America 2012-2014," in *Jahrbuch Für Liturgik Und Hymnologie*, 54 (2015), 54-66.
- _____, "Worship Wars," in *Liturgy*, vol. 19, no. 4 (2004), 1-4.
- SHENK, J., "The Jargon of Liturgists: Brainwashing the Faithful," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 120, no. 4 (1993), 11-13.
- SINASAC, J., "Two Cardinals at Odds over Number of Tridentine Masses," in *The Catholic Register*, 6-13 (July 2008), 3.
- SIRICIUS, *Epistle I*, 2 in J.P. MIGNE (ed.), *Patrologia cursus completes: Series Latina*, 217 vols., Paris, Garnier and J.P. MIGNE, 1844-1864, vol. 13, 1134-1135.
- SMITH, C., "Questions and Answers about Latin in the Modern Roman Liturgy," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 135, no. 1 (2008), 37-38.
- SMITH, I., "The Synoptic Gospels and the 1962 *Missale Romanum*," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 21 (2017), 115-144.
- SMITH, K., "The Singing Assembly: How Does Music Affect the Faith Life of a Worshipping Community?" in *The Australasian Catholic Record*, 87 (July 2010), 284-295.
- SMITH, P., "Determining the Integral Reordering of Law: Tools for the Canonist," in *Studia Canonica*, 35 (2001), 97-132.
- _____, "Word and Worship: Interpreting Liturgical Law," in *New Theology Review*, 18 (2005), 87-89, published 4 February 2013.
- SOBANSKI, R., "La parole et le sacrement facteurs de formation du droit ecclésiastique," in *Nouvelle revue théologique*, 95 (1973), 515-526.
- SODI, M., "Il *Missale Romanum* tra l'edizione del 1474 e quella del 1962, La *novitas* nella *traditio*," in *Rivista Liturgica*, 95 (2008), 55-77.

- STEINFELS, P., "Fixing the Liturgy: What We Have Done and What We Have Failed to Do," in *Commonweal*, vol. 130, no. 13 (2003), 14-15.
- _____, "Ideas and Trends, 25 Years Later, Catholics Still Seek the Poetry of the Mass," in *The New York Times*, 10 December 1988.
- STRICKLAND, A., "Liturgy and Law: Liturgical Law in the System of Roman Catholic Canon Law," in *Pastoral Music*, vol. 31, no. 5 (2007), 50, 52, 54.
- SUERTE FELIPE, V.T.J., "The 2002 *GIRM* and the 2007 *Summorum Pontificum*," in *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, 85 (2009), 267-289.
- TAFT, R., "In Dialogue with Fred McManus, Catholic Liturgy and the Christian East at Vatican II: Nostalgia for Orthodoxy," in *The Jurist*, 72 (2012), 466-491.
- _____, "Mass without the Consecration? 'The Most Important Magisterial Teaching since Vatican II,' Interpreting and Applying the Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East" in *Worship*, 77 (2003), 482-509 and *America*, vol. 188, no. 16 (2003), 7-11.
- _____, "Return to Our Roots: Recovering Western Liturgical Traditions," in *America*, vol. 198, no. 18 (2008), 10.
- TEGELS, A., "The Fortunes of the Tridentine Mass," in *Worship*, 60 (1986), 169-171.
- _____, "The Roman Missal of 1970," in *Worship*, 44 (1970), 561-568.
- TENA, P., "El *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*: Análisis y reflexiones," in *Phase*, 47 (2007), 275-288.
- TERTULLIAN, "De baptismo adversus Quintillam" in J.P. MIGNE (ed.), *Quinti septima florentis Tertulliani, opera omnia, tomus prior*, Paris, J.P. Migne, 1866, XIX, 1331.
- THEISEN, R., "The Reform of the Mass Liturgy and the Council of Trent," in *Worship*, 40 (1966), 565-583.
- TRIACCA, A.M., "La strutturazione eucologica dei Prefazi," in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 86 (1972), 233-279.
- TRIBE, S., "Round Table: The New Liturgical Movement," in *Usus Antiquior*, 3 (July 2012), 147-149.
- TUCKER, J., "The Brilliance of László Dobszay," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 138, no. 3 (2011), 56-57.
- _____, "Commentary: The Proper Place of Mass Propers," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 136, no. 2 (2009), 59-61.
- _____, "The Vatican Intervenes: No More Tropes in the *Agnus Dei*," in *Sacred Music*, vol. 139, no. 4 (2012), 62-64.
- _____, "To Whom Does the Liturgy Belong?" in *Sacred Music*, vol. 137, no. 1 (2010), 68-69.
- URDEIX, J., "A propósito del 'Misal Romano' del Beato Juan XXIII (1962)," in *Phase*, 47 (2007), 289-310.

- VAN SLYKE, D.G., "Abstinence from Conjugal Relations before Reception of the Body of Christ," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 20 (2016), 151-172.
- VELKOVSKA, E.V., "The Liturgical Year in the East," in A. CHUPUNGO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume V: Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 2000, 157-176.
- VERE, P., "Continued Usage of the 1958 Liturgical Missal," in A. ESPELAGE (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2001-2005*, Alexandria, VA, Canon Law Society of America, 2006, 23-24.
- _____, "Dispensation to Use the 1965 Roman Missal," in A. ESPELAGE (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2001-2005*, Alexandria, VA, Canon Law Society of America, 2006, 35-37.
- _____, "Liturgical Adaptations to the 1962 Roman Missal," in A. ESPELAGE (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 2001-2005*, Alexandria, VA, Canon Law Society of America, 2006, 29-33.
- VISMANS, T., "Liturgy or Rubrics? Some Reactions to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," in *Concilium*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1966), 45-49.
- VYNER, O., "Recontextualization or Revitalization? A Sacramental Approach to Postmodernity and Pluralism," in *Antiphon: A Journal for Liturgical Renewal*, 22 (2018), 16-37.
- WALDSTEIN, W., "Zum *motuproprio Summorum Pontificum*," in *Una Voce Korrespondenz*, 38 (2008), 201-214.
- WARD, A., "The Centenary of St. Pius X's *Sapienti consilio* and of His Founding the Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments," in *Notitiae*, 45 (2008), 205-216.
- _____, "Liturgy and Law," in *Canon Law Society of America Proceedings*, vol. 44 (1982), 184- 197.
- _____, and C. JOHNSON, "Sources of the Roman Missal," in *Notitiae*, 23 (1987), 413-937.
- WCELA, E., "A Dinosaur Ponders the Latin Mass," in *America*, vol. 197, no. 10 (8 October 2007), 17-20.
- WEAKLAND, R.G., "Liturgical Renewal: Two Latin Rites?" in *America*, vol. 176, no. 20 (7 June 1997), 12-15.
- WIENER, C., "Presentation du nouvelle lectionnaire," in *La Maison Dieu*, 99 (1969), 29-49.
- WITCZAK, M., "The Sacramentary of Paul VI," in A. CHUPUNGO, (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Volume III: The Eucharist*, Collegeville, MN, The Liturgical Press, 1999, 133-175.
- WOESTMAN, W., "*Ecclesia Dei* and Ecclesial Communion," in *The Jurist*, 53 (1993), 199-209.
- _____, "*Ecclesia Dei* and Ecclesial Communion' Revisited," in *The Jurist*, 55 (1995), 897-903.

- WOESTMAN, W., "Presuming Permission for Use of Pre-Vatican II Rites: Another Opinion," in A. ESPELAGE (ed.), *Roman Replies and CLSA Advisory Opinions 1994-2000*, Washington, DC, Canon Law Society of America, 233-235.
- _____, "Summorum Pontificum and Ecclesial Unity," in V. D'SOUZA (ed.), *In the Service of Truth and Justice, Festschrift in Honour of Prof. Augustine Mendonça, Professor Emeritus*, Bangalore, Centre of Canon Law Studies, St. Peter's Pontifical Institute, 2008, 449-465.
- WOLFE, K. J. "Latin Mass Appeal (Editorial)," in *The New York Times*, 28 November 2009.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Fr. John Lessard was born in 1967 in the village of Three Rivers, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, United States. He graduated with a Bachelor of Arts *Magna cum laude* in 1988, in English, Theology and Philosophy from St. Mary's College at Saints Cyril and Methodius Seminary, Orchard Lake, Michigan. After supplementing his education and life experience in Kraków, Poland, and in the United States Army, he earned a Master of Divinity in 1992 from St. John Seminary, Brighton. That same year, he was ordained for the Diocese of Springfield, where he served as Parochial Vicar and Pastor in local parishes for more than two decades. He was awarded the Master in Canon Law and Licentiate in Canon Law in 2018 from the University of Ottawa and Saint Paul University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, respectively, after which he commenced doctoral studies. He presently serves as Adjutant Judicial Vicar, Judge, Promoter of Justice, Delegate for the Extraordinary Form and Chancellor of the Diocese of Springfield.