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ABSTRACT

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMAN MISSAL: FOSTERING THE GROWTH OF THE
ORDINARY AND EXTRAORDINARY FORMS OF THE ROMAN RITE

Name: Long, Alexander Dennis
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. William H. Johnston

This study seeks to examine the development of the Roman missal in order to contribute
to the discussion of the methods and potential changes for the Holy Mass. The task for us in this
work involves analyzing several key areas in order to understand the foundations for liturgical
growth and demonstrate how these foundation can be applied in order to facilitate the growth of
the Roman missal. Our first goal is to examine the historical account of how the Roman missal
has developed, which is seen through what is called “organic development.” This often involves
growth from the ground up; a gradual process that usually begins on the local level. Through the
passage of time, some liturgical features mature and graft themselves onto the liturgy in a more
permanent fashion, which may then be adopted Church-wide beyond the more local boundaries
where it grew. Often, these developments have as their motivation some type of pastoral response
involving the current situation in the Church. Therefore, this study will also examine the
Liturgical Movement of the 20th century leading into the reforms of the Second Vatican Council.
This pastoral maneuver establishes the precedent to move the Roman missal out of its nearly 400
year stagnation since the Tridentine reforms and respond to the need to generate the “active
participation” of the laity. The movement quickly developed into a Church-wide entity calling for not only education and intelligent involvement with the Roman missal, but also a call to enact reforms and revisions to the Holy Mass in order to better facilitate this “active participation.”

The concept of “active participation” and the laity was the banner of the 20th century liturgical changes and is still one of the major focuses today. Our study will also analyze and attempt to derive from the concept of “active participation” several subcategories. This is in an effort to identify other forms of active participation, which reveals the interior, individual, and unitive aspects that see “active participation” as not merely belonging to the category of external physical activity. This is an important feature to fully understand, as the 20th century reforms were based largely upon active participation and any future reforms and restorations should revolve around a better understanding of the major pastoral foundation of the liturgical renewal.

Having established the foundations for our work, the organic development of the liturgy and the pastoral desires of the Church with regards to active participation, we will then examine the necessity to continue the development and reform of the Roman missal. This is explained by firstly investigating the Extraordinary Form, or what is essentially the Roman missal of 1962 which Pope Benedict XVI authorized for a wider use in the Church. Here, we will argue that it should continue its development, moving out of the year 1962, and follow Benedict XVI’s vision of its enrichment derived from the “Ordinary Form” or the reformed Roman missal of Paul VI. Conversely, pastoral issues surrounding the Ordinary Form will be examined in order to justify the reform and enrichment it can derive from the Extraordinary Form. The potential future development of each form of the Roman missal will be followed by various examples of how this process may begin and what fruits it may bear in the near future. The proposals given here will take into account the organic development of the liturgy, the pastoral desire of the Church with emphasis on the active participation of the lay faithful, the edification of the Body of Christ, and the glorification of God.
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INTRODUCTION

The Organic Growth of the Roman Missal

In this paper, we will explore the possible future development of the Roman missal with the hope that each topic we examine will help the current liturgical renewal and assist the foundation of proper development in light of the Church’s pastoral goals. Before proposing any future revisions to the Roman missal, several subjects must be analyzed and clarified in order to help fortify the basis for liturgical reform. In the nearly 2,000 years of the Church, the Mass has gradually developed and adapted itself to the cultures and time periods in which it subsisted. Hence, there are several rites and forms of the Mass in the Church that contain longstanding prayers and ritual. These rituals may be termed the “objective liturgical tradition” because their form, the content of the prayers, and the external action of the ritual have developed throughout the centuries and contain not only surface value, but also deep symbolism and a connection to the past.

The development of the Mass, therefore, renders much of the content in the objective liturgical tradition as a valuable treasure. Thus, the first issue that we will explore is the development of the Roman missal through the concept of “organic development.” It is important to consider how the Mass developed historically to elucidate the meaning of this concept, which is sometimes ambiguously used. The first chapter in this work will examine the historical accounts of the development of the Roman missal and seek to understand how much of its growth belongs to the category of organic development. Our analysis will demonstrate that the process of organic development can be described with a generalized set of principles. In other words, the
Roman missal does not necessarily have one means of growth and change, but rather several principles which, if executed properly, fall under the umbrella of “organic development.”

In this chapter, we will see that the principles of organic development include the emergence of new forms, termed “innovations.” It also includes the revival of older forms that have been lost due to the accidents of history, termed “restorations.” The principle of “simplification” involves a streamlining and pruning of the liturgy from accretions. The final principle, termed “eliminations,” is the wholesale removal of certain liturgical features due to several factors, including abuse and historical circumstances. In addition to defining these principles, our study will also demonstrate that the entire organism of the liturgy is often developed and reformed in response to a pastoral need. Historically, these pastoral needs frequently occur on the local level, which pertains to certain countries or regions. Through gradual growth, certain features may see a widespread usage and eventually can become codified for Church-wide use.

Following this analysis, we will examine certain false principles of liturgical development. In contrast to the gradual change associated with organic development, these false principles can sometimes result in changes that are abrupt and implemented from the top-down in an inorganic fashion. The first of these false principles is labeled “antiquarianism.” Antiquarianism is a revival of a liturgical feature in the past under two pretenses. The first pretense is a resurrection for the sake of the past; valuing the past for its own sake and thus seeking to revive features from the antiquity of the Church. The second pretense, which occurs in conjunction with the first or may stand alone, is the revival of a liturgical feature from the past that neglects legitimate organic development. Here, the liturgical feature is resurrected in opposition to other liturgical features that have superseded it. The next major misapplication of liturgical development is termed “fabrications.” This form of liturgical development does not take into consideration the slow and gradual development from preexisting liturgical forms that is a major component of true organic development. Rather, a fabrication is a complete construction
from nothing, or almost nothing, that is added to the liturgy. The last false principle is termed “splicing,” which is when parts of other liturgical rites are taken and spliced together. Once again, splicing disregards the objective liturgical tradition by assuming an inventor’s role, stringing together various features from different rites in a hasty, artificial manner and implementing changes in a top-down fashion without respect to organic growth. Overall, the first chapter attempts to demonstrate the normal principles of the development of the Roman missal through the historical data. These principles will be considered in the fourth chapter on the future development of the Roman missal.

**The Liturgical Movement**

The second major foundation for the future development of the Roman missal, the pastoral initiative of the Liturgical Movement in the 20th century, is the focus of the second chapter. The Liturgical Movement emphasized the concept of “active participation,” which was first promoted as the engagement of the laity with sacred music by Pope St. Pius X in 1903. Liturgists and pastors adopted the concept of active participation and developed it throughout the decades of the 20th century to include the people’s full engagement with the liturgical action, not only through sacred music but also by participating with the priest, following and responding to him as he leads the congregation.

The Movement further developed beyond simply promoting increased lay participation and to considering ritual reform of the Roman missal necessary to promote the active participation of the people. In this chapter, we will examine various proposals from several individuals and congresses in the Liturgical Movement that discussed altering the Roman missal, the development of which had been at a near standstill for 400 years. The efforts of the Liturgical Movement are embodied, in some small degree, in the Extraordinary Form of the Roman rite, or the 1962 missal. This is due to the missal reforms efforts under Popes Pius XII and John XXIII. The Liturgical Movement’s efforts are also seen in the post-conciliar reforms, as exemplified in the Ordinary Form, or the missal of Paul VI of 1970. The current will of the Church is to continue
implementing the reforms of the Second Vatican Council, which carry with it the pastoral goals of the Liturgical Movement: the active participation of the lay faithful. The second chapter, therefore, also serves a foundational role for our proposals in reforming the Roman missal. By understanding the pastoral goals of the Liturgical Movement, we can better comprehend how the liturgy should further develop to fulfill the desires of the Council in accordance with the general principles of organic development.

**Active Participation**

The entire liturgical efforts of the 20th century rested upon the concept of “active participation,” which is still the desired goal for the current liturgical renewal in the life of the Church. Thus, in the third chapter, we will examine this concept in more detail in order to identify its specific features or subcategories. First, we will examine the present pastoral issues that the Church faces in light of the current state of participation in the liturgy. Clergymen have identified that there is still a deficiency of full intelligent and active participation. However, several of them have also raised concerns about the development of an overly external participation that does not maintain its proper balance with the primary means of participation: interior participation. Once the pastoral precedent for our examination of this concept is established, we will seek to define “active participation” in a more detailed manner by identifying three subcategories; silent, relational, and physical.

The goal of our analysis in this third chapter is to further clarify what “active participation” entails in order to gain a proper understanding of balance between interior and exterior participation. Participation that maintains a proper balance between the two involves a mixture of the different styles of engagement indicated above; silent, relational, and physical. Participation, therefore, should not be a wholly private affair, where the indvivial is silent and detached from the liturgical action. At the same time, participation should not be seen as exclusively external, where the community must constantly be doing something physical and audible. Any future development of the Roman missal should consider a proper understanding of
active participation, a prudent pastoral observation of the needs of the people, in tandem with respecting the objective liturgical tradition as new forms may emerge through the principles of organic development.

**Development of the Roman Missal**

Having established a foundation from which future development can occur in our previous three chapters, the fourth chapter will begin by examining the reasons that the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite should continue to undergo development with emphasis on how they can mutually enrich each other. Based on what we elucidated in our earlier chapters, these developments should have as their aim the active participation of the people and at the same time respect the organic development of the liturgy to safeguard the objective liturgical tradition. The first step in the process of development by means of mutual enrichment is the organic influence each form of the Mass can have on the other by their usage at the parish level. For this to happen, the Extraordinary Form of the Roman rite must continue its slow growth in the life of the Church. If this can be accomplished, then elements from each missal can mutually enrich the other without the need to change the existing liturgical law. This enrichment could include an alignment of the prayers in the Extraordinary Form, having the priest and people reciting certain prayers together instead of separately. It could also include opting for the established traditional features in the Ordinary Form, including an increase in the use of Latin or *ad orientem* worship.

The Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite, after some time has passed, may begin a processes of formal missal development. This development should reflect the general principles of organic development in some way; it should be gradual, organically developed from the ground up, implemented first on the local level in light of the pastoral situation, and aim to encourage the active participation of the people. The final section of the fourth chapter will highlight possible developments that respect these principles and are founded on the mutual enrichment of both Forms of the Roman rite. Some possibilities we will discuss include the
restoration of liturgical features in the Ordinary Form that are found in the Extraordinary Form, such as the “last Gospel.” Conversely, the Extraordinary Form could adopt features from the Ordinary Form, such as “prayers of the faithful” or a form of the Offertory ritual that includes the people’s participation.

The first and second chapters will demonstrate that none of the changes proposed should be implemented in a hasty manner without an organic precedent and often with a pastoral outlook. The third chapter’s analysis may help generate a clearer view of proper participation and assist in understanding some of the proposals in the fourth chapter. None of these proposals are absolute due to the sometimes unpredictable and often gradual way the liturgy grows; adaptations should respond to the changing pastoral circumstances and be guided by competent authorities. Some of the proposed developments may never manifest and new features or “innovations” may eventually arise in time regardless of the present outlook of pastors and liturgists.

In summary, the hope of this work is to concentrate on certain aspects of the liturgy in order to assist in the future development of the Roman missal. This includes studying the historical examples of how the Roman missal has developed and the pastoral foundation and initiatives of the 20th century Liturgical Movement, expanding the definition of “active participation,” and finally, in light of all this, offering proposals for future organic development which take into account the mutual enrichment between both forms of the Roman rite.
CHAPTER I
ORGANIC DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

Before exploring the topic of further development within the Roman rite, it is necessary to establish what proper liturgical development entails. Authentic development is the most vital foundation for change in the living organism of the liturgy and this is seen through the principle of “organic development.” It is crucial to explore organic cultivation of liturgical change throughout history, as this cultivation should serve as the model for any potential future change.

The Second Vatican Council describes liturgical growth as “organic” and identifies three areas of study before undertaking liturgical reform; “theological, historical, and pastoral.”¹ Therefore, this chapter will present a detailed study of the concept of “organic development,” demonstrating the general principles throughout the history of the Church in light of pastoral necessities as well as exposing serious misconceptions that derail proper liturgical growth.

We will categorize organic development into four general principles; innovations, restorations, simplifications, and eliminations. These serve as general guidelines to organic growth as we will examine within the historical account. The Roman missal has also undergone various forms of development that have obscured the objective liturgical tradition or have generated difficulties with regards to participation of the Church. These features can include overgrowth or accretions, “antiquarianism,” fabrications, and the splicing together of various

rites. The culmination of this chapter will be the recognition that organic development takes on many different features and the Roman missal’s growth throughout the centuries is not always a perfect development. The hope of this chapter is to distinguish between authentic liturgical development in its various forms and inauthentic, harmful liturgical change. This foundation may assist in the future development of the Roman missal that will be explored in the fourth chapter.

**Organic Development: An Overview**

In his work *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, Cardinal Ratzinger describes organic growth as being analogous to a plant which “grows and whose laws of growth determine the possibilities of further development.”\(^2\) He explains that such a progression does not equate to a manufacturing process where one can create through spontaneity and that “the life of the liturgy does not come from what dawns upon the minds of individuals and planning groups.”\(^3\) If one examines Ratzinger’s thought, he appears to rely heavily on these “laws of growth.” The liturgy operates under its own venerable tradition, one that grows in a manner that a plant grows and should be respected as such, yet at the same time the authority of the Church has a role in cultivating and pruning this growth. This “organic” growth is contrary to hastily grafting things onto the liturgy or imprudently hacking away at it, both of which do violence to its natural growth and subsequently to the objective liturgical tradition as a whole.

The principle issue, therefore, is how should the development of the liturgy take place in light of organic growth? Dom Alcuin Reid describes the process of liturgical development as involving “pastoral prudence” and as being “gradual,” developing slowly overtime.\(^4\) The most obvious guide for such development in our present circumstance is seen under the direction of the hierarchy and particularly the Papacy.\(^5\) The Second Vatican Council’s document on the sacred liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* emphasizes organic development as the principle of liturgical

---


\(^3\) Ibid., 168.


growth and reform: “Finally, there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.”

The theme of organic growth is clearly seen in the Council’s texts, which explicitly teach that such a growth must emerge from already existing liturgical practices and in light of theology and the historical growth of the rite itself. This is a call for what Reid describes as a “profound respect for received liturgical Tradition with an openness to necessary development. Continuity and harmony with Tradition are primary concerns.” Such a continuity with tradition “guards against sudden or spectacular changes that cause scandal,” and is thus prudent, pastoral, and gradual. This pastoral emphasis is also seen in the Council in its use of the phrase, “the good of the Church” and in its overall goal of reforming the liturgy for the full conscious and active participation of the faithful, as opposed to merely changing it according to the tastes of the current pontificate.

The twentieth century liturgist Josef Jungmann describes liturgical change in the history of the Church as a “natural process of organic growth and development.” Jungmann, writing in the 1950s, further clarifies liturgical development as being “imperceptible” throughout the centuries. However, he felt that the natural process needed to be given a “shot in the arm,” an authoritative push in the right direction, in order to spur development in an environment which had seen stagnant growth for nearly four centuries. Jungmann’s view of organic growth was influenced by the twentieth century liturgical movement’s drive for active and intelligent participation in the liturgy. He supported this goal by arguing that there was a pastoral necessity of moving the Roman liturgy out of its stagnant state due to insufficient lay participation stating,

---

6 Ibid., 23.
7 Ibid.
8 Reid, Organic Development, 26.
9 Ibid., 54.
10 Second Vatican Council, Sacrosanctum Concilium, 14.
12 Ibid., 518.
“modern religious man cries out for intelligent participation in the life of the Church and therefore, an understanding of its liturgy.”¹³ In this view, adaptation to present circumstances is a natural reaction, a pastoral maneuver, which Jungmann categories under the umbrella of “organic” albeit in a “stepped-up” fashion.¹⁴ However, Jungmann differentiates between an organic growth that is gradual and imperceptible with growth that is a reaction to a pastoral need, a sped up process involving a more direct intervention. The issue that will be explored further in this chapter is whether or not this “shot in the arm” approach, where liturgists analyze the historical development of the liturgy and then implement changes based on their observations and pastoral needs, is truly “organic” in nature and prudent in its employment.

Limits and Harmful Developments

There are certain limits to understanding the liturgy as an organic entity. The Jesuit liturgist Fr. John Baldovin explains that the liturgy must be seen in the context of tradition and questions whether some features which slowly developed over time, such as the “silent recitation of the Canon of the Mass, infrequency of reception of holy communion, the retention of Latin,” are in fact harmful developments.¹⁵ In other words, some features of development may require elimination because they no longer serve a purpose or they are cumbersome accretions in opposition to the nature of the liturgy. Baldovin further explains that even some aspects of the liturgy that were lost to history may be restored as he likens them to broken limbs being realigned to an organism so that they can be used once again, a sort of organic restoration.¹⁶

Baldovin’s analysis is derived from an examination of the history of the Roman rite. A similar idea is seen in the Second Vatican Council, which express the desire to cultivate liturgical growth through the addition of new forms but also to engage in a “pruning” of the rite.¹⁷ Alcuin Reid also describes simplification of the rite or “pruning” as a feature which has generally been

¹³ Ibid.
¹⁴ Ibid., 519.
¹⁵ John Baldovin, Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 56.
¹⁶ Ibid.
¹⁷ Reid, Organic Development, 177.
done from time to time in order to reduce “dubious accretions.” Likewise, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* called for the total elimination of certain elements in the liturgy and also the restoration of others that had been lost:

“…the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance; elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded; other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the vigor which they had in the days of the holy Fathers, as may seem useful or necessary.”

Thus, even in the process of organic growth certain “organic” accretions can spring up, which can be compared to excessive overgrowth or forms that “appear over-ripe, the growth becomes dry and withered.” The liturgy, therefore, can be subjected to organic growth that is harmful or even sees the unfortunate loss of certain features.

*Organic Development’s Instruments of Growth*

The preceding analysis has demonstrated that there are four valid general features of organic development in the liturgy, all of which are based on gradual growth in relation to the liturgical tradition that has been handed down. The first is the adoption of new forms or “innovations,” the second is a “simplification” of certain items, the third is a total “restoration” of existing liturgical elements that were themselves eliminated through the “accidents of history,” and finally the fourth is the total elimination certain forms. Often, these features substantially overlap. It will be seen that reforms of certain liturgical features take on elements of each of these four categories.

In order to obtain a proper understanding of organic development, the succeeding sections will begin by examining each of these elements in more detail. Next, an examination of misinterpretations and overreach in liturgical reform will also be undertaken in order to differentiate proper development from inorganic alterations. The goal of this analysis is to

---

18 Ibid., 214.  
19 Ibid., 50.  
demonstrate more accurately what organic development actually is and subsequently what it can be mistaken for. This will establish one of the foundations for the rest of this work, in which we will consider the future development of the Roman rite.

The Four Principles of Organic Development

Innovations

As previously mentioned, innovations are what the Second Vatican Council labels as new forms that organically grow from the existing liturgical tradition. Reid concurs with the nineteenth century liturgist Dom Guéranger, who maintains that such innovations should be “rare and only where necessary.”

Although Reid uses the term in a more negative fashion, it should be noted that the word “innovation” does not necessarily equate to “novel,” which has the connotation of totally new and discontinuous. The Latin word in the Council text is “innovationes” which can have a varied meaning depending on the usage. The word in its denotation is defined as making something new, which indicates a broad meaning. There are several places in the Council texts where the same word is used but is instead translated as “renew” or “alteration.” Other sources define the term as “innovation” but list alternatives such as “renewing” and “alterations” as well.

A renewal or alteration from “already existing forms” cannot be viewed as a creation from nothing because its very context demands preexisting forms. Hence, Sacrosanctum Concilium’s acceptance of innovations can be viewed as a call for organic growth in continuity with the past as the situation demands.

If we take the meaning of adding new items to the liturgy in the context of growth from things already existing, then there may be some historical, albeit slow, examples of authority codifying liturgical change to the Roman rite before the 20th century. In this instance we turn to Pope St. Pius V and his liturgical reforms of 1570 succeeding the Council of Trent. Here, Pius

---

21 Reid, Organic Development, 59.
22 In paragraph 66 of Gaudium et Spes, the word “innovationes” is translated as “renewal,” while in Christus Dominus the word is translated as “alternations” in paragraph 24 and subsequently “changes” in paragraph 32.
took an already existing and developed liturgical feature that was practiced in various places,24 which involved the reciting the first 14 verses of the prologue of St. John’s Gospel, and codified it for universal use in the Roman rite at the end of Mass.25 The “last Gospel,” as it is called, is still said in the Extraordinary Form today. It appears to have originated as a private devotion of priests who prayed these verses after Mass quietly to themselves. Gradually it was “absorbed by the liturgical service” and by the 13th century is was prayed at the altar in some locations.26

Pius V’s actions demonstrate that proper authority can intervene and add things to the missal for Church-wide usage insofar as they developed through organic, localized growth, over a long period time, and gradually were absorbed and used in many places before being universally codified in the rubrics. This is an example of the highest authority mandating a liturgical change to particular regions which did not pray the last Gospel after the *ite missa est* and closing blessing. For these places it constitutes an “innovation,” but one that grew organically from the ground up and existed in other locations within the Roman rite.

Another instance of organic growth through innovation is the kind of gradual adoption of forms and prayers between rites. Baldovin explains that the perception of a totally homogenous rite is erroneous in view of the historical data and that there has always been “cross-fertilization” in the liturgy.27 The borrowing that each rite undergoes refutes a simplistic notion that there is a “pristine rite” that is the result of an enclosed organic growth. The method and means to such growth can often be seen throughout history as a response to a pastoral necessity. It is then introduced at the local level, as opposed to Church-wide imposition. Eventually, if it gains wide acceptance through sustained practice, it may see an official Church-wide codification. Some
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examples of cross-fertilization at the local level that eventually became staple features of the Roman rite are seen in the *Kyrie* and *Agnus Dei*, prayers borrowed from the Christian East.\footnote{Ibid.}

Another example of “innovation” is seen through the speculation that Pope St. Leo I may have inserted into the Roman canon the words “*sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam*” after the mention of Melchizedek’s sacrifice. The reason he did this may have something to do with the Manicheans and their refusal to drink wine, which they carried into liturgical functions. Some speculate that putting more emphasis on the sacrifice of Melchizedek, who used bread and wine, was Leo’s pastoral attempt to help combat the situation.\footnote{Ibid., 2:230–31.} His addition to the Roman Canon was a localized feature that eventually spread to other regions in the Christian West as they gradually adopted the Roman missal. These examples may serve as some basis for the total “invention” or “innovation” of prayers and ritual. The entirely new formulas are influenced from the existing material, making more explicit the reality they are supposed to convey, and hence form a direct relationship to the missal. It is important to note once again that such inventions are prudent, are employed for local usage on the outset, and respond to a pastoral need. In addition to new forms, legitimate authority may undertake “simplification” efforts in order to organize and clean the ritual that has become cumbersome. We will now examine the general operations of how this simplification process has been implemented in the history of the Roman rite.

*Simplifications*

Simplification of the ritual is something that has commonly happened in the history of the Roman rite. The analogy to “pruning” is used by some to indicate that this entails a clear respect for the growth of the Mass, a method of simplifying an existing form without hacking away at it, which would destroy the rite itself.\footnote{Reid, *Organic Development*, 310.} Items in need of pruning are ones that developed “accretions,” such as unnecessary repetition or crowded additions. This process can be summarized as a growth that went awry, leading to necessary simplifications in order to restore...
the rite to its proper integrity. In this context “simplifications” can be a soft “restoration,”
whereby through its simplification the liturgical feature is restored back to its previous condition.
Categorically, it is easier to place this type of organic development merely in the sphere of 
“simplifications” because it denotes that what is being restored is currently a part of the rite itself, 
albeit with accretions.

A clear historical demonstration of a simplification is seen, once again, in the example of 
Pius V and the simplification of the Kyrie. In order to match the long neumes that had developed 
within the Kyrie, the Middle Ages saw the gradual incorporation of tropes into this portion of the 
Mass. Neumes were a series of notations written above the text of the chant as a general guideline 
to the music’s inflections that “do not represent absolute pitches or musical intervals but rather 
melodic gestures.” Over time, the melodic gestures became longer and the insertion of neumes 
as memory aids became common. As a result of the length, tropes were inserted, which are 
“freely composed additions of the texts and melodies.” In the example of the Kyrie, such text 
was inserted between each call of mercy, Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison. These additions caused a 
cumbersome result whereby the essential words of the prayer were being flanked by other prayers 
in “a very curious mixture of Latin and Greek.” In order to resolve this and other liturgical 
issues, Pius V expunged these tropes and the result was a restoration of the simple formula of the 
 thrice “Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison.” Subsequently, Pius V also banned such additions to the 
Gloria. Jungmann describes this simplification as a freeing of the Kyrie from “overgrowth.” Pius 
V essentially restored the Kyrie to roughly its developed form found in the early Middle Ages, 
before accretions were added after the 10th century. The execution of such a reform in the 16th 
century may demonstrate the principle of organic development. This is in opposition to the 
assumption that simplifications and restorations should take on the form of early church antiquity.

31 Kate Helsen, “The Evolution of Neumes into Square Notation in Chant Manuscripts,” Journal of the Alamire 
Foundation 5, no. 2 (October, 2013): 143.
This concept is generally referred to as “antiquarianism” which was condemned by Pope Pius XII as we will examine later. Pius V’s reforms can be seen as recovery of a liturgical feature to a point before overgrowth occurs and not a tool that prunes the liturgy back to the farthest possible point in history, which results in a loss of legitimate liturgical development. In the next section, we will examine the concept of “restorations” which also seek to recover liturgical features. However, this method sees the wholesale recovery of a liturgical feature that was lost due to the accidents of history.

Restorations

By simplifying the Kyrie Pius V and his commission not only authorized a simplification in continuity with received tradition, but also a “restoration.” However, this concept is different from “restoration” as we will use it in this work. Here, “restoration” will be defined as a total resurrection of a feature that had been entirely lost from the liturgy. As mentioned previously, Sacrosanctum Concilium teaches that certain liturgical features may be restored when they were lost due to the accidents of history. Liturgical elements that experienced such disuse through the “accidents of history” can be legitimately restored if following the path of organic growth. Pope Pius XII describes this concept well in his encyclical Mediator Dei:

“Here is the reason for the gradual addition, through successive development, of particular religious customs and practices of piety only faintly discernible in earlier times. Hence likewise it happens from time to time that certain devotions long since forgotten are revived and practiced anew. All these developments attest the abiding life of the immaculate Spouse of Jesus Christ through these many centuries.”

Pius XII explains that restoration of practices that were lost is done gradually, through the guidance of the Church, and within the scope of “the needs of the Church.” The nature of such restorations is debated insofar as whether or not they can be mandated Church-wide, without first having been implemented at the local level to see if the practices would organically take hold and

35 Pope Pius XII, Mediator Dei (Vatican: 1947), 64, accessed on April 4, 2016, http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20111947_mediator-dei.html.
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become popular in usage. Using the example of Pius XII, there appears to be an argument for understanding restoration as a practical need within the liturgical life of the Church and having a gradual development over a long period of time, which potentially results in an element’s official codification for the entire rite.

A modern example of a restoration, which will be examined in detail later, is the offertory ritual that incorporates the laity. This feature in itself was not a novelty, as it was contained in missals even until the time of the council of Trent. Most notable is the “Ordo Missae of John Buchard” from the early 16th century, which the later Tridentine commission used as one of their sources in the revision of the Roman rite. Various experimentations in the Roman rite before the Second Vatican Council incorporated an offertory procession, generally through the decision of the priest in an attempt to cultivate a more acute active participation of the people. The ritual procedure of this liturgical feature in Buchard’s missal greatly differs from what we have in the Ordinary Form today. Despite this, the addition of the offertory procession to the Roman rite after Vatican II may still be considered a partial restoration that may have organic and pastoral foundations, rather than something akin to a complete novelty.

A better example of restoration may been seen in the complete resuscitation of the “Braga rite” which was the “ancient Portuguese use of the Roman ritual family originating between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries.” Reid explains that “untraditional elements” began to creep into this rite around the 16th century and that by the 20th century it had incorporated elements of the Roman rite including “spurious legends of the saints.” Additionally, this region saw the spread of the Roman rite, which further displaced Braga’s own traditional rite in many places if it had not already been subjected to the gradual splicing with the Roman rite and the addition of untraditional features. Popes Benedict XV and Pius XI authorized a reform process that was initiated by the successive archbishops of Braga. In this reform, their own respective breviary and
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missal were restored and updated with the latest developments, such as the reforms of Pius X. Through this, the restoration of a local rite was accomplished. The reform of the Braga rite provides support for understanding liturgical restoration as an authoritative undertaking for a particular local region that seeks to eliminate unnecessary growth and restores the rite to the integrity it had before it was subjected to accretions and splicing. The final general principle of development we will examine is the elimination of liturgical features and the justifications behind their removal.

Eliminations

While the previously explored Kyrie restoration/simplification of Pius V involved an elimination of words, it was not a wholesale elimination of the prayer. However, at different times throughout history, some features of the ritual and prayer have seen an elimination based on a gradual disuse. The Second Vatican Council describes liturgical features that may be discarded under certain conditions such as duplications or those items which have “little advantage.” A more recent example of this can be seen with the “sanctus candle,” whose mandatory use after the consecration finally became merely an option in the 1962 missal. The rubrics required this feature, but it long since fell into disuse in many areas, not by means of any top down directive but by a gradual fading away. The disuse of the sanctus candle was therefore the result of pressure from local custom that prevailed over the force of the rubrics. However, the rubric still allows for its use “where the custom [still] prevail” in an attempt to respect the few areas where its use still continues.

There have been several other instances of eliminations based on gradual disuse or even as adaptations to the current historical situation. One such example is the 1955 Holy week changes in which the prayers for the Holy Roman Emperor on Good Friday were completely
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eliminated and replaced with general prayers for those in authority.\textsuperscript{46} This is a clear example of elimination as an historical adaptation, as the “Christian Emperor” no longer existed, rendering the prayer futile. Still another example was seen in the 1950s with the rite of the consecration of a Bishop in which he was required to take an oath not to “murder, or conspire to murder, the pope.”\textsuperscript{47} Such an oath was seen as a useless measure as the days of politicizing the Papacy to such corruptible degrees had passed.

Another feature that grew organically but eventually fell into disuse was the “\textit{pax} board,” which originated from England in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century and “gradually spread to the [European] continent.”\textsuperscript{48} In the “kiss of peace,” the highly decorated \textit{pax} board was passed around and each participant kissed it. Jugmann describes its usage being promoted by Emperor Charles V in the 16\textsuperscript{th} century and even being codified in the missal of Pius V in 1570 as an “\textit{instrumentum pacis}.” The gradual disuse of this feature was due to the board being passed down “by way of gradation,” from person to person, improperly focusing on the ranks of each individual at Mass and making it a “direct contradiction to the very meaning of the ceremony.”\textsuperscript{49} This example demonstrates that eliminations have occurred in the process of liturgical growth not only as a means of adapting to historical circumstances, but also to expunge developments that have become riddled with abuse or contradict the objective meaning of the ritual.

Eliminations may also be described by way of analogy in the concept of “pruning,” which was also seen as a way to describe “simplifications,” trimming the organism without harming its objective meaning and overall structure. But once again, each category of organic development may have overlapping concepts, hence the elimination of a liturgical feature may also be seen as a legitimate means of “pruning” or simplifying the organism. The gradual disuse of certain rubrics, or antiquated prayers and rituals that no longer serve any purpose, can generate
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a reliable justification of expunging elements from the Roman rite. However, as the previous examples show, such eliminations also can be the result of authoritative mandates that remove from the missal anything not suited to the historical context such as with the prayers for the Holy Roman Emperor. Thus, any consideration of eliminating a liturgical practice must be based on certain precedents which include historical circumstances being reflected in either obsolete prayers or simply abuses. Further, it may also be justified insofar as certain prayers and rituals exercising overgrowth and unnecessary accretions may obscure the ritual in some way. Taking the historical data into account reveals that these changes never appear to be very dramatic, they are usually accompanied by temperance and prudence towards the tradition handed down, and never executed unless there is a clear and justifiable reason.

Summary of the General Principles of Organic Development

All four features of organic development explored in this section may be viewed as general principles and guides. In forthcoming sections of our paper, when we consider the potential future development within the Ordinary and Extraordinary forms of the Roman rite, these principles will be utilized to determine what may be legitimate and what should be considered inorganic. In summary, organic development may be seen through the following four features:

- **Innovations**: New liturgical features, gradually developing from local customs in response to pastoral needs, springing forth from already existing forms, which have the potential to be codified for official use Church-wide in the Roman rite.
- **Simplifications**: The pruning of the liturgy in order to eliminate accretions or cumbersome features, while maintaining the integrity of the rite and retaining legitimate development.
- **Restorations**: A gradual restoration of liturgical features that were lost due to the accidents of history, implemented at the local level and with the potential for later Church-wide codification.
• Eliminations: The wholesale elimination of liturgical features due to disuse, having no relevancy for the present historical circumstances, or are being subject to abuse.

Once again, all of these features of liturgical reform should start from the ground up, be pastorally driven, be guided by competent authorities, and spring forth from forms already existing. However, it is still necessary to explore what organic development does not entail to gain the clearest possible picture of how to move forward with the living organism that is the liturgy. The first item on the list of misconceptions is what Pius XII calls “antiquarianism.”

Problematic Understandings of Liturgical Development

Antiquarianism

Antiquarianism may be defined as an attempt to restore a liturgical practice to the form it had in early church antiquity, which for many is “the first four or six centuries,” while disregarding legitimate development that followed it.\(^{50}\) The most famous condemnation of antiquarianism, as mentioned previously, comes from Pius XII’s encyclical *Mediator Dei*, in which he stated, “…unwise and mistaken is the zeal of one who in matters liturgical would go back to the rites and usage of antiquity, discarding the new patterns introduced by disposition of divine Providence to meet the changes of circumstances and situation.”\(^{51}\) Pius XII does not condemn the restoration of liturgical practices that were lost through the accidents of history.\(^{52}\) Thus, for Pius XII, antiquarianism is not simply the restoration of all liturgical practices of the past; rather, it is a disregard for the organic and gradual development of the liturgy.

Antiquarianism can take various forms. It can be an inorganic revival of a liturgical feature that has already been superseded by its more developed form. It can also be the revival of a liturgical practice that was eliminated altogether during the first centuries of the Church, without a gradual and organic reintroduction. In this case, the introduction would be a mandatory
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top down imposition of a long discarded practice, disregarding other liturgical features that were developed to replace it. However, there is a debatable line between legitimate restorations and antiquarianist tendencies, which usually centers on how exactly to define a liturgical feature that was lost to history by accident. This debate also rests on how to pinpoint a specific time where the liturgical feature was not muddled with accretions, hence restoring it to its proper form, without losing what it possesses as legitimate development throughout the centuries.

Some historical examples of antiquarianism can be seen in the aforementioned reforms of Cardinal Quignonez who, with papal approval, attempted to construct a breviary for personal use that had as its goal to return the canonical hours back as far as possible to their ancient form. Pius XII gives us another historical example in the illegal council of Pistoia, which was called in 1786 by an Italian bishop named Scipio Ricci. Here, many liturgical and devotional reforms were attempted, including the elimination of the Rosary, the removal of flowers and relics from the altar, and the reduction of only one altar per church. The illegal council of Pistoia and its novelties were condemned not only by Pius XII, but also by his predecessor Pope Pius VI in his bull Auctorem Fidei. Pius XII would describe Pistoia as containing “exaggerated and senseless antiquarianism.” Hence, Pistoia is the historical example of a misapplication of liturgical reform and one which may be used a general guide in identifying antiquarianism.

Overall, we have seen that antiquarianism is a break within the continuity of organic development, regardless whether the individuals involved had such an intention or whether they were merely spurred on by pious motivations. The wish to reduce things to a simpler state of the first few centuries strikes at the very nature of religious growth and development that the Church has experienced from the beginning, not only in liturgy, but also in doctrine. However, not every return to an earlier liturgical practice should be considered “antiquarian.” A return to earlier liturgical practices is acceptable when the general principles of organic development are
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followed. As explained previously, the principles that should dictate any future growth are; starting from the ground up, pastorally driven, guided by component authorities, and springing forth from forms already existing. The question some may ask then is why something like the Kyrie simplifications of Pius V is a feature of legitimate development instead of antiquarian action. We will use these simplifications as an example in order to differentiate between antiquarianism and organic restoration.

**Restoration vs. Antiquarianism**

A careful differentiation must be made between antiquarianism and restoration. The Second Vatican Council teaches that elements which were lost “through accidents of history” may be able to be restored, if necessary, to the form that they had at the time of the “holy fathers.” Once again, it must be noted that Pius V’s restoration respected the liturgical tradition handed down well after the turn of the first millennium, rather than being simply a wholesale return to the earliest possible source of Christian antiquity. Pope Pius XI’s restoration of the Braga rite was also an instance where the inorganic splicing and near loss of the rite, albeit still practiced, demonstrated a proper restoration, not antiquarianist endeavor.

In differentiating between antiquarianism and proper restoration, we must recall the general prerequisites that would render a liturgical practice’s revival a true development. The first is that the practice was accidentally lost, as opposed to legitimately, albeit slowly, eliminated in an organic fashion. The second is that this liturgical practice was not superseded by something arguably superior in an objective perspective. For example, Pius XII taught that seeking to restore altars to a simple “table form,” which was the design of the early Christians, in opposition to its developed counterpart, the decorative altar, was motivated by antiquarianism. The meaning of a “senseless” return to older liturgical features is further explained by Pius XII as being objectively inferior in comparison to some of the later developments. This due
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in part to the development in the liturgy from the assistance of “divine Providence to meet the changes of circumstances and situation.”

Hence, Pius XII condemns stripping churches of their imagery because this neo-iconoclastic wish to return to an age of simple decoration does not consider the fact that the Church was in her infancy. Simplistic church designs were in themselves the normative stage along the path of future development, rather than a norm that the present day should strive to imitate. However, not all liturgical change in the history of the church is the result of Divine Providence, as evidenced by the reformation process that the Roman rite has undergone through the subsequent adding and subtracting of features.

The guidance of the Holy Spirit is clearly applicable to the doctrinal content found in the liturgy as it is reflective of the Church’s teaching authority; however, His guidance is not unlimited, as most liturgical features involve disciplinary judgments, which are subject to err. In order to clarify this parallel further, Pius XII compares liturgical development with that of doctrinal development. He states clearly that “no sincere Catholic can refuse to accept the formulation of Christian doctrine more recently elaborated and proclaimed as dogmas by the Church” in favor of returning to previous definitions. In other words, jettisoning the more explicit and fuller definitions of developed doctrine in favor of those of the first several centuries of the Church is clearly an inferior undertaking because one would lose the precision that developed over the course of history and be more likely to fall into error. Hence, liturgical antiquarianism can be compared to a desire to return to Christological definitions of the ecumenical councils before Chalcedon, for example. Aside from what is contained in Scripture, the judgment of what exactly in the liturgy is the product of Divine Providence is a difficult task. However, Pius XII attempted to offer a guideline in order to situate future developments in the liturgy along a stable, yet imperfect, path. Specific undertakings, such as antiquarianism, are to be
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avoided, and the example of the liturgy growing slowly in the same manner as doctrinal development should be followed when undertaking any reform.

When comparing antiquarianism with restoration, we can examine some very stark differences. Restoration can be defined as bringing something back that was accidently lost, as opposed to having been discarded altogether because it became inferior or developed into a better form entirely. Such restoration does not stop at these ideals. As explained earlier, organic development is a gradual process that begins with implementation on the local level, in response to a pastoral precedent, and should never be absolutely obligatory Church-wide unless the feature gradually grows and establishes itself first. Overall, we could conclude that a prudent and pastoral decision by component authorities, such as a bishop, allowing the optional restoration of a particular form that was accidently lost to history appears to be the proper course of action for the process of restoration.

Monsignor Klaus Gamber explains that legitimate change must also avoid violating the integrity of the rite itself. As an example of a legitimate change, he discusses the restoration of Easter Vigil Mass to its proper place in the evening, instead of the morning, by Pius XII in 1951.\(^6\) This particular case will be examined in greater detail later, but we will briefly summarize the situation to demonstrate how it serves as an example of a legitimate restoration. Several bishops thought it would be pastorally beneficial to move the Vigil Mass back to its more “ancient” place in the evening to communicate the sense of an actual “vigil,” during which one waits and watches for the risen Lord. The integrity of the rite and the objective liturgical tradition were not harmed and restoration of a more Biblically timed liturgy as well as respecting it as a true “vigil” better signifies the purposes of the Holy Saturday liturgy. In this particular example, we see an ancient practice that was lost to history legitimately restored, not antiquarianism. For neither the authentic restoration of accidentally lost liturgical practices, gradually or instantly, nor
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a gradual and slow organic growth within liturgical tradition, is antiquarianism. Rather, antiquarianism is the implementation of liturgical practices from antiquity without regard to later legitimate developments that took place in history, or it is ancient practices artificially restored and mandated for their own sake. From this point, we will now examine the last set of harmful liturgical developments termed “fabrications” and “splicing.”

Fabrications and Splicing

Fabrications can be defined as liturgical inventions, separated from the criteria of gradual organic growth established previously: organically developed from the existing tradition, done in a response to a pastoral need, and finally implemented on the local level, whereby it may or may not gain wider acceptance gradually overtime. The existence of fabrications has been discussed by several figures in the Church. Cardinal Ratzinger recognized apparent fabrications in some of the liturgical changes following the Second Vatican Council that he defined as breaking organic growth, labeling them an “on-the-spot-product.” Fabrications have also existed in the past, such as those seen in the “diocesan rites” notably in France after the 16th century. Here local traditions, spliced together with elements of the Roman rite and other supplements “of their own invention” were employed. Alcuin Reid argues that a modern example of a fabrication occurred in the 1951 Easter Vigil experiments, which yielded a “total novelty;” the insertion of a prayer for the renewal of baptismal vows by the laity, thus constituting a fabricated rite that has no precedent in tradition.

Fabrications can be instances of newly comprised prayers being inserted into the liturgy or they can be occasions of “splicing.” Such procedures were frowned upon by some liturgists, such as Fr. Adrian Fortescue, who wrote that fabrications and the splicing together of elements from other liturgical rites was “silly and ugly.” For him, it constituted a break in the “historic
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development or the inherent build of the rites” and results in a jumble of different liturgical uses which are foreign to the rites themselves.\textsuperscript{64} A historical example of this that we have already mentioned is the Braga rite of Portugal, which underwent splicing. Here, elements of the Roman rite were gradually incorporated into the Braga rite to the point that it was nearly wiped out entirely. Splicing should be differentiated from “cross-fertilization,” as splicing would entail substantial portions of one liturgy being sewn onto the other. The result would alter the rite, disrupting its unique character that had grown throughout the centuries, and obscure its identity. From our discussion, it is clear that fabrications and splicing are in opposition to organic development. They constitute the most severe break in tradition and continuity as they tend to produce totally new prayers and ritual foreign to the rite up until that point.

**Conclusion**

From our analysis in this chapter, we can conclude that organic development can be examined in the historical record of the Church, through the actions of the hierarchy, and through the example of gradual and pastoral adaptations. Its application is thus slow, springing forth from already existing liturgical forms, always within the continuity of the rite itself. Organic development even sees the necessary elimination of accretions, which have produced cumbersome results. It can also be a means of recovery as it can gradually restore features that have fallen into disuse through the accidents of history.

Organic development, therefore, does not follow one set path or rule but lives within a general set of principles. It might be seen in a way where new forms do not entirely spring up seemingly from nowhere. Yet these new forms must follow some principle of subsidiarity; their insertion into the ritual is done on the local level and often in light of pastoral needs. Therefore, a sudden introduction of four more words into the Roman canon by Pope Leo I can be classified as organic because it was a pastoral response, implemented on the local level, that served the needs of the faithful.

\textsuperscript{64}Ibid., 88. Reid quotes Fortescue in a letter he wrote to typographer Stanley Morison. In it, Fortescue reacts to William Edwin Orchard, who composed a prayer book comprised of many liturgical traditions.
of the community. Additionally, such growth must be prudent and its eventual codification in a “Church-wide” sense should come gradually. This prudent approach respects the objective liturgical tradition as it was handed down, developing it in accordance with the circumstances, and does not attempt sweeping changes that could alienate the faithful. However, there is also the case in which Pius V mandated that certain regions say the Last Gospel who did not have it in their liturgies in the first place. Pius took a feature that was already organically grown, currently in use, and codified it for the whole Church where the Roman rite is celebrated. It was an addition, based on an organic and pastoral precedent, not a subtraction and not an invention coming from nothing or constructed together from various other sources. His reforms were also not a massively substantial change to the Roman missal. Hence, organic development seems to have some flexibility in the way it operates that goes hand in hand with pastoral necessity and simultaneously does not violate the integrity of the rite itself.

Additionally, there has been, more or less, some form of flexibility and options in developing and changing the missal. In the case of Pius V there was still not a total and mandatory imposition of the 1570 Roman missal on the entire Church as other rites were permitted, but eventually the Roman rite became the dominant form of Mass in the Western Church. What we have also observed is that organic development is not a wholesale return to the most pure form of liturgical practices from the earliest times in Church history. It is also certainly not a top down imposition of the most well intentioned and pious practices without their first originating from an already existing organic foundation. Simply inventing a form or resurrecting an older one and suddenly inserting it into the liturgy out of nowhere does not constitute legitimate organic development.

The four general principles of organic development should be utilized in order to move forward with the development of both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite; innovations, simplifications, restorations, and eliminations. The Second Vatican Council’s document on liturgical reform, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* teaches that any reform should take into
consideration the “theological, historical and pastoral” angles of the liturgy. In this chapter, we attempted to respect the developed liturgical tradition as it was handed down, which reflects the theological development in the Church throughout the centuries. We also attempted to demonstrate that the pastoral necessity has often been one of the most important driving components of the Mass’ development and in doing this examined the historical accounts that exemplified liturgical growth. Taking these concepts into consideration, we attempted to further follow the council’s directive concerning liturgical reform; “there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.” During this process we also examined several misconceptions in implementing liturgical development and differentiated them from their legitimate counterpart. The vision for liturgical change in the past century was experienced by the Church in a sweeping pastoral force dubbed the “Liturgical Movement,” which was the key factor in the 20th century’s liturgical reforms. We will now examine this Liturgical Movement, its development and its goals, in an effort to derive a more accurate understanding of potentially where liturgical development should gradually take the Roman rite.
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CHAPTER II
THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

Introduction

The Second Vatican Council directed liturgical reform by teaching that it should be executed through the investigation of the “theological, historical, and pastoral” dimensions of the liturgy.\(^6\) The call for future “innovations” in the liturgy is described as a “growth” through an organic process. The council’s teaching for liturgical reform, in light of its development through history, is exemplified by what has previously been explored in the first chapter. This often entails a pastoral need that is implemented on the local level as the situation deems necessary. Further, delineation of liturgical features that “grow organically,” in light of the historical investigation that the council called for when reforming the Roman missal, implies a process that is often slow and gradual deriving new features from “already existing forms” since the growth of an organism is not instantaneous. The historical development of the Roman rite has often rested on a pastoral need and the current endeavor of the Church’s liturgical renewal is a pastoral reaction to the situation of the liturgy in the 20th century.

Hence, in order to properly evaluate what course the Roman rite should pursue, an examination of the pastoral initiative of the Liturgical Movement from the past 100 years is necessary. The Liturgical Movement was a response to a need in the Church for a renewal in the liturgy, primarily in the active participation of the laity, but also in the edification of the priests
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and the Church as a whole. The Liturgical Movement was based on these basic principles; however, opinions regarding how these principles should be executed varied between each person and entity within the Movement. There was a collective yearning to renew the liturgical life of the laity that quickly developed into a call for the adaptation of the Missal itself to the modern period.

At the present, there are some, such as the then Cardinal Ratzinger, who called for a “new liturgical movement,” which itself contains members with varying opinions and goals.\(^6\) Within this movement has emerged both a desire to reform the Missal of Paul VI and to bring out of isolation the Traditional Roman Missal of 1962, putting it back on the path of organic growth. The precedent to reform these two forms of the Roman Rite will be explored in the fourth chapter. In light of the desire for continued growth and the arguments in favor of this, it is absolutely necessary to derive from the Liturgical Movement the primary pastoral reasons for reform and subsequently, the features of the Mass the Movement wished to cultivate in order to bring about growth in the liturgy once again. These desired developments, executed properly, may fall under the general category of organic development as explored in the last chapter; innovations, simplifications, restorations, and eliminations. As discussed in the last chapter, to be legitimate this growth must be pastoral, guided by the authority of the Church, developed from forms already existing, and executed prudently and gradually starting on the local level until it is deemed necessary for Church-wide codification. In an effort to continue the liturgical renewal from the Second Vatican Council, the common ideas and recommendations of the Liturgical Movement will now be examined. These principles influenced the Council and the subsequent reform efforts, and these pastorally minded recommendations must be taken into account when considering the potential growth in both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman Rite.

The 20th Century Liturgical Movement: A Pastoral Response

The beginning of the 20th century Liturgical Movement centered on the desire for a renewal that would cultivate the active and intelligent participation of both the clergy and, more importantly, the laity. Soon after its formation, it would develop into an entity that called for ritual reform in order to carry out this goal. Dom Alcuin Reid describes the outset of the Movement as neither a “reaction to rubricism… nor was the Movement fundamentally antiquarian or vernacularist.” Its beginning did not intend to strip away rubrics. However, others maintain that a form of “rubricism” existed within the clergy, which was generally seen as equating the rubrics with the liturgy itself. This rubricism was an excessive attention to the liturgical rules and guidelines, which harmed the “prayer aspect” of the liturgy. The focus on the rubrics resulted in a disregard for the message and “spiritual symbolism” embodied in the ritual. This prompted the Liturgical Movement to consider the priest’s own edification and engagement in the liturgy in order to avoid any danger of the Mass becoming an itemized list of procedures which was prayed “without feeling or expression.”

The bulk of the Liturgical Movement’s goals, however, were focused on the laity and their liturgical participation. The congregation was sometimes riddled with personal devotions or ignorance of the ritual, which resulted in less participation with the Mass itself. These devotions included prayers such as the Rosary and by all appearances some laity embraced the liturgy as a “passive experience.” Thus, the movement set its sights on a pastoral need by seeking to “return liturgical piety to its rightful place in the life of the Church.” This piety entails that the people understand the liturgical rites and subsequently, once this understanding is achieved, their active participation would be cultivated. In essence, the lay faithful needed a pastoral solution that
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opened the way for their intelligent and active participation in the Church’s liturgy, “the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed.”

The authoritative precedent that began the modern movement is generally seen in the efforts of Pope St. Pius X. His pontificate laid some of the foundations that influenced the future movement, including his 1905 call that frequent and daily communion “should be open to all the faithful.” Five years later, Pius X decreed in Quam Singulari that once children achieved the age of reason, which is generally considered to be around seven, they could receive Holy Communion. Pius X essentially lowered the minimum age for Holy Communion to the point where it now preceded the sacrament of Confirmation.

However, the most significant document that is generally considered to be the authoritative foundation that later influenced the launch of the modern Liturgical Movement was the motu proprio Tra le Sollecitudini. This document had as its goal the reform of sacred music, which Pius X described as a “complementary part” of the liturgy and it also helped motivate the clergy to explore pastorally minded directives in an effort to cultivate increased participation of the faithful. His purpose in reforming the music used in the liturgy was that it would “add greater efficacy to the text, in order that through it the faithful may be more easily moved to devotion and better disposed for the reception of the fruits of grace belonging to the celebration of the most holy mysteries.” The reform of music had two goals, firstly to expunge from the sacred liturgy secular music and their instruments and secondly to foster genuine musical developments springing forth from the liturgy itself, exemplified in Gregorian chant and polyphony. Pius X clearly explains that his intentions to restore music back to its liturgical origins were “the glory of
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God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful.” Thus, with particular emphasis on the faithful as a whole and their participation, the Liturgical Movement, through the motivation of *Tra le Sollecitudini*, adopted music as its first step in the renewal process.

The most important phrase in *Tra le Sollecitudini*, which later becomes the foundation of the Liturgical Movement, is the promotion of the “active participation” of the faithful at Holy Mass. The document taught that the “true Christian spirit” was achieved through the “active participation” of the body of worshipers. This document, therefore, is the first Papal reference to participation in the liturgy as “active participation.” The motu proprio was first published in Italian in November 1903 and within a few weeks its Latin counterpart emerged. The Italian to English translation states:

“We deem it necessary to provide before anything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for no other object than that of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable font, which is the active participation in the most holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church.”

Later in the third section, it states that Gregorian chant is to be restored “to the people” so that they may “again take a more active part in the ecclesiastical offices, as was the case in ancient times.”

Pius X goes on to describe sacred music as a necessary “true art,” otherwise it would be impossible “for it to exercise on the minds of those who listen to it that efficacy which the Church aims at obtaining in admitting into her liturgy the art of musical sounds.” Sacred music, therefore, should propel the mind towards participation in the liturgy itself. Significantly, Pius X writes that this art form should help those who “listen to it” rather than externally sing, suggesting that there would be individuals without the capacity to sing Latin, who could still experience a participatory role. Further, he explains that besides the clergy, “all the rest of the liturgical chant
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belongs to the choir of levites, and, therefore, singers in the church, even when they are laymen, are really taking the place of the ecclesiastical choir.”82 The “ecclesiastical choir” is seen by Pius X as a “real liturgical office.” For this reason, he maintains that all singing, except that which is the clergy’s, belongs to the choir itself. He goes as far as banning women from such a choir and even men who are not pious.83

Thus, we can see that Pius X wished to spur the engagement of the lay faithful through their official participation in the choir and their active role in the pews, in the singing of chant when possible. This is the spark and foundation of the Liturgical Movement in the 20th century: a papal call to align the congregation’s participation with the Holy Mass itself through an enrichment and reform proper church music, resulting in the conscious and verbal participation of the laity in Gregorian chant. Even though the vision of Tra le Sollecitudini was never fully realized during the pontificate of Pius X, and even though the lay faithful could not always understand and sing Latin, it still sets the tone for a closer engagement of the lay faithful with the ritual. Pius X’s motu proprio, therefore, encouraged the Liturgical Movement to examine the modern circumstance involving sacred music and adapt the liturgy to meet the pastoral goal of active participation. As a result, it set a precedent for examining the attitudes and engagement of the laity during the entire Mass, identifying the issues, and furthering the Movement towards the adaptation of the missal itself in order to encourage more active participation beyond Gregorian chant and polyphony.

Pius X’s endeavor was on the basis of a pastoral need of the Catholic faithful, that encouraged pastors to cultivate the participation of the laity in the restoration of sacred music, yet this call was not absolutely required of the lay faithful in the pews via the rubrics. The restoration of Gregorian chant and polyphony represents a legitimate revival of liturgical features that organically grew out of the liturgy and, in some areas, became lost due to historical
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circumstances. The decree does not impose a mandatory law that laity in the pews must now participate in the sacred music. The lay person in the pews was not forced to participate or suffer a penalty and hence, the goal was to initiate a pastoral reform by recovering legitimate liturgical features with the hope that it would eventually grow organically. Pius X’s initiative gave an authoritative spark to the Liturgical Movement and motivated many individuals in pursuing the goal of renewal and active participation. This can be seen most notably in one of the movement’s pioneers; Dom Lambert Beauduin.

**Dom Lambert Beauduin**

Dom Lambert Beauduin, who is regarded by many as the father of the modern Liturgical Movement, took Pius X’s motu proprio to the next level. Beauduin entered the Benedictine Abbey of Mont-César, Belgium in 1906 and, through the influence of Pope Pius X and his sudden discovery of the beauty of the liturgy, began work on a liturgical endeavor so that “all the faithful of the Church without exception [can achieve] the greatest possible active and frequent participation in the priestly life of the visible hierarchy.”

Beauduin was instrumental in taking the phrase “active participation” from Pius X’s *motu proprio* and transforming it into the “leading motive of the Liturgical Movement.” His reform proposals were presented to the Catholic Conference at Malines, Belgium in 1909 and they were influential for the passing of several resolutions for liturgical reform. These proposals were considered a “decisive point for the Liturgical Movement.” Beauduin’s desires included the translation of the missal for the promotion of personal piety so as to “popularize the complete text of at least Sunday Mass and Vespers.” This was sought in order to move people away from personal devotions during the Mass so that they could better follow the liturgy and pray with the priest. Other resolutions
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included restoring ancient liturgical tradition in homes, using the pre and post-Communion prayers in the missal, and the strengthening of Pius X’s restoration of chant.

Beauduin believed that the liturgy was a diverse entity in the Church that assumed characteristics of “traditional” yet was living and capable of following the “dogmatic and organic developments of the Church herself.” He would later develop these ideas in his 1914 published paper *La Piété de l’Église*, specifically stating the spiritual life of the people was of utmost importance and that their active participation in the liturgy was one of the foundational principles of such an undertaking. The spiritual life and active participation was not limited to the laity as Beauduin also included the clergy’s edification in a liturgical renewal. A change in the attitudes of the people and priest were desired by Beauduin so that the liturgy would not viewed as a routine requirement but as a “source of Christian life.”

Beauduin’s other proposals followed the call to reform sacred music by Pius X in stating that Gregorian chant should be fostered and involve the congregation. He also desired a “scientific study” of the liturgy by professionals and at the local level, for both laity and clergy to acquire a greater knowledge of the liturgy through “liturgical education circles.” Beauduin also wished to spread popular liturgical publications in order to propagate an understanding of the importance of the liturgical life of the Church. This action-oriented effort was designed to instill a liturgical awareness outside of the Mass as well as cultivate an active participation within it. Beauduin’s proposals sought a revival of a Christian piety centered on a life with God through the liturgy, even outside of liturgical events.

Beauduin clearly saw the potential to invigorate the spiritual life of the faithful through a properly executed active participation in the liturgy. Intelligent participation in the mysteries of the liturgy was for Beauduin the “fundamental catechesis of Christian doctrine,” which is
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reflected in his outline. Merely being able to chant the ordinary parts of the Mass or even
dialogue with the priest was not the sole goal of the Liturgical Movement; rather, this serious
endeavor to cultivate devotion to the liturgical life of the Church both inside the Mass and in
people’s homes was seen as a means of educating individuals on Catholic doctrine. Beauduin
points out that the Church’s liturgy develops in tandem with the development of dogma, “it lives
and follows the dogmatic and organic developments of the Church.”\textsuperscript{94} Hence, to acquire a
knowledge and understanding of liturgical practices was to acquire a knowledge of proper
doctrine as a fruitful outcome.

With Beauduin’s initiatives spreading and becoming influential, the Liturgical Movement
did not intend to freeze the liturgy in an “oasis of medieval liturgical splendor” or delve into
antiquarianism, but to achieve the active involvement of the faithful with the Liturgy itself, “to
awaken people’s consciousness, including, and primarily, that of the clergy.”\textsuperscript{95} At this very early
point, the movement was not concerned with the reform of the ritual itself; rather, it focused more
on taking what was already in the treasury of the Church, such as Gregorian chant, and promoting
education about the contents of the Roman missal. Most importantly, it sought to cultivate the
active and intelligent involvement of people and clergy. Once again, we see a pastoral precedent,
followed by a grassroots project that sought both a mental awareness of the actions of the liturgy
and an active engagement in it. The movement did not seek to force the laity’s active
participation but to encourage them, planting seeds and watering the ground, in order to bear fruit.

The Belgium liturgical movement would eventually spread into neighboring Germany
and later France. The staggering growth of the movement soon after can be seen in the
publication of translated missals for the people, books and journals, conferences, the
establishment of schools for liturgical music and “institutes of academic liturgical study.”\textsuperscript{96}

Established as a movement that focused on the renewal of the liturgy through the people’s
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conscious and active participation, it soon started to see calls for the possibility of simple changes to the rite itself under the justification that this would enhance liturgical piety. As early as 1916, German Fr. Joseph Göttler, at the Ludwig Maximilian University in Munich, suggested the use of vernacular in the “Fore-Mass,” what is referred to today as the Liturgy of the Word. He also questioned if some prayers were superfluous, such as the prayers before the foot of the altar at the beginning of Mass and the *munda cor meum*, the prayer before the Gospel in which the priest asks for his heart and lips to be cleansed.97 Another liturgist was the English Fr. Adrian Fortescue, who in 1917 also thought that reform of the missal was desirable through “some measure of simplification.”98 As noted in the previous chapter, while admitting that reform is possible, Fortescue had a “disdain for the fabrication of liturgies” and clearly rejected the idea of splicing together liturgical prayers and ritual, regardless of a well-intentioned effort, favoring a more organic process.99 The Liturgical Movement survived the First World War and began to increase in momentum in the 1920s. This lead to the first Papal recognition and promotion of the movement under Pope Pius XI.

**Pope Pius XI: Divini Cultus**

In December 1928, 25 years after the issuance of *Tra le Sollecitudini*, Pope Pius XI issued *Divini Cultus* (“On Divine Worship”). This document continued the work of his predecessor, Pius X, through the developments of the Liturgical Movement. Pius XI states that there is a connection between dogma and the liturgy, “between Christian worship and the sanctification of the faithful.” He praises to Pius X’s *motu proprio* and notes that much work still needs to be accomplished in the quelling of abuse and in encouraging the participation of the faithful. In the areas of the liturgical movement where Pius XI considers the effort a success, “the faithful have gained a deeper understanding of the sacred Liturgy, and have taken part with greater zest in the ceremonies of the Mass, in the singing of the psalms and the public prayers.”

Here we see a more crystalized expression of Papal expectations concerning the congregation’s participation where he states that the faithful come to church so that they can take an “active part” in the mysteries.

Pius XI then describes, in unambiguous terms, that the faithful should “actively participate” in the Mass. He describes the attitude of “silent spectators” as improper participation in the liturgical ritual, opting rather that the faithful should “sing alternately with the clergy or the choir.” Pius X and Pius XI’s efforts in the restoration of sacred music would desirably result in an increase in sung Masses, rather than the inaudible low Mass. Even if some of congregation did not have the ability to sing Latin, there is still value in cultivating proper liturgical music, which edifies the people and helps them to participate in other ways. Such participation may be seen as exterior attentiveness and interior union to the music and ritual of the Mass. Pius X’s efforts started with an encouragement to participate in the sacred music during Mass and the Liturgical Movement embraced this call and developed it further. Pope Pius XI confirmed this legitimate development of lay participation through his explicit statements in Divini Cultus. This was even confirmed earlier when in 1922 the Sacred Congregation of Rites “admitted permissibility” of the dialogue Mass, a Mass where the people responded back and forth with the priest in the same manner as the server or deacon. This took the Papal desire of active participation beyond music and brought it, on an experimental basis, to the Mass responses. Pius XI is even reported to have celebrated a “dialogue mass” himself at St. Peter’s in May of 1922.

Until the time of Divini Cultus, there has been some notable progress in the participation of the laity. Pius XI’s call for pastors to continue encouraging the laity in their active participation was, once again, not a forceful requirement for the people in the pews, but an expression of a deep desire for their edification and spiritual wellbeing. When the dialogue Mass began to be employed, it too was not something that was imposed, but rather was slowly introduced. It was an optional feature under the direction of the local bishop that would see varying success in the
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decades to come, having, for example, a widespread use in Germany but a varying use in the United States.\textsuperscript{101} It was implemented on the local level in a hopeful effort that it would organically take hold in the liturgical life of the Church. During the 1920s and through the 1930s, the Liturgical Movement did not slow down; its paced was increased and many new figures and ideas began to be discussed including changes to content of the ritual itself. So far, several clergymen in the Church were responding to a pastoral need and attempting to foster the faithful’s active participation. The encouragement to sing, dialogue, and educate appears to be a vital first step towards cultivating a foundation of organic growth. By stimulating the faithful’s engagement in the objective liturgical tradition it had the potential to identify several areas of the ritual that may need reform in order to respond to the pastoral situation of developing active participation. In the next phase of the Liturgical Movement proposals in developing the missal gained a greater voice. These reform suggestions coincided with some discussion on how they should be implemented, including the quantity and pacing of such changes. We will now begin to examine in more detail these suggested changes to the Roman missal.

\textbf{The Continuing Movement}

\textit{Virgil Michel}

The Liturgical Movement sought a renewal of worship in the lives of every Catholic, which entailed developing their awareness of their participation in the “royal priesthood of all believers.” This “priesthood of all believers” was given to each Christian through their baptism and enables them to fully participate in the life of Christ. The result of this charism given at baptism encouraged the Movement to seek to produce a “Christ-life” in each Catholic that participated in Holy Mass. In other words, active engagement with the liturgy should not be isolated to simply fulfilling the Sunday obligation, but was to renew and fulfil the life of the faithful in Jesus Christ throughout their daily lives.\textsuperscript{102}
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One of the more influential figures in the Liturgical Movement who attempted to carry
out this principle was Dom Virgil Michel, a disciple of Dom Lambert Beauduin and the founder
of Liturgical Press, as well as the liturgical journal *Orate Fratres* in 1926. Michel’s thought was
in standard alignment with the Liturgical Movement in that he desired a renewal that aimed to
guide Catholics towards a more active participation in conjunction with the priest so that they
would “pray with him and act with him.” He examined the real need to once again wed the
people’s role and the liturgical action itself and move away from personal devotions and private
prayer which was not a part of the content of Holy Mass itself, such as the Rosary or the Angelus.
Michel eventually developed an approval toward ritual reform as well.

Michel saw that liturgical development slowed to a crawl after the codification of the
1570 missal and recognized that the days of priests and local bishops cultivating change were
now over. However, he still maintained that new liturgical features develop and that it was the
role of the Papacy to regulate and approve of such change. Michel assumed that changes
should be in response to contemporary needs. Some of the changes he proposed included a
limited use of vernacular in some parts of the Mass while retaining the Latin for the “essential”
parts like the canon, yet Masses entirely in Latin would be maintained for solemn celebrations.
Other suggestions included the restoration of the Offertory procession, so as to cultivate a sense
of participation and involvement of the laity, and the allowance for evening Masses, as it was
gradually becoming more difficult for some people living in the modern world to attend Mass in
the morning. Virgil Michel’s suggestions were shared by some of his fellow liturgists of the
Liturgical Movement in the time before the Second World War.
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Fr. Roger Schoenbechler’s Overview of the Liturgical Movement

In October 1936, Michel’s periodical *Orate Fratres* published an article by Fr. Roger Schoenbechler wherein he described the state of the Liturgical Movement from its inception to the present. He stated that the general goals of the Movement after nearly three decades remained, which were to “increase and intensify the liturgical life of the faithful, priests and laity.” Since there was, however, talk of reforming the rite itself, Schoenbechler attempted to lay down some criteria to be followed when attempting such reforms. He admitted that not everything that the Liturgical Movement was considering was necessarily endorsed by *Orate Fratres* itself, but wished to mention them nonetheless in order to further dialogue within the Movement.

Schoenbechler explains that there is “no need to reform the essentials” and that any changes to the rite must be absolutely necessary. An example of such necessity would be “if the present rite has lost its meaning on account of changing historical conditions and background.” Such changes should be “conservative” in nature and “small” in their employment. Another point he advocates is that reform should take into account the procedures of the past, respecting the tradition that has been handed down in order to “preclude the introduction of subjective inventions.” He finally mentions that any reforms should not simply be a return “back to the old” or a restoration of ancient ceremonies that would neglect properly developed liturgical practices; this was, of course, later identified by Pius XII as “antiquarianism.” Schoenbechler’s general principles appear to follow the path of organic development, where adherence to the traditions handed down and following the historical pattern of liturgical change are respected. A pastoral response to the circumstances and a recognition that possible liturgical features may be eliminated if no longer applicable may fit into the category of organic development if executed correctly.
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The first item Schoenbechler mentions, which some in the Liturgical Movement were contemplating, is the use of vernacular. The basic argument for its use lies in the fact that it render the language fully understandable by those who do not know Latin; therefore, some argued that its employment would increase liturgical participation and piety. Here in the 1930s, the use of vernacular was again being brought up, despite Pius X’s ban on its use in sacred music, which was stated in the very document that many consider to be the beginning of the 20th century movement itself. Further, the frequency of its use, if any, was also under debate. Schoenbechler notes that the vernacular was already employed for liturgical ceremonies outside of Mass, such as baptism, in some places in Europe. Other proposals were for it to be used during the “mass of the Catechumens,” or in today’s terms the “Liturgy of the Word,” which is the first half of Mass until the Creed. Boldly, some were even advocating its use in the “Mass of the Faithful” or “Liturgy of the Eucharist” with the exception of the “preface and the Canon of the Mass.”

Other proposals Schoenbechler notes include a fixed date for Easter, possibly on the “first Sunday in April,” and for allowance of the Holy Saturday Easter Vigil to be celebrated in the evening once again. The general call for a reformation of the calendar was underway, as well with some suggesting the transfer of certain feasts of saints “to times when their celebration does not interfere with the liturgical spirit of the temporal cycle.” In other words, some felt that certain feast days of saints interrupted the flow of the temporal cycle, particularly the emphasis on the Sunday celebration, or were in conflict with the spirit of the cycle, such as the seasons of Lent or Advent. Such disruptions complicated the flow of the calendar, particularly for the faithful. A simplification in this regard would help emphasize the centrality of the temporal cycle and would help people better understand and follow the liturgical cycle of the Church. Thus, Schoenbechler mentions the idea of allowing Sundays in the temporal cycle to have precedence over sanctoral
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feasts and explains that such a change would “bring out better participation of the people in their official capacity as co-worshippers.” This reform, if executed with the principles of organic development respecting the objective liturgical tradition, may be considered a “simplification” because through it, the original intent of the temporal cycle would be restored.

Schoenbechler calls for further simplification via pruning with the “avoidance of duplication” in the rite. In the traditional Roman rite, the priest would often recite prayers of the Mass in a low voice with the server while the choir sung these same prayers aloud. The result was that the priest would finish these prayers before the choir and either move to the next part of the Mass or simply sit down and wait for the choir to finish. Some wished that this “duplication” would be abolished and that the priest’s pacing and prayers would align themselves with that of the choir and subsequently the people present. It was argued that this would enhance the participation of the people, as their prayers would then be more perfectly united to those of the priest, who leads them in Mass and through whom they offer the Sacrifice. Other duplications he proposed could be eliminated included the second Confiteor (“I confess to Almighty God…”), the first of which occurred near the beginning of Mass right before the Introit. The duplicate Confiteor existed in the rite of Holy Communion that was sometimes celebrated after the Mass. Once this rite was grafted into the Mass itself, there were calls for this second Confiteor to be dropped because Holy Communion was seen as intimately connected to the entirety of the Mass itself and the first Confiteor was considered sufficient for the participation in the “sacrificial offering” that was to come.

More frequent reception of the Eucharist and the Communion rite being celebrated in the Mass after the Sacrifice was also a desired goal of the Movement. Receiving Holy Communion within the Mass would signify a participation in both the sacrificial and communal meal aspects.
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of the Mass. There would be an emphasis on one’s own participation in the Mass until Holy Communion. The Eucharist was sacrificed by the priest, and by the lay faithful through him, and now the Eucharist comes down from the altar and is given to the congregation. This signifies an intimate connection and participation with the events of Paschal Mystery celebrated at Holy Mass.

Schoenbechler explains that overall, the sense of the Movement by this time was that seemingly modest or “small” reforms of the ritual itself would enhance participation and that this had quickly become for many a necessary component of the Liturgical Movement’s goals to cultivate active participation. The Liturgical Movement had quickly stepped from one phase to the next. The first phase of the Movement focused on promoting the laity’s participation in the Mass, as well as their education, and fostering a general liturgical awareness through the emerging historical resources to serve as a wellspring for the both clergy and laity. The second phase suggested small changes to the ritual itself in tandem with a first phases’ cultivation of a conscious liturgical awakening. In addition to this reform of the ritual, some further desired reform of the structure of the church building itself, by, for example, placing the altar in a “more prominent and more central position” so as to facilitate celebrations where the priest could stand “facing the people.”

Schoenbechler ends his examination of the most frequent proposals of the Movement by discussing how there was speculation concerning further reforms to the breviary. These proposals varied but in general they had as their focus the simplification of and the lessening of the “burden” of prayers that priests had to perform on a daily basis. The suggestions included ideas such as a two week psalter as opposed to the current one week cycle, and the increase in Scripture readings through a two year cycle instead of one. The idea was not only to give priests more breathing room; the Movement further hoped that shorting the breviary would spur the lay
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faithful to use it so that they could more deeply participate in the liturgical life of the Church in
their homes. Notably, Schoenbechler points to Cardinal Quiñones’ 1536 breviary simplification
as an example.

Schoenbechler’s analysis of some of proposals demonstrates the evolving nature of the
liturgical movement. Missal reform was now being called for, along with modest changes such as
the elimination of duplications and the alignment of the priest’s and people’s prayers. Many of
these suggestions appear pastorally motivated and are not necessarily a breach of organic
development if executed in a prudent and gradual manner. However, we can also see more
questionable proposals starting to emerge, such as modifying the priest’s positioning during Mass
and the lauding of Quiñones’ breviary, which had been constructed without a gradual organic
method. Further, the execution of such reforms, how many features and over what time period,
was never specifically discussed. Implementation of liturgical reforms can range from a very
gradual and prudent execution all the way to a swift, tremendous top down change. There were
some who disagreed with the majority of the Movement and tried offer a different perspective in
attempt to foster a more cautious approach when discussing changes to the Holy Mass. We will
now examine one of these figures, Fr. William Busch.

Fr. William Busch Responds

One theologian who advocated for a more cautious approach to liturgical reform was Fr.
William Busch, an American professor of Church history at St. Paul Seminary in Minnesota.
Writing the year after Schoenbechler’s article, Busch explores some of the suggestions that others
such as Fr. C.C. Martindale proposed concerning “hasty” ritual reform. Busch warns against any
tendencies to “change things immediately” and recommends prudence in adapting the liturgy to
modern temporary circumstances, especially by those who “wish to utilize it for some particular
and immediate purposes.” 118 For Busch, the concept of quickly moving into change that rests on
the premise that the liturgy is not “understandable” for many people was not a sufficient reason to
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adopt numerous adaptations. He admits that reform is possible and adaptations are desirable, but he explains his fears regarding excessive reform and calls the reader back to one of the original principles of the Liturgical Movement: liturgical education. Busch calls for a balance between ritual reform and advocates for what he describes as the people’s adjustment to the liturgy, rather than adjusting the liturgy “to our liking.”¹¹⁹ The proper balance, he believes, lies more in the education of the people than in ritual reform. Therefore, he called for vernacular materials that could serve as aids in understanding the Latin rituals. Bush, therefore, wished that the movement would slow down. He can perhaps be understood as recommending an approach that moves slowly and gradually, which is more in line with the principles of the liturgy’s organic development.

Busch also breaks with other figures in the Movement when he questions the viability of having Mass offered in the evening in order to accommodate the modern life’s work schedule. He recommends first trying to restore Vespers in the evening life of the parish, during which the pastor could educate his flock on its relation to the Mass and to the liturgical cycle of the Church.¹²⁰ More practically, he wonders how the Lord’s Day will be spent before the Mass in the evening. As an example, Church in the United States generally recommended spending the entirety of Sundays focusing on the faith in some way and thus Busch refers to the fact that receiving the sacraments first thing in the morning aids and sets the tone for the rest of the day. He explains that the Mass can set “our program for daily life” and that at the dismissal “is a sending forth, as our Lord first sent forth His apostles.”¹²¹ He uses this example to demonstrate his belief that the Movement must first slow down and educate themselves and the lay faithful properly about the liturgy, its history, and its context, before moving forward with any potential changes.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.
¹²⁰ Ibid., 354.
¹²¹ Ibid., 355.
Busch further explains that the liturgy is composed of both a subjective and objective nature and he thinks that “individualistic piety” may be focusing too much on the subjective. He admits that liturgical reform is always desirable, particularly with the changing circumstances; however, he is fearful that within the Movement there may be too much emphasis on the subjective worship that each individual brings to Mass. This focus may render the “objective” liturgy, the prayers and rituals, as subject to excessive modification, resulting in the loss of too much of its external forms that were handed down through the centuries. Busch wishes that there would be a proper balance between modifications that are employed for the subjective nature of changing circumstances and the objective ritual. Considerations for people’s subjective experiences are important; however, objectively the liturgy’s external forms have value “beyond whatever we may contribute” and thus an excessive emphasis on the subjective neglects the objective tradition and possess a danger “to introduce modifications in the liturgy without sufficient understanding of its objective nature and without due effort acquire such understanding.”122 Without sufficient knowledge of the meaning of the ritual, for both laity and clergy, the value of the liturgy’s objective ritual is in danger of being lost instead of its beauty being rediscovered as a precious treasure.

Even with such concerns, Fr. Busch still sees value in some reforms, such as a more “liberal use of the vernacular,” yet at the same time rebuts those who see Latin as a barrier. He calls, rather, for more written translations of the Latin text into his native English so as to assist in the faithful’s participation. Busch states that there is a “neglect” in the movement in regards to studying the nature and value of the objective liturgy and pinpoints this issue as the main problem of the movement’s lag in places where “it ought most to flourish in our institutions of higher learning.”123 Busch represents a more cautious approach to the Liturgical Movement, interpreting the calls for reform as a hasty endeavor. His wish for a slow and gradual reform is more akin to
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the gradual change that the liturgy has undergone throughout history. He appears to be fearful of latching on to a proposed idea and implementing it quickly. His more conservative approach signals a fear that objective liturgical tradition may be harmed. During this period the Liturgical Movement ran into the Second World War and by 1945 Pope Pius XII issued a new optional Latin translation of the breviary’s psalter as well as issue the first encyclical on the liturgy in 1947, Mediator Dei. Pius XII’s goal was to encourage the Liturgical Movement, yet at the same time he attempted to strike a balance between hasty and inauthentic liturgical change and negating the pastoral need of a liturgical renewal.

**Pope Pius XII and Mediator Dei**

In November 1947 Pope Pius XII issued the encyclical Mediator Dei, which was the first encyclical to focus on the liturgy. Cardinal Antonelli, a former member of Pope Pius XII’s Pian Commission on the liturgy during the 1940s and 1950s, described it as “a true moment which defines an epoch in the history of the liturgy… a true magna carta of the true liturgical movement.”

The encyclical sought to further cultivate the Liturgical Movement in places where the “sacred liturgy is defective, or all but inexistent.” This would require as its overall goals, according to liturgical movement pioneer Louis Bouyer, both a “mental awareness,” or rediscovery of the liturgy, and a “renewal in practice.” At the same time, Mediator Dei aimed to extinguish excessive tendencies from individuals and communities who were “over-eager in their search for novelty” and therefore adopting abuse and sometimes even endangering doctrine.

Bouyer identifies two major warnings that Mediator Dei sought to communicate to the Liturgical Movement in order to keep it on the right path. The first is an injunction against antiquarianism, which is “any artificial attempt to revive some period of the past in all its details.
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- whether that period be well or badly chosen.”\textsuperscript{128} The second warning is that of what Bouyer calls “false modernity,” which he describes as an effort to bring about a “so-called adaptation” of the liturgy to modern needs to the point where there is a loss of “true tradition as the result of an idolatry of ephemeral fashion, and as the result of the unregulated fancies of individuals.”\textsuperscript{129} We will now examine the principles which Pius XII sought to pastorally impart to the Liturgical Movement under his capacity as Supreme Pontiff.

\textit{Pius XII’s Principles of Liturgical Renewal}

Pius XII’s desire for a liturgical rediscovery is both a response and agreement with the Liturgical Movement whom he was addressing. Once again, the foundational aspect of participation is the main feature of the encyclical. Pius XII describes Christian participation in the liturgy as a “duty” and states that it encompasses the entire Mystical Body of Christ, from “its Head and members,” not merely the clergy.\textsuperscript{130} It is the worship and participation in Christ Himself and subsequently through Him the worship of the Father. Such worship must be “interior as well as exterior.” Pius XII draws on the analogy of the human person as being both body and soul, interior and exterior to explain worship. He describes that worship is an individual and a social undertaking, manifesting itself in external visible forms in order to “raise the mind to meditation on the supernatural... to foster piety, to kindle the flame of charity, to increase our faith and deepen our devotion.”\textsuperscript{131}

Pius XII attempts to strike a balance between interior and exterior acts of worship, emphasizing that the “chief element” of worship is interior. Liturgy is not mere “formalism” or a list of rules which must be followed. Pius XII recalls Jesus’ act of rebuking those who adhere to external acts only, “people who pretend to honor God with nothing but neat and well-turned phrases, like actors in a theater, and think themselves perfectly capable of working out their
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eternal salvation without plucking their inveterate vices from their hearts.”

Worship, therefore, relies primarily on the interior as this is where vice and sin may be expelled through the freely given grace of Christ so that the exterior worship may have value in the glorification of God and edification of people. In the same paragraph, Pius XII extols the exterior practices during Mass and explains that it is the Church’s desire that people “sing their hymns and chant their song of praise and thanksgiving to Him who is King… she would have them move their lips in prayer, sometimes in petition, sometimes in joy and gratitude, and in this way experience His merciful aid and power.”

From this analysis, it is clear that Mediator Dei is attempting to rebut both mere internal passivity and external expression which does not have the “mind and heart” set on God. The Liturgical Movement was focused on cultivating the active participation of the lay faithful through their external involvement with the rite itself. As previously discussed, by the time of Mediator Dei, calls for ritual change and reform to help promote this were well under way. The Movement did not discount interior participation, rather Pius XII was trying to emphasize both interior and exterior, explicitly placing the interior as primary while still encouraging exterior practices because both are intertwined. In this way Pius XII identified some excessive tendencies that constantly focused on the exterior, attempting to generate a balance between the external, objective participatory aspects and the interior, subjective worship. In addition to discussing the balance between interior and exterior participation, Mediator Dei also addressed the reform of the rite itself.

Reform of the Liturgy

Pope Pius XII reminds his readers that it is the ecclesiastical hierarchy that has the “right in matters liturgical,” of approving any liturgical changes and reforms. Divinely instituted elements in the liturgy “cannot be changed in any way by men,” however the “human
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components admit of various modifications, as the needs of the age, circumstance and the good of souls may require.”\textsuperscript{135} Pius XII explains that potential changes come by gradual addition “through successive development,” deriving themselves from previous forms and are the cause of many liturgical variations, most acutely seen between Eastern and Western forms. He even makes mention of the restoration of forgotten practices that, together with new developments, “attest the abiding life of the immaculate Spouse of Jesus Christ through these many centuries.”\textsuperscript{136} Pius XII, therefore, explains that liturgical development is guarded and approved by authority, develops gradually, and even involves restorations and pruning, which as we saw in chapter one, are essential elements in organic development. Therefore, Mediator Dei is an important statement as in it, the Pope himself is now opening the way towards future change both by teaching that such events are possible and by giving no indication that they are complete.

However, Pius XII admonishes those who wish to implement “novel liturgical practices, or call for the revival of obsolete rites out of harmony with prevailing laws and rubrics.”\textsuperscript{137} This statement is clearly aimed at those who go above the proper authority and wish to implement liturgical change on their own and those who are using novelty at odds with the liturgy itself. Adaptation and accommodations to “temporal needs” are lauded, yet disobedience and/or forms that are entirely new without established continuity are disparaged. The most dramatic examples given by the Pope are attempting to use vernacular during the “august Eucharistic sacrifice” and the condemnation of antiquarianism, as seen in the previous chapter. Once again, we can understand Pius XII as trying to strike a balance between excessive change and liturgical paralysis. The explanations he gives for why the liturgy can change are the authoritative foundations for future growth after a near standstill of development from the last 400 years. At the same time, he warns against overzealous and reckless novelty coupled with antiquarianist tendencies. Thus, in Mediator Dei Pius XII attempts to align the Liturgical Movement on the
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right path between extremes and most importantly demonstrates the wishes and desires of the Supreme Pontiff in pushing forward with the renewal that is based on a real pastoral need.

*People’s Participation: Encouragement and Theological Basis*

Pope Pius XII then addresses the participation of the faithful, which he describes as “required” so that their sanctification through the meritorious act of Christ can be achieved.\(^{138}\) As Pius XII explains, the glorification of God and the edification of the people are intimately linked and the Holy Mass, through the Sacrifice of Calvary, is the highest means of this glorification.

Pope Pius describes participation’s chief aim:

> …to foster and promote the people's piety and intimate union with Christ and His visible minister and to arouse those internal sentiments and dispositions which should make our hearts become like to that of the High Priest of the New Testament.\(^{139}\)

Pope Pius XII has essentially summed up the entire Liturgical Movement in this one sentence. By becoming more like Christ the glorification of God naturally follows and active, intelligent participation in the liturgy is one aid that can assist towards this goal.

*Mediator Dei* emphasizes that the sacraments, including chiefly the Eucharistic sacrifice, must be celebrated with “active and individual participation.” Pius XII reaffirms the Liturgical Movement’s call to “active participation,” but in the context of his previous explanation, which tries to find a balance between its exterior and interior forms. Participation in the Eucharistic sacrifice becomes the “chief duty and supreme dignity” of the faithful. \(^{140}\) This is very much in the same thought as his predecessor Pius XI with regards to the disapproving of “silent spectators.” Pius XII further admonishes “daydreaming” and other distractions, calling for the people to unite themselves to the priest in offering the Holy Sacrifice together with him. Once again, the lay faithful are encouraged not merely to participate in a general sense at Mass, but to
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unite themselves with the priest and his prayers so that they offer worship and sacrifice through him, which was, as we saw, a major theme of the Liturgical Movement.

Pope Pius XII connects the Church’s teaching on the Mass with the participation of the laity while simultaneously directing the course of the Liturgical Movement. He makes note that the Mass is not merely a commemoration and that the sacramental priesthood is a real entity instituted by Our Lord to communicate grace and that the sacrifice of the Mass is a “true and proper act of sacrifice.”¹⁴¹ Pius XII’s directives in this regard were a reaffirmation of traditional Catholic doctrine, emphasizing both the real sacrifice of the Mass and the communal, commemorative aspects where the faithful are united to the life of Christ. However, he also explains the proper understanding of active participation in the Holy Sacrifice stating that the lay faithful through their baptism are made members of the “Mystical Body of Christ the priest” and thus they are appointed and enabled to “give worship to God… they participate, according to their condition, in the priesthood of Christ.”¹⁴² Yet at the same time, he explains that the sacerdotal power which belongs to the sacramental priesthood is different than the “priesthood of all believers,” which is given to each member of the Church through their baptism. Pius XII explains that the sacrament of Holy Orders renders the recipient a true representation of the divine Redeemer and makes him a mediator of the sacraments to the people.¹⁴³ He mentions this to curb excessive tendencies that had begun to blur the line between the priest and the laity, explaining that the faithful “do offer the divine Victim, though in a different sense.”¹⁴⁴

The congregation therefore cannot offer the Eucharistic sacrifice by themselves; however, neither are they merely onlookers in an event awaiting to see the priest elevate Jesus or merely waiting to receive Him under the Sacred Species. Rather, they offer the sacrifice “by the hands of the priest, but also, to a certain extent, in union with him.”¹⁴⁵ In this way the whole
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Church “offers up the victim” together through the priest in one movement towards God. This communal aspect of worshiping God together, offering up the same Sacrifice together, is combined with Pius XII’s exhortation for each individual Christian to offer “spiritual sacrifices.” They should offer and consecrate themselves “to the furthering of the divine glory, desiring to become as like as possible to Christ in His most grievous sufferings.” These two different components of worship, individual and communal, are brought together by the Pope in an effort to balance personal piety and communal worship. Each of these components serve to enhance a Christian’s active participation if they are executed in a proper manner, and neither is desirable apart from the other. So far, Pope Pius XII further crystalizes the call to active participation by focusing key theological reasons behind the renewal of lay involvement. We will now examine additional features that Pius XII recommends concerning the participation of the laity.

More Methods of Active Participation

The Holy Father praises those who make efforts to render the Roman Missal more easily understandable and familiar so that the people can take a greater active and conscious part in the ritual. Lauding external participation, he mentions different ways in which people can participate, including responding to the priest’s prayers and singing the “liturgical chant.” These components are what he considers to be the core of liturgical participation. The individual must first understand and familiarize himself with the Mass, which is done through education, either of children by their parents or if they older, by competent educators, perhaps even the priest himself. The next component of participation is the encouragement of dialogue with the priest at the appropriate times. In the past, the norm had been for the priest to pray and the altar server to make the prayer responses, but now there was a direct appeal from the Pope to allow the congregation to make some of these responses. Finally, in tandem with verbal response, is the singing of sacred music by the congregation, where appropriate, according to the laws of the
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Church at that time. In such statements, Pius XII is clearly encouraging and praising the basic tenants of the Liturgical Movement.

However, Pius XII does not think that the dialogue Mass is an absolute replacement of the “High Mass.” The High Mass involves a trained choir singing the Ordinary and Propers, the changing parts of the Mass. Pius XII explains that High Masses possess their “own special dignity due to the impressive character of its ritual and the magnificence of its ceremonies.”\textsuperscript{148} This curious portion of \textit{Mediator Dei} may have a specific context in mind where the dialogue Mass is differentiated with High Mass, most likely the Solemn High Mass. Pius XII encourages the dialogue Mass and external lay participation but still retains the honor of the High Mass, where the congregation does not formally respond or sing, which signals Pius XII’s perception that the High Mass has value in the people’s enrichment and in rendering proper worship to God. It could also be that he believed that retaining liturgical methods, alongside encouraging new ones, is a way to gradually develop the liturgy without aliening the faithful.

Regardless of the form of Mass, Pius XII still encourages devotion to the liturgy to spur participation of the faithful, even in the midst of the almost absolute usage of the Latin language. To this end, Pius XII was aware of those who were unable to use a missal translation or do not have the ability to sing and respond in Latin. Additionally, he singles out those who are “varied and diverse” in their characters, so much so that it is “impossible for all to be moved and attracted to the same extent by community prayers, hymns and liturgical services.”\textsuperscript{149} The “needs and inclinations” between each person are different and hence certain forms of participation that may bear fruit for one person may not do so for another. He admonishes those who consider these individuals as not truly participating when they engaged the Mass in other ways such as meditating on the mysteries of Jesus Christ or performing other acts of piety such as reciting
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prayers; “though they differ from the sacred rites, are still essentially in harmony with them.” In this statement, Pius XII shows that there is liberty and choice in the manner of how one wishes to participate in the Mass, even though he encourages external participation with the Mass itself. For Pius XII, all forms of personal participation should be linked with the rite itself and sometimes may be considered a form of communal participation because the individual is uniting themselves with liturgy through prayers “in harmony” with it and thus with congregation as they focus on the Sacred Mysteries.

For Pius XII to give such liberty to liturgical development is only natural, as any change should be gradual, cultivated organically from the bottom up, as opposed to being overly imposed top-down, as we saw in chapter one. This liberty in means of participation and diversity in the forms of Mass can be seen as a way to cultivate organic growth as the encouragement is not mandatory, rather it is merely optional. Therefore, the liturgy is given freedom to grow and mature so that specific liturgical methods may bear fruit, while others may be discarded naturally over time by competent authorities. After Mediator Dei the Liturgical Movement moved swiftly and began to have an increased number of congresses and meetings that generated more specific ideas to spur active participation and reform the Roman missal. We will now explore two of these conferences in order to examine the pace and scope of where the movement was heading.

On the Eve of Reform: Detailed Suggestions for the Roman Rite

After Pius XII’s encyclical Mediator Dei, the Liturgical Movement continued its discussion on various ways to reform the Roman missal. Here, two liturgical congresses will be briefly examined as they offer examples of what was being suggested on the eve of the Roman rite’s 1950s revisions. It is important to note that each congress did not describe the manner and mode of liturgical reform and they do not suggest any sort of time period that such a change should take place, if any at all. The congresses only suggest that when the Roman missal does undergo a reform, their proposals should be taken into account. This implies that they hoped for
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their suggestions to be implemented immediately, or at least as soon as possible. An immediate, Church-wide, mandatory use of a wholly new liturgical features is not always the vision of the general principles of organic development. However, this should not discount some of the ideas presented, as their potential future application could be administrated in a more gradual and local fashion.

*The First Maria-Laach Congress*

The Abbey at Maria-Laach is located in the German state of Rhineland-Palatinate and was one of the leading centers of the Liturgical Movement. The Abbey initiated their first international congress in 1951, which adopted several proposals designed as considerations for liturgical reform. These naturally reflected the principles of the Liturgical Movement: the active participation of the faithful and clergy as well a general liturgical renewal. The congress’ suggestions included the elimination of duplications, namely when the celebrant prays or recites the same material as the choir or other ministers. In the same spirit, they suggested that the *Sanctus* be prayed before the Roman canon began, as generally the singing of the *Sanctus* overlapped with the priest’s silent recitation of the canon. Their aim was to align the priest’s prayers more closely with those of the congregation in order that they could better fulfill an active liturgical role in praying and offering the Sacrifice with and through the priest. There was also a suggestion for additional Scripture readings and to include the prayers of the faithful or “Suffrages,” after the creed, both of which would be recited in the vernacular. Some argued that the pedagogical and spiritual enrichment of the people could be further promoted by allowing Scripture to be read in the vernacular. The “prayers of the faithful,” also done in the vernacular, would conceivably incorporate needs of the community, bringing their prayers and concerns and incorporating them directly into the ritual. In general, these features may be considered restorations because of their use within the Roman rite in the past. However, in light of the
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general principles of organic development and prudent implementation, the method and means of introducing these liturgical features should be enacted in a gradual and pastorally aware method on the local level.

The congress also called for a greater number of prefaces, particularly for Sunday Mass, and the elimination of the second Confiteor before Holy Communion.\textsuperscript{154} The elimination of the second Confiteor should also follow the pastoral and organic precedent as explained previously in regards to accretions and “eliminations.” Its second instance may be considered a “useless repetition” as the prayer was already said earlier in the Mass, albeit in a sung Mass such a feature is said only by the priest and his server or deacon. The congress also put forth some considerations for further study and development. These included taking the silent “secret prayer” at the end of the offertory and making it audible and the same suggestion was made for the “great doxology” at the end of the canon as well.\textsuperscript{155} Also at this time, they suggested that the priest would hold up the Host and Chalice in a “minor elevation” until the doxology ended. Subsequently, they requested an elimination of the five Signs of Cross at this particular point. They also wanted a rearrangement of the section of prayers following the Our Father with the insertion of a Pax rite. Several of these suggestions appear to be a move towards more audible cues during Holy Mass, a way to familiarize participants with repeated Latin prayers and to signal important transition periods.

Other proposals recommended some larger changes, such as the “prayers before the foot of the altar” being restored to a point in time where they were said by the priest starting in the sacristy and ending once he reached the altar.\textsuperscript{156} Conversely, they desired that the “Last Gospel” be eliminated altogether. This prayer was said by the priest, inaudibly, after the Ite Missa Est and
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closing blessing. The congress wished that the Mass would more fittingly end with this closing blessing instead of the priest’s private Gospel prayer.157

**Congress at Mont Sainte-Odile**

The following year, Mont Sainte-Odile Abbey in Alsace, France continued the discussion that the Maria Laach congress began. They concurred with several suggestions made the previous year, including the changes to the doxology, the minor elevation, the elimination of the second Confiteor, and the *Ite Missa Est* with the final blessing being the formula of dismal. Additionally, they sought the elimination of the “*Misereatur* and *Indulgentiam*” prayers before Holy Communion that followed the Confiteor.158 This congress focused more closely on ritual details, making many suggestions, such as a restructuring of the prayers after the Our Father by eliminating the “sign of the cross with the paten,” as well as rendering the prayer afterwards, the *Libera* (“deliver us from evil”), audible.159

The congress also suggested that the congregation could sing the *Agnus Dei* during the fraction rite of the priest. They desired shorting the formula for the distribution of Holy Communion when there was a very large number of communicants to “*Corpus Christi*, or *Corpus Domini*.”160 They encouraged the use of a “communion verse,” which would be sung during the distribution of Holy Communion, solemnly executed, and possibly using vernacular, which they argued with would help facilitate the people’s participation in singing.161

Many of the suggestions given at these congresses, which reflect the general perception of the Liturgical Movement, can be executed within the principles of organic development. Several are simply a realignment of various prayers in the Mass so that the people can participate with the priest more closely. Others called for more audible cues and prayers, including the restoration of features such as the prayers of the faithful or a third Scripture reading with their use
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of the vernacular. The congresses’ suggested eliminations of prayers and ritual features is debatable insofar as determining if they are true accretions or impediments to participation. However, what can be seen in these two congresses overall is an appreciation to retain some of the objective features of the liturgy as they were handed down, a call to restore lost features, and a desire for general simplification in order to spur an active participation in the ritual.

Conclusion

Several ideas found throughout the Liturgical Movement were realized during the 1950s reform of the Roman rite under Pope Pius XII and eventually were incorporated into the revised missal of Paul VI. The context of the Second Vatican Council’s call to revise the Roman ritual so that the people may achieve a more perfect active participation in the liturgy can be viewed as being in continuity with the Movement’s suggestions, experiments, and push for liturgical awareness via education.

The Second Vatican Council called for an investigation into the liturgy that encompassed its theological, historical, and pastoral features. Taking into consideration the general principles of organic development as well as the pastoral necessity and reform suggestions during the Liturgical Movement, we will able to examine briefly the reforms that were brought to the Roman missal leading up to the 1969 revisions under Paul VI. Afterwards, already having established that growth and progress are normative for the liturgy, we will then proceed in our analysis of the future development of the Roman rite found in its Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms through the principles of organic development and in light of the pastoral necessity of the Liturgical Movement. However, before we begin recommendations for the Roman missal, this proposal wishes to focus first on the concept of “active participation.” In the next chapter we will attempt to render a more explicit definition of active participation through the identification of several subcategories. The hope for the next chapter is to pinpoint the different modes of liturgical
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participation under the umbrella of “active participation” in order to both elevate pastoral concerns and to assist any future reform of the Roman rite.
CHAPTER III
THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION: A MULTIFACETED LITURGICAL PARTICIPATION

Introduction

The foundational goal of the Liturgical Movement in the 20th century and the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council was to foster a fully conscious, intelligent, and active participation. This goal was described as “the aim to be considered before all else.”\footnote{Second Vatican Council, Sacrosanctum Concilium (Rome: Vatican, 1963), 14, accessed on April 17, 2016, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html.} The phrase “active participation” was launched into the normal vocabulary of the Church by Pope St. Pius X’s motu proprio on sacred music. As analyzed previously, this phrase was used frequently in order to cultivate a renewal and eventual reform of the Roman missal. However, “active participation” has seen several misapplications and misinterpretations, which some clergymen have observed as a pastoral concern.

Cardinal Ratzinger explains that there has been an excessive application of active participation, noting that many have taken the phrase to exclusively mean something “external, entailing a need for general activity, as if as many people as possible, as often as possible, should be visibly engaged in action.”\footnote{Joseph Ratzinger, The Spirit of the Liturgy, trans. John Saward, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 171.} Simultaneously, on the opposite end of the spectrum, there is still an issue of those who do not participate properly in the external fashion, mimicking the...
appearance of a “passive spectator.” More importantly, as Fr. Brian Harrison notes, the massive
decline in Mass attendance over the last 50 years demonstrates that the laity “can scarcely be said
to participate more actively” since they do not even assist at Holy Mass in the first place.165

Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to explain the varying features of “active
participation” and propose that this phrase undergo a more explicit redefinition. The interior and
exterior active involvement the Church in the liturgy is still a pastoral initiative and was intimate
foundation for the reforms of the Roman missal in the 20th century. The first focus of this section
will be liturgies that have experienced what Cardinal Arinze calls “activism,” or misapplication
and overly active external participation.166 Second, we will consider those members of the Church
who still wish to remain as passive spectators or for whatever reason are not fully
participating in
the Paschal Mystery - the opposite of “activism.” The pastoral concern of many surrounds both
the continuing effort to cultivate active participation and at the same time to remedy the opposite
of excessive activism. Both extremes serve to break down the sense of the sacred, the serious and
solemn character of Mass; hence, a more explicit definition of proper active participation may
help in cultivating an increase in proper and fitting celebrations. A properly celebrated liturgy
will more clearly reflect the truths of Catholic doctrine concerning the Holy Mass, which in turn
may edify the people and brings greater glory to God.167

The Second Vatican Council advocated for the active participation of the faithful in a
pastoral reaction to the genuine problem of the laity having a deficient participatory role. This
problem had as its extreme the “detached and silent spectators” among the laity.168 The council
continued the effort of the Liturgical Movement in attempting to inject into the faithful “a deep
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sense of the beauty of the Liturgy" through an active participation in these Sacred Mysteries.\textsuperscript{169}

The desire was for the community to fully participate in the Paschal Mystery culminating with the Holy Eucharist as they offer up Christ in the representation of Calvary and share in His Body and Blood during Holy Communion. Paul Philibert describes St. Paul’s usage of the term “communion” as being used equivalently with other terms like “divinization” and “participation.”\textsuperscript{170} In other words, with the proper disposition and freedom from known serious sin, participation in the liturgy can fully incorporate us into the Mystical Body of Christ in the sharing of the life of Jesus. This in turn is a means to “transform us and the world” so that the proper ends of humanity are reached which is “the imitation and glorification of God.”\textsuperscript{171} Since the implementations of the Second Vatican Council’s liturgical reforms there have been some pastors who have become concerned over the state of the liturgy and how people participate in Mass. We will now examine some of these concerns in order gain develop a possible response.

**Active Participation: Pastoral Concerns**

The goal of active participation is the goal of the liturgy: the glorification of God and sanctification of the people. However, certain issues arose after the Council that caused problems with authentic liturgical participation. Already mentioned was Ratzinger’s observation that many have taken active participation to the level of overemphasizing the external action. More specifically, he identifies the constant need for visible and external action as an erroneous approach. This can produce a perception that external actions must “become the essential in the liturgy” and thus, “if the liturgy degenerates into general activity, then we have radically misunderstood the ‘theo-drama’ of the liturgy and lapsed almost into parody.”\textsuperscript{172} The overabundance of external participation may harm and detract from interior participation, which
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has been identified by Pius XII as the primary means of participation during Mass.\textsuperscript{173} This is due to the fact that it may detract from other vital forms of participation that are necessary in one’s spiritual life including silence and meditation.

With a sharper criticism of implementation of the liturgical reforms, Fr. Harrison notes the “failure” to generate proper participatory ends for the faithful. He identifies part of the problem with a sort of “clericalization of the laity.” According to Harrison, a clear hierarchical distinction between the roles of each person have been obscured. Several things that only the clergy could previously do the laity can now do: “handling the sacred vessels, touching the Sacred Host itself through Communion in the hand, standing instead of kneeling to receive it, proclaiming Scriptures, passing freely in and out of the sanctuary, distributing Holy Communion.”\textsuperscript{174} Further, Harrison argues that the examples he lists are not found in \textit{Sacrosanctum Concilium} and were not what the Council fathers had in mind. He explains that the result of such activity desacralizes the Holy Mass and starts to characterize the celebration in an unbalanced way. The imbalance is seen in the perception of Holy Mass being more of a communal meal rather than also and “pre-eminently”\textsuperscript{175} the Sacrifice of Christ, His suffering and death brought before us in a real and substantial way. The sacred character of the Holy Eucharist, the entire Paschal Mystery, and by extension the sanctuary where this is all celebrated, is demonstrated by not only words but also by the external action of the liturgy. The roles previously reserved to the clergy emphasize both the distinguishing character of the sacramental priesthood and cultivate a sense of the sacred through the entire celebration, most notably the Holy Sacrifice. The extraordinary event of the Mass carries with it the elevation of the individual out of the ordinary in order to better instill Catholic doctrine and render proper and fitting worship to God. If laity are allowed to do things that were
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once reserved for the clergy, the sense of a holy and extraordinary event decreases. Reserving these tasks for those with Holy Orders characterizes the special nature of these tasks, elevating from the participants out of the ordinary into the extraordinary.

Cardinal Arinze also expresses a pastoral concern over the current state of liturgical participation. He lauds the efforts of the Second Vatican Council in bringing people to a more acute participation in the liturgy; however, he notes that some celebrations have degenerated into an “extreme of activism in liturgical participation.” The liturgy became too “noisy” with the roles of the priest and of the people becoming “confused.” Arinze sees this perversion of participation as seemingly rendering the liturgy into something that we put together when in reality “it is something that we receive, not something that we invent.” In essence, even if people are “doing something” during Mass it may still harm what “active participation” really means and what the Church intends. This is because if we are not assuming our proper roles and at the same time do not have a proper distinction regarding the ends of Holy Mass, the liturgy degenerates into more of a celebration of people instead of giving God what is owed to Him. Once again, the issue does not exclude the problem seen before the liturgical changes of the 20th century, which is when the laity take the mode of a passive spectator.

The Church’s goal for proper active participation for the faithful has not always produced the desired fruits of spurring people to engage verbally and physically, as well as mentality, with the Holy Mass. This deficient participation can be generally observed in both the Ordinary Form and Extraordinary Form to various degrees and was a feature that the Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican Council sought to remedy. Some liturgical celebrations at times seem “both anthropocentric and Philistine” and thus render proper worship and glory to God as secondary principles in favor of a more people-centered communal celebration. The problem with this view of participation is that it helps to obscure the proper ends of Mass, which are the adoration
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and glorification of God and the sanctification of the people. It should be noted that these two concepts are intimately intertwined and that the sanctification of the people enhances and promotes the glorification of God. Conversely, the opposite issues of the passive participant denotes a liturgy that is the sole possession and activity of the clergy, devoid of lay involvement, and divorces the sacred action from the people who ought to join the priest in offering Holy Mass. We will now attempt to examine in detail what “active partition” entails and recommend a more explicit definition in an attempt to orient the situation in a proper balance between activism and mere spectator.

**Developing Active Participation: A More Precise Definition**

The solution to this situation will not simply be found in redefining and making more explicit the role of active participation, yet this is a crucial component. The serious malaise of those who do not practice their faith, those who passively participate, and those who engage in “activism” has multiple causes and thus needs multiple solutions. Through a proper organic development of the liturgy and the mutual enrichment of each form of the Roman rite, the Church may restore some elements to the Holy Mass that can help spur its beauty, reverence, and proper orientation. In a similar vein, we will now explore a potential development to the concept of “active participation,” first by analyzing active participation’s internal and external features. Next, we will examine a proposal that will take active participation and attach to it three accompanying subcategories. These include relational participation, silent participation, and physical participation, all of which are interlinked and more or less overlap with each other. By doing this we hope to contribute towards helping solve the current problems in the laity’s participation mentioned above.
Internal and External Participation

Touching upon the concept of active participation, Pius XII teaches in Mediator Dei that “the chief element of divine worship must be interior.”\textsuperscript{178} Interior participation, both by means of knowledge and by following with heart and mind, is the primary, but not exclusive, means of participation in the liturgy. He explains further that this participation enables us to “always live in Christ and give ourselves to Him completely, so that in Him, with Him and through Him the heavenly Father may be duly glorified.”\textsuperscript{179} This hierarchical ordering of the interior and exterior is important in helping to stave off any overt forms of “activism” in the liturgy. Interior and exterior participation both aid each other in manifesting full, conscience, and active participation, yet the interior is still the hierarchical head of participatory focus. Arinze also concurs with Pius XII and states that an internal growing of the theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity are “fundamental requirements” in cultivating full liturgical participation.\textsuperscript{180} Conversely, Pius XII also encourages the faithful to take a more external and “active part” in divine worship, even encouraging the Latin dialogue Mass.\textsuperscript{181} Each of the proposed aspects of active participation in the upcoming sections not only overlap and are intimately related to each other, but they also incorporate the interior and exterior. We will now explore the proposal of these three subcategories of active participation in order to properly explain the balance and execution of interior and exterior participation in the liturgy.

The First Subcategory: Relational Participation

The 20\textsuperscript{th} century liturgist Fr. Louis Bouyer describes participation in Holy Mass as a “refreshment” of our baptism in Christ.\textsuperscript{182} The faithful, by their baptism and through its special character of the “royal priesthood of all believers,”\textsuperscript{183} unite to Christ Himself when they
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participate in the “death and resurrection of Christ” through the Holy Eucharist.\textsuperscript{184} This is the fundamental basis for “relational participation.” The word “relational” may not be sufficient to describe this particular aspect of active participation, for all participation is relational or “unitive.” Nonetheless, the term will be used here in order to categorize this specific feature. Relational participation entails that each individual, as well as the community as a whole, participates in the Divine love of Jesus Christ’s life through the Paschal Mystery, preeminently in His Holy Sacrifice during Mass. Each person is able to unite themselves to Christ and to each other through their baptism. In the Holy Mass, they are able to more perfectly participate in this “relational” way as the Mass transcends the boundaries of time and brings us into contact with Jesus’ life, His death on Calvary, as well as the Heavenly Liturgy and the Church Triumphant. Thus, fruitful participation in the Mass entails “offering one's life to God in unity with the sacrifice of Christ for the salvation of the whole world.”\textsuperscript{185} In this way the people practice their “royal priesthood” that all baptized Christians share, united in the Body of Christ, and thus are united in a participatory manner to Christ the head in order that they can “join in the offering of the Eucharist.”\textsuperscript{186}

Yet the laity do not and cannot offer the Sacrifice by themselves; for this they need a validly ordained priest. In fact, there are several parts of the Mass, whether it be the Extraordinary Form, Ordinary Form, various Eastern rites, etc., in which lay people do not have any external dialogue or song. Rather, there are others who do this, most notably the priest during several points in the Mass, such as the Eucharistic prayer. When the priest prays certain prayers for the entire assembly, such as when he offers Christ to the Father, we join with him in a relational fashion. When we listen to these specific prayers that the priest prays “in the name of the Church
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and the assembled community,”¹⁸⁷ we ought to join our interior dispositions and offerings to the words he speaks.¹⁸⁸ This is the essence of relational participation.

During these times at Mass, we are not doing much by way of exterior participation save our physical postures. Rather, we listen and offer prayers interiorly and at the same time they are united with the prayers of the priest. Another way to explain this is participation via “listening.” Listening is described by Cardinal Arinze as “an active openness to God’s action in us” that includes “reverent attention as the priest says or sings the prayers.”¹⁸⁹ In this way, relational participation is one aspect of full and active participation. Even though sometimes the person is not necessarily “active” in the sense of doing something physical, they are still fully engaged and participating in the Holy Mass.

This relational participation is personal as well as communal. The 20th century theologian Dietrich von Hildebrand writes that in the liturgy personal prayer, united with what is taking place on the altar, can allow us to enter consciously “into the wider stream of prayer.”¹⁹⁰ He explains further that the individual will take part “in the prayer of the Head,” that is Christ, and simultaneously the individual will be united to the prayers of the Mystical Body as a whole. Hence, personal relational prayer between one’s own interior intentions and the priest’s audible prayers can also be communal and thus help to achieve a full and active participation.

The Second Subcategory: Silent Participation

The Second Vatican Council recommended silence during the liturgy in its section on active participation, where it explains that “at the proper times all should observe a reverent silence.”¹⁹¹ Silent participation is closely linked to relational participation. In fact, relational participation is present in all forms of participation to some degree. However, silent participation
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is a distinct feature in that it becomes manifest during absolute silence or inaudibly spoken prayers in liturgical events. This is different from the general relational participation where even though the individual in the pew is being silent, there is still audible praying happening. Silent participation is something that is not as prevalent in our modern liturgies. Hence, in light of the mutual enrichment of the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite, which will explored in the next chapter, efforts should be made to render some parts of the Ordinary Form more inaudible or “silent” so as to bring about a “correct ars celebrandi.”

Cardinal Ratzinger helps to articulate this mode of participation by first characterizing it “not just a period of waiting.” Silence in the liturgy can be a condition of “disposing ourselves, preparing the way, placing ourselves before the Lord, asking him to make us ready for transformation.” Ratzinger goes on to describe silence as “shared” not only with the community, but also as sharing in the life of Christ “toward merging our time with his own.” Hence, much like relational participation, silent participation can also be a means of sharing with the community a reverent silence and praying for those in the assembly. Further, it can help us to look inward, a moment where sound stops and one is able to orient themselves through various ways such as examining their conscience or making personal pleas and offerings to God with intimate expressions of love and praise.

Cardinal Arinze gives us an example of personal prayers after Holy Communion in a church that observes silence during this time, for “[it] serves to allow people to praise God and pray to him in their hearts.” Silence not only serves as a time of personal and relational prayer but also as a method to highlight the prayer or hymn that the faithful previously encountered. Arinze explains that this is a means for the faithful to “meditate and interiorize what they heard.” Monsignor Klaus Gamber also shares this sentiment noting, “modern man frequently experiences
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silence merely as emptiness. He lacks the training for contemplative prayer.”195 Thus, external guidance, such as through choral singing, can become “a wave which will carry his personal prayer” when silence is instituted immediately thereafter.196 Gamber further argues that sometimes a person who prays silently in the corner may “go home more justified than other people who, from an external point of view, have taken an active part.”197 Silence then, if done properly, can be an enriching means of active participation.

The Third Subcategory: Physical Participation

Deitrich von Hildebrand writes that the meaning of all of creation is “the imitation and glorification of God, the inconceivably glorious and holy One.”198 Such a task is achieved in and through Christ who is the only one that can perfectly “offer adoration and love to God.”199 The imitation of God in each person entails real physical activity as opposed to mere passivity. This is seen in Holy Scripture, in which Our Lord constantly performs visible signs in the glorification of His Father. This activity includes Christ instituting the Holy Mass and all the other sacraments, commanding real visible and physical action. Physical participation is thus another aspect of active participation that aids the person with interior participation, as well as sharing in the two other aspects of relational and silent. Physical participation entails the relational when performing physical gestures alongside the assembly, such as the sign of the cross. The physical and silent aspects also intertwine through the example of the assembly assuming physical posture in solemn silence, such as kneeling after Holy Communion.

Today, there is still a need to get people outwardly engaged in the liturgical action. Hence, the physical aspects of participation must be reaffirmed in the same manner as stated in the Second Vatican Council, which taught that the laity “should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons, and songs, as well as by actions,”
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gestures, and bodily attitudes.” The positive results of the Council’s reform transitioned the lay faithful from a “passive” role into a more externally active and visible means of worship, where the Mass was not seen simply as the action of the clergy while the laity were merely present. Pope John Paul II lauded the liturgical changes following the Second Vatican Council and the increase in this type of “physical participation” of the faithful, who do so by “virtue of the common priesthood into which they have been initiated through Baptism and Confirmation.”

Increased physical participation is also praised by Cardinal Ratzinger, who describes the physical actions in Holy Mass as having “developed out of the liturgy’s inner demands and that make the essence of the liturgy, as it were, bodily visible.”

Each member of the Body of Christ should therefore utilize the outward physical participatory means available, in union with Jesus, in order to more perfectly imitate Him and unite themselves intimately in His divine action for the glorification of God and for their own salvation. Such visible signs and physical gestures, such as the sign of the cross, responses, and singing, at times bear the mark of communal unity throughout the Church, and express “the intentions and spiritual attitude of the participants and also fosters them.” In essence active physical participation, when it has its proper place, enriches the participatory experience of the individual and unites them more closely to the community who is performing the same actions. Kneeling during the consecration, for example, can help to produce in the minds of the assembly the idea that something unique and holy is happening since a reverent and humble posture is now being utilized. Another example can be seen in the singing of sacred music, which is a physical
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action that can help cultivate devotion in the faithful; “[it] adds delight to prayer, fosters unity of minds, or confers greater solemnity upon the sacred rites.”

As expressed previously, there are times when physical participation can become too excessive and devolve into a form of “activism.” However, the other two features of participation can also become excessive; silence can devolve into mere passivity and relational can become excessively collective and neglect the necessary private and individualistic side of prayer. In our current time, there appears to be in the writings of certain Cardinals, one of whom became Pope, a more urgent focus on the abuse of the outward physical “doing something” aspect of participation. Monsignor Gamber explains that for each person at Mass there is a proper role to play which, although different, does not diminish full active participation. He describes that we must be attentive in “allocating proper roles as between celebrant, deacon, reader, choir (schola) and faithful.” Thus, if we are to take the hierarchical principle of interior participation being more valuable than the exterior, but not to the latter’s exclusion, coupled with a recognition of the different modes of active participation as described above, we may be able to help mitigate the current excessiveness and deficiencies witnessed in the liturgy today.

**Conclusion**

Fr. Louis Bouyer states quite truthfully that the ultimate achievement of participation in the liturgy is that it incorporates us into Jesus Christ and His Mystical Body, “a life wholly lived by faith.” This participation reveals to us the hidden realities of Christ, the mystery of God, and He becomes for us “more real than the realities of common life.” The importance of rightful participation in the mysteries of Our Lord during Holy Mass should spur further development of the concept of “active participation” in order to not only assist the Church in achieving the pastoral goal of active and intelligent participation, but also to curb abuse via its excessive
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application that Church leadership has so clearly identified. In this chapter, we first demonstrated a pastoral issue regarding the current participation of the faithful during Holy Mass. Second, we demonstrated the hierarchal nature of interior and exterior participation, without disregarding the latter. Third, we further developed the concept of active participation by identifying three forms of it: relational, silent, and physical.

By bringing to light a more explicit presentation of active participation through these three subcategories, the Holy Mass may be celebrated in a more balanced fashion, giving proper space to each aspect of participation without detracting from each individual’s engagement and the solemnity of the event. Despite the importance of a proper understanding of active participation, the continuing renewal of the liturgy must take many different approaches including education, evangelization, and furthering the organic development of the Mass. It is hoped that by reorienting participation in a more balanced and explicit manner the organic development of the Roman rite can be better executed as the time proceeds. In the next chapter we will now examine the precedent for the continuing development of the Roman missal with regards to the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite. These developments should have as their foundation the previously explored principles of organic development, the pastorally driven foundation of active participation as seen in the Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican council. We hope that any further growth of the Roman missal will also take into consideration a more explicit and balanced approach pertaining to this concept of “active participation” explored in this chapter.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONTINUING DEVELOPMENT OF THE ROMAN MISSAL

Introduction

In this chapter we will explore the various pastoral reasons for the continuing development of the Roman missal in light of organic development explored in the first chapter, the general intentions of the Liturgical Movement seen in the second chapter, and through the principle of active participation of the faithful. Here, we will also call for new developments in the Roman missal and at the same time suggest restorations of traditional liturgical practices that many argue would serve to enrich the Church. The results of the ongoing development of the both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite cannot be predicted with any precision due to organic development’s slow and gradual change that respects the authentic objective liturgical traditions and pastoral concerns. Innovations, eliminations, restorations, and simplifications may well be anticipated, but once again their employment may or may not be immediate and should rely on prudent pastoral analysis. In the first part of this chapter, we will explore the need to continue the gradual development of the Roman rite and the “mutual enrichment” of both of its forms. The second part of this chapter will expand upon these needs by offering recommended reforms to the liturgy in an attempt to carry out the desired goals of the Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican Council.
PART I: THE NECESSITY FOR REFORM

In the first part of this chapter, we will examine the necessity for the continual reform and renewal of both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite. First, a brief overview of the Liturgical Movement’s ritual reforms that were implemented in the traditional Roman missal until 1962 will be examined to provide a clearer picture regarding general pastoral goals. Next, we will review Pope Benedict XVI’s restoration of the traditional Roman rite and attempt to demonstrate a pastoral necessity in the development of both the forms of the Roman rite with regards to the present pastoral situation and the treasures of the Latin Church’s liturgical traditions. We will argue that the Extraordinary Form needs to move beyond the year 1962, albeit in a slow and gradual manner according to the general goals of the Liturgical Movement, the Second Vatican Council, and present day pastoral needs. Likewise, we will also explore the necessity to develop and reform the Ordinary Form by considering arguments from pastoral needs, potential missteps with its implementation, and the possible restoration of traditional forms that were lost. Our considerations of the organic development of both Forms will seek to reflect Benedict XVI’s vision of “mutual enrichment.”

The 20th Century Pre-conciliar Ritual Reforms and the Need for the Continued Growth of the Extraordinary Form

In 1951, Pope Pius XII approved experimental changes to the Easter Vigil liturgy that led to one of the most significant liturgical developments of the 1950s: the general alterations of Holy Week. Fr. Fernando Antonelli was an influential member of the Pian commission, which was created in 1948 to study and implement liturgical reform. Writing in 1957, he describes the Pius XII reforms as the “most important act in the history of the liturgy from St. Pius V to our day.” Before the post-conciliar period, this is indeed the most significant change to the Roman missal. The 1950s revisions have been lauded but at the same time it was the first attempt at alterations to the Roman missal in nearly 400 years. This was the Liturgical Movement’s first attempt to

---

implement a change within a structure that saw little wiggle room in the rubrics and relied on Papal mandates for its approval and implementation.

Antonelli describes Holy Week as the pinnacle of the liturgical year, that is, with its ancient and rich content, “the most precious part of the whole liturgical patrimony.” Simultaneously, he states that a revision was “imperative” and that several elements needed to be restored while others that had become deformed or were “superimposed” demanded pruning. Holy Week, for Antonelli, was muddled with “formalism… creating an artificial climate” that harmed the active and intelligent participation of the faithful. His explanations justifying liturgical reform were, once again, shared by many in the Liturgical Movement. For Antonelli, it was not simply that the rite needed development or adjustment in order to bring about the goal of active participation, but rather that some of the content of the rituals themselves were a barrier in the current pastoral situation. This view harkens back to the principle of “simplification,” a pruning of built up accretions or even “eliminations.” In addition, other reform efforts included streamlining the rubrics and even attempting to introduce “innovations” and “restorations.” All of this was an effort to generate “liturgical authenticity, simplification of the rite, and pastoral expediency” with the aim of active participation.211

The reforms under Pius XII included an adjustment to the Sacred Triduum, where Holy Thursday’s Mass of the Last Supper, the Good Friday liturgy, and the Holy Saturday Easter Vigil were moved from their morning hours to more appropriate times. The Mass of the Last Supper was moved to the evening in order to correspond more closely to the actual time of day it was offered by our Lord. Additionally, the Good Friday liturgy was moved from the morning to the afternoon or early evening.212 Finally, Holy Saturday retained its experimental time change from 1951, which moved it from the morning to the evening, even giving the option of beginning it at
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This was done firstly to give the faithful an opportunity to participate in the Triduum in its entirety, as modern circumstances would often entail work in the morning. Biblically, this arrangement made more sense as the Last Supper was a late afternoon event, the Crucifixion was in the early afternoon, and the Resurrection was seen as the light of dawn. Thus, having a late evening or even midnight Holy Saturday liturgy would better represent the anticipatory mood of the Resurrection at dawn. Further the change represents, in part, a restoration whereby Holy Saturday liturgy was traditionally celebrated in the evening, lasting all night and into the morning.

Palm Sunday was revised in an attempt to reach the desired goal of lay participation through simplification and elimination. The blessing of the Psalms was abbreviated and done on a table facing the people, whereas it originally had been done on the altar. This rite was shortened to emphasize the procession that followed. The laity would participate in this procession and by putting more focus on this feature, its significance within the Biblical account of Jesus’ entrance into Jerusalem was highlighted. Other changes included a reduction of Gospel reading that eliminated anything that did not involve the Passion itself. This simplification was also extended to Tuesday and Wednesday liturgies. The Holy Thursday Mass of the Last Supper now had the option of inserting a “washing of the feet” ritual after the Gospel. Holy Saturday’s temporary experimental reforms became permanent in 1955 and included a reduction in the number of “prophecies” from 12 to 4 and inserted a moment of silence and genuflection after each prophesy. This was seen as a pastoral orientated change that simplified the prayers and increased the physical participation of the laity through genuflection and interior participation through silence. Other adjustments also followed, such as replacing the prayers for the Holy Roman Emperor with general prayers for those in secular authority. This reform reflected the current historical circumstances, as the Holy Roman Emperor no longer existed. Holy Saturday
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also saw the insertion of a new feature, “the renewal of baptismal vows,” which was done by the lay faithful in the vernacular.\textsuperscript{219} This feature aimed directly at the edification and participation of the faithful by recalling their baptism and life in Christ, as well as generating a communal link to the actual baptisms of the neophytes and arguably giving them a deep sense of personal participation via vernacular.

Good Friday saw a substantial restricting of the rite, the dropping the title “Mass of the Presanctified” and prayers such as the Offertory, which was derived from the Mass itself. As the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is not celebrated on Good Friday, the elimination of the Offertory prayers appeared feasible. Another reform involved the restoration of Holy Communion during this Liturgy. The custom of receiving Holy Communion on this day developed in Rome during the seventh century, through the “titular churches,” and eventually found its way into Papal liturgies\textsuperscript{220} and from there spread throughout the Latin rite world. This practice began to wane in the High Middle Ages and eventually was “explicitly forbidden in the seventeenth century.”\textsuperscript{221} This restoration was a pastoral move intended to facilitate the participation of the faithful through the reception of the Holy Eucharistic and more importantly to give them grace so that they can live a life more deeply united in Christ.\textsuperscript{222}

Reid views these efforts as mixed in their results and in their execution. He questions the prudence of restructuring of the palm blessing on Palm Sunday and the refashioning of the Mass of the Presanctified.\textsuperscript{223} His concerns are based on the elimination or revision of a substantial amount of the objective liturgical tradition and he considers some of the reforms an undertaking derived from the “pastoral and historical desires of experts: pastoral expediency.”\textsuperscript{224} Concurring with Dom Bernard Capelle, Reid also criticizes the insertion of the renewal of baptismal vows as
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a complete novelty, “[an] untraditional and theologically impoverished innovation.”

Reid explains that this insertion lacked any longstanding tradition and helped to detract from the main purpose of the vigil Mass: the reception of the Eucharist. He later explains that “pastoral expediency” is not the authentic sense of the liturgical movement and renders the objective liturgical tradition subject to modification “without concern for continuity.”

However, he does praise the reforms as having “overall substantial continuity… largely within the boundaries of both the organic development of the Liturgy and of the supervisory competence of the bishop of Rome in respect of the Roman rite.” Further, the majority of liturgists and pastors during 1955 looked favorably upon the changes. For example, Antonelli considered the undertakings “fully justified” in light of liturgical history and necessitated by “pastoral expediency.”

Antonelli explains that the Pontifical Commission’s work in the Holy Week revisions focused on two principles, the first being “scrupulous faithfulness” and the other “sensitivity to pastoral interests.” He connects these pastoral interests to certain rites whose symbolism may be lost on modern participants and thus demands reform. Such pastoral concern is clearly seen in Antonelli’s concurrence with the Liturgical Movement’s goal of active participation, as demonstrated in his statement that “the layman must be helped by means of the gestures and formulas to penetrate and re-live the mysteries of redemption.”

For Antonelli, understanding the rites is essential to the religious formation of the laity and hence, a ritual that has seen little change for 400 years necessarily needs revisions. The “symbolism” is lost on modern individuals, demanding modifications so that it may teach and incorporate the laity into the Paschal Mystery. Antonelli explains that the faithful must be able to “see, understand and follow the development” of the ritual so that they can achieve “active and informed” participation. The reform of Holy

---

225 Ibid., 176.
226 Ibid., 174.
227 Ibid., 228.
228 Ibid., 229.
229 Ibid., 225.
231 Ibid., 148.
Week, and consequently the earlier Holy Saturday revisions, was the first authoritative attempt at revising the missal according to the general goals of the Liturgical Movement. The trends that we see in the Liturgical Movement and the Church’s intentions for revision in the Roman missal through the Holy Week reforms set the precedent for the continuation of the development of the Extraordinary Form in the present day. This is due to the fact that the Extraordinary Form’s development was halted in the year 1962 in anticipation of the Second Vatican Council. The result of the Council’s reform efforts was the introduction of the 1970 missal as this was seen as the normative transition from the pre-conciliar Roman rite Mass. However, as we will explore later, some such as Cardinal Ratzinger view several of the post-conciliar liturgical changes as unauthentic and banal. An argument can be made for the restoration of the 1962 missal and its continued development as well as the enrichment it can derive from the new missal.

_The Need to Continue the Reform_

As explored previously, the development of the traditional Roman rite reached a near standstill after the council of Trent until the 1950s. This issue was exacerbated in the 19th century when the Roman missal became dominant throughout the Latin rite, stifling other diocesan liturgies, and its growth became stagnant due to “modern and uniformistic narrowness.”²³² For decades, the Liturgical Movement had sought to increase the active participation of the lay faithful and eventually called for some type of reform of the missal that would further this end, as seen in the Pius XII reforms. The gradual development of the liturgy is reflected throughout history as a response of pastoral needs and the general imperceptible growth of the rites themselves. The entirety of the Liturgical Movement demonstrated that some level of development was needed in order to facilitate active participation. The current Extraordinary Form of the Roman rite represents a missal that is almost frozen in the year 1962, in the midst of the Liturgical Movement. It is a missal that saw several ritual and rubric revisions for nearly 12

---

years before the implementation of the Second Vatican Council’s reforms. Benedict XVI’s allowance for the use of the Roman Missal according to the use of 1962 does not require that its organic development simply be halted in that particular year, rather it should continue to grow gradually in accordance with the pastoral principles of the Liturgical Movement in light of our current situation and according to the principles of organic development.²³³

The liturgical reforms that were implemented after the Second Vatican Council garnered praise by many in the Church, including all post-conciliar Papacies and several cardinals and clergymen. This reveals that the Extraordinary Form is not regarded as an entity that the entire Church should accept as frozen in its 1962 structure and rubrics. Rather, several important individuals, most notably Benedict XVI, consider reform necessary for both forms of the Roman rite, while emphasizing the value and richness each possesses. Hence, the justification of the potential future development of both forms of the Roman rite should not only be understood as a correction of the potential missteps of the liturgical reform, but also as following the principles of organic development as explored in the first chapter. One such method of organic growth is seen in Benedict XVI’s motu proprio Summorum Pontificum and his call for the “mutual enrichment” of Extraordinary and Ordinary Forms of the Roman rite.

The Liberation of the 1962 Missal: Pope Benedict’s Vision for the Extraordinary Form

In his memoirs, Pope Benedict XVI wrote that the prohibition of the 1962 missal disconnected the continuous growth of the liturgy as it had been handed down. He argues that the prohibition sometimes emphasized not the Sacred Mysteries but a “self-made liturgy” that was not the result of organic growth and living development but of “erudite work and juridical authority; this has caused us enormous harm.”²³⁴ Through his liturgical vision and his strong feelings towards the results of the 20th century changes, Benedict XVI issued a motu proprio in July 2007 which gave permission for priests in the Roman rite to use the 1962 missal, if they

were duly competent and with some prerequisites, without the need to seek permission from their local Ordinary. Some of the requirements that were attached included the parish pastor possessing the authority to decide whether or not implementing this Mass would be pastorally prudent endeavor; an assistant pastor could not implement the Extraordinary Form on his own accord. However, the parish pastor may do so on his own accord, without request from the people, after prudent consideration with regards to pastoral circumstances. Otherwise, a stable group of faithful may make a request concerning their desire to attend an Extraordinary Form and, under certain conditions, they must somehow be accommodated. Before Benedict XVI’s motu proprio, the faithful who desired the use of the 1962 missal had to ask permission from their local bishop in order to celebrate it through the directives of the 1984 document Quattuor Abhinc Annos, from the Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments. Thus, from 1984 until 2007, the “indult” period was enacted and very slowly, the number of Masses celebrated according to the 1962 missal began to grow. Benedict XVI writes in the introduction of Summorum Pontificum that the Extraordinary Form throughout its development has helped cultivate the spiritual lives of saints and enriched many people in their devotional lives as well.

Benedict XVI’s 2007 motu proprio Summorum Pontificum was clear that it did not intend to interfere with the missal of Paul VI, which was and still is the normative use for the Roman rite. In the accompanying letter to the motu proprio, he assures us that the Second Vatican Council’s authority and undertaking in the liturgical reform was not being called into question. Rather, he respects firstly those who were once attached to the 1962 missal and those who have “discovered this liturgical form, felt its attraction and found in it a form of encounter with the
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Mystery of the Most Holy Eucharist.” Benedict XVI then describes how each form of the Roman rite can be “mutually enriching,” calling for new saints to be added to the Extraordinary Form’s calendar since its development was halted in 1962 and for the introduction of “new Prefaces.” Conversely, he says that the reverence and sacrality that is usually seen in the Extraordinary Form can help enrich the Ordinary Form in order to “bring out the spiritual richness and the theological depth of this Missal.” The indult of 1984 was designed to accommodate those who were attached to the Traditional Mass from their youth, to help secure unity, and, as eventually emphasized in John Paul II’s document Ecclesia Dei, as an additional means to heal the rift with the Society of Saint Pius X. However, an organic yet small stream of life had sprung up in the midst of the indult period that represented a new spiritual attraction to the traditional Mass. Many people became attracted to the previous liturgical uses and traditions even though they had not known them since childhood. Further still, Benedict XVI himself felt that some legitimate aspects of the liturgy were lost while others were gained following the changes that occurred during the 1960s. All of these reasons lead him to call for the mutual enrichment of the two Forms and the recognition that the traditional Roman rite has organically taken hold, albeit in a small way, within the life of the Church. According to Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos, the former president of the Pontifical commission Ecclesia Dei, Benedict XVI desired that the Extraordinary Form “become a normal occurrence in the liturgical life of the Church so that all of Christ’s faithful – young and old – can become familiar with the older rites and draw from their tangible beauty and transcendence.” Additionally, in his letter, Benedict XVI explains that there is no contradiction between the two missals and that they both have immense value. The Extraordinary Form contains a richness that “remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely
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forbidden or even considered harmful.”\footnote{Pope Benedict XVI, \textit{Letter to the Bishops}, no. 10.} For Benedict XVI, the further development of the Roman rite may be seen in the general principles of organic development, as discussed in the first chapter. He calls for each to mutually enrich the other and his opinion on liturgical growth appears to be against fabrication and in favor of a natural and slow process. Such is the case with his instructions in \textit{Summorum Pontificum} which gave only four directives for liturgical development: the insertion of new saints into the calendar, new Prefaces, the option for scripture readings in the vernacular, and “mutual enrichment.”

**The Necessity to Grow and Reform the Ordinary Form**

The post-conciliar liturgical revisions led a number of individuals, including the then Cardinal Ratzinger, Monsignor Klaus Gamber, and Cardinal Ranjith, to express some concerns regarding a general loss of sacred reverence and liturgical treasures. More specifically, their concerns can be viewed as belonging to three categories: the loss of traditional liturgical rituals, criticisms of fabricated ones and subsequently their supposed inferiority, and the breaking of organic development, which in turn results in altered perception of the liturgy from something handed down to something crafted for the needs of present. It is dishonest to ignore the value of the post-conciliar revisions and the renewed liturgical consciousness it brought to the Church.

Each person has his own view on the weakness and richness that the missal of Paul VI brings to the Church. Simultaneously, many feel that the traditional Roman rite, which has now been labeled the “Extraordinary Form” by Benedict XVI, is still lacking in its “intended” development that the Liturgical Movement was attempting to carry out before the post-Vatican II changes sought to create a new “ordo” of the Mass. In the next section we will review some of these concerns and criticisms in the implementation of the liturgical reform in order to gain a better understanding for the need to reform and enrich the Ordinary Form of the Roman rite.
Continuity and Pastoral Concerns

The most obvious feature of the Liturgical Movement that was adopted in Sacrosanctum Concilium was the revision of the Roman ritual with the “full and active participation” of the laity as the highest desired goal.\textsuperscript{243} The Council explains the reform of liturgy was a part of its overall mission to “impart an ever increasing vigor to the Christian life of the faithful.”\textsuperscript{244} Such vigor involves not only the intelligent and conscious participation in the rites themselves, but also the execution of this participation, the frequency in which the faithful receive the sacraments and attend Mass, as well as their overall basic grasp of the rites and doctrinal truths of the liturgy.

Cardinal Antonelli, as well as other liturgists during the 1950s, would laud the reforms under Pius XII of Holy Week because they brought about an increase in attendance and participation of the faithful, most particularly by moving the times of these liturgies from the morning into afternoon or evening.

Although attendance was praised as a successful result of the reform, it was yet one fruit among several desired goals. In contrast, if we examine the data after the introduction of the Missal of Paul VI, we see a dramatically sharp decrease in attendance.\textsuperscript{245} The liturgical reforms were in part an effort to help impart “vigor” to the lives of Christians, yet attendance plummeted. This was obviously not an intended consequence of the liturgical revisions following the Second Vatican Council, but that attendance did decline is a sign that such revisions were either incomplete or inadequately developed, for they failed to sustain the “vigor” it wished to increase in the face of a rapidly changing world. The then Cardinal Ratzinger lamented the decline in Mass attendance and wished to spark a “reform of the reform” in order to help alleviate the situation.\textsuperscript{246} Thus, we have at least one piece of evidence, by the standard of the Liturgical
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Movement itself, which may indicate that the post-conciliar liturgical changes were an incomplete reform with mixed results.

Cardinal Ratzinger, before his election to the chair of St. Peter, while lauding the liturgical changes after the Second Vatican Council, mixes his praise with some rather harsh words revealing that the incomplete reform is not simply a minor issue and needs to be addressed. He writes in his memoirs that the liturgical revisions after the Council “brought with it a real improvement and enrichment.” While he sees the revision of the missal as a much needed endeavor, he nonetheless critiques aspects of its implementation. For example, Ratzinger wrote in the preface to the French edition of Klaus Gamber’s *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy*:

> “…in the place of liturgy as the fruit of development came fabricated liturgy. We abandoned the organic, living process of growth and development over the centuries, and replaced it—as in a manufacturing process—with a fabrication, a banal on-the-spot product.”

Ratzinger’s feelings on the issue reveal his perception that the 20th century liturgical reforms should have followed a path that was for the most part organic and mimicked the historical development of the rite. Additionally, he maintains that there is a “crisis in the church” and this was “to a large extent due to the disintegration of the liturgy” after the Council. Thus, Ratzinger sees the liturgical reforms following the Council as not entirely corresponding to the directives of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

Others, including Cardinal Arinze, also praise the efforts of the Second Vatican Council for bringing about a better participatory role for the lay faithful, calling it the “greatest fruit of the liturgical movement” and maintaining that it successfully moved the liturgy away from a celebration mostly enacted by clergy with the laity as simply spectators. However, he also observes that after the Council an excessive tendency developed where an “extreme of activism in
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liturgical participation” sometimes took hold, which resulted in “noisy” liturgies where the proper roles of the priest and lay faithful became “confused.” Arinze goes on to describe how such interpretations of active participation have led to liturgical abuse, an ailment that has gone beyond the mere laxity sometimes seen before the Council, which saw an overabundance of inaudible low Masses being celebrated hastily. The liturgical abuse he describes goes beyond violating the norms laid in the rubrics and strikes against the very context of the Mass itself. These incidents of abuse have exploded since the promulgation of the Ordinary Form. Arinze upholds the “liturgical renewal” that the Second Vatican Council sought to bring about, but warns that such “activism” and liturgical abuse are indicative of a perception that the liturgy is something that we create for ourselves instead of something received and is primarily “something that Christ does, not something we put together.”

Pope John Paul II, who has a much more appreciative and positive outlook on the liturgical revisions following the Second Vatican Council than Arinze, still saw problems in the implementation of Sacrosanctum Concilium. He even went as far as apologizing for the weakness and “negligence” of what sometimes occurred during the process, asking forgiveness for the “one-sided and erroneous application of the directives of the Second Vatican Council, [which] may have caused scandal and disturbance concerning the interpretation of the doctrine and the veneration due to this great sacrament.” From our consideration of the critiques of Cardinals Antonelli, Arinze, and Ratzinger, as well as those of John Paul II, we can see that the post-conciliar reforms were not entirely successful in renewing the liturgical life of the laity and did not always follow a true path of liturgical development that respected the integrity of the rite. Therefore, it is necessary to consider how the Ordinary Form should continue to develop, an idea that we saw Cardinal Ratzinger refer to as the “reform of the reform.”
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quite truthfully stated that the liturgical reform following the Second Vatican Council brought several improvements, yet some “cannot be judged as authentic liturgical development.”\textsuperscript{255}

In this section we explored some of the justifications for the continuing development of the Roman missal. Both the Ordinary and Extraordinary forms have the potential to learn from each other, gaining substantial benefits and enrichment. The next part of this chapter will be a series of analyses and suggestions in order to continue the organic development of each liturgy. Every suggested change will be founded on the pastoral motivation of active participation as demonstrated by the desires of the Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican Council. Additionally, they will also attempt to follow the criteria for organic development argued in the first chapter; they will be pastorally motivated, respecting the objective liturgical tradition, and never mandatory as to facilitate authentic and gradual organic growth.

PART II: THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF ORDINARY AND EXTRAORDINARY FORMS OF THE ROMAN RITE

The Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite: A Renewed Vision

The foundation for the Extraordinary Form’s continued development is found in the explicit directives from the pontificate of Pope Benedict XVI. These directives are seen in several documents that deal with the application of the Extraordinary Form starting from Benedict XVI’s \textit{Summorum Pontificum} 2007. First, the directive to add new saints to the calendar of the Extraordinary Form is simply a natural consequence of the Church’s ongoing liturgical life.\textsuperscript{256} Second, there is a directive for an eventual incorporation of the dozens of new prefaces into the Extraordinary Form which may be derived from the Ordinary.\textsuperscript{257} Next, a directive from \textit{Summorum Pontificum} is made clearer by the 2011 document \textit{Universae Ecclesiae} from the
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Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*. This document states that vernacular may be used solely in the Scripture readings in “low Masses” or Masses that are not sung with a choir. The fourth directive, that of “mutual enrichment” itself, is already seen in the first three and will most certainly, but very slowly, continue beyond these directives.

These directives noticeably mimic the historical development of the Roman rite. The insertion of new saints is a normal occurrence, but new prefaces were a rare occurrence in the Roman missal and the option of vernacular readings is something entirely new. The “new prefaces” have yet to be incorporated into the Extraordinary Form and there was no top-down mandatory directive towards this goal, but rather a future directive. The instruction appears to be reflective of a “restoration” insofar as new prefaces derived from the Ordinary Form would have themselves been derived from tradition. Reflecting the principles of organic growth in the first chapter, additional prefaces, either from the Ordinary Form or entirely new altogether, should be done prudently and in light of a pastoral necessity. It is much in the same manner as the directive for vernacular during the Scripture reading; it is not a mandatory feature but an option. The future addition of new prefaces may benefit from optional usage as well until they have time to grow and cement themselves into the ordinary liturgical life of the Church. Thus, this instruction demonstrates Benedict XVI’s vision of enriching the Extraordinary Form through a gradual, prudent undertaking with the pastoral foundation of enriching the participation of the people. Benedict does not desire to rush liturgical growth nor enact things with speedy top-down mandates. Dr. William Johnston sees Benedict XVI’s vision for mutual enrichment a “less disruptive, noncoercive, more involving, long-term, gradual, organic process for guiding the future development of the Roman Rite—or, better, for letting that development naturally unfold.”
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Monsignor Gamber describes a kind of mutual enrichment which involves personal discretion of the priest in choosing which features he feels are necessary to foster the greatest enrichment of the community. He suggests that enriching the 1962 missal with Prefaces from the ancient Roman Sacramentarium and introducing additional Scripture readings would be a prudent example.\textsuperscript{261} The priest would then choose which Preface to use as well as which Scripture reading to employ, the exception being the Gospels. The “natural unfolding” then is a cultivation from the local level, from the ground up. If certain options and additions to the Extraordinary Form become widespread in use, through either legitimate development or mutual enrichment, they could later be codified in the same manner that St. Pius V authorized the Last Gospel for the entire Roman rite after its gradual development and attachment to the liturgy. Johnston states that Benedict XVI wished to avoid what he saw as inorganic fabrications following the Second Vatican Council and instead enact a reform that would be “open-ended and receptive to what would arise from the ground up in the pastoral liturgical practice of the church.”\textsuperscript{262} Hence, if a feature of the Ordinary Form appears to be good, it should not be forcefully inserted into the Extraordinary Form; rather, there should be an allowance for its slow integration. This renders that feature as an authentic growth, instead of as a top-down insertion without first being cultivate organically and gradually. This gradual development the Extraordinary Form should come by means of certain steps, done with care and prudence, which we will now explore.

\textit{A Step by Step Process}

At this point in time, there is no lawful ability to allow, even as options, features found only in the Ordinary Form to be inserted into the Extraordinary Form and vice versa. This is a good thing for the time being. \textit{Summorum Pontificum} is approaching its tenth anniversary and there are not many signs of the mutual enrichment of the Extraordinary Form within the ritual itself, but if things proceed as Benedict XVI and others intend, eventually the first step will be
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made. The preliminary phase in this process was the freedom of the 1962 missal and its growth in usage. The goal for the future involves enough growth of the Extraordinary Form throughout the Church to initiate a first step in the process of “mutual enrichment” and the continuation of the classical Roman rite’s organic development. This first step assumes that liturgical law and rubrics are more or less the same as they were in 2007 when Benedict XVI’s motu proprio was issued. Here, mutual enrichment would not entail a change to the 1962 rubrics themselves, but a change made “within the rubrics regarding the way a ritual is enacted by a community.”  

The second step in this process would in fact see a change to the rubrics. These changes would simply allow the option to enact new rituals or prayers. The new liturgical features may be elements taken from the Ordinary Form, or at least influenced by them. Additionally, they may be “innovations” cultivated from the ground up from preexisting forms if the “good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them.” We will now examine the first step in this process: the Ordinary Form’s ritual influence on the celebration of the Extraordinary Form.

The First Step: Changes without Altering the Missal

Assuming that the preliminary phase is successful and there is sufficient growth of the Extraordinary Form of the Roman rite, one will then see its effects on the minds of bishops, priests, ministers, and laity alike. Awareness of the ritual and an understanding of its functions are a part of this first step of organic liturgical development. Prudentially determining when the preliminary phase has come to its completion may prove difficult and would obviously rely on the extent of the growth of the Extraordinary Form, assuming it continues to grow in the first place. Catechetical instruction and general education is foremost in anything; the ability for the laity to understand Catholic doctrine concerning the Mass is of extreme importance and it was even one of the fundamental aspects of the Liturgical Movement during the last century.
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The Extraordinary Form can undertake, without violating its rubrics, one of the most obvious changes that involves the external or physical participation of the people: more prayerful responses between the priest and the faithful as well as their participation through singing sacred music, which was a desire expressed by the Second Vatican Council.\textsuperscript{266} The conciliar reform brought about a greater interaction and correlation between the priest and the people. This can be seen as a “true fruit” of the Council where it “directed our attention to the relationship between the faithful and the liturgy.”\textsuperscript{267} The cultivation of active participation had already been attempted before the post-conciliar changes with the various forms of the “dialogue Mass” by participating in the responses with the priest as well as singing the more familiar, unchanging ordinary parts of the Mass.\textsuperscript{268} These “ordinary parts” of the Mass should often be performed in the Gregorian style of sacred music.

This recommendation also appeared in the 1948 North American Liturgical Week. Fr. Thomas Dennehy argued that in order to fulfil the directives of St. Pius X and Pius XI, the faithful should sing the ordinary parts of the Mass. These “ordinary parts” of the Mass are those in the Extraordinary Form that are repeated each Mass without change and include the *Kyrie*, the *Gloria*, the *Credo*, the *Sanctus*, the *Angus Dei*, etc. Dennehy explains that for common parish celebrations the ordinary parts should be sung in “the simplest Gregorian melodies… the simpler the melodies are, the easier will be our success in congregational singing.”\textsuperscript{269} This simple chant is in opposition to polyphony that requires substantial training and timing in order to perform correctly. The Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1958 also approved of this idea due to Gregorian chant’s simplicity and hence ability to cultivate more physical active participation.\textsuperscript{270} Thus, plain chant would be easier to follow and in time the congregation can more easily participate in these
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ordinary parts of the Mass. Physical participation is an obvious mimicking of the Ordinary Form’s successes in increasing the vocal participation of the people and hence a healthy instance of mutual enrichment.

Gregorian chant in the ordinary parts of the Mass would add to the clarity and the external participation of the faithful. The Second Vatican Council states that Gregorian chant is to be given a “pride of place” in the liturgy and, advocating for increased active participation, teaches that the laity should be able to “say or to sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them.”271 This is also true of the Latin prayers that the priest says with the server. Dr. William Johnston describes the Ordinary Form’s dialogue aspect as being capable of enriching the Extraordinary Form in this way, as the priest’s role should result in “genuine human communication” when praying and speaking the Latin. The people, therefore, should know the “meaning and significance of the brief Latin phrases and can say or sing them with intelligence and intention.” The priest, on the other hand, can speak the Latin with “intelligence, decorum, and clarity,” which would render a more proper worship of God and enrich the people’s participation insofar as it contributes to the “sacrality of the community’s ars celebrandi.”272 This is opposed to simply speedily and mechanically praying the Latin while the congregation has an insufficient active and intelligent part.

In order to facilitate proper organic growth, gentle and prudent guidance is necessary in encouraging the physical active participation of the faithful in the Extraordinary Form. The lay faithful’s participation should not be mandatory in a sense that they are required by the rubrics to perform certain things along every step of the Mass. Rather, they should be encouraged to take a more active part and to let their participation grow in a prudent manner, always keeping in mind the circumstances of local pastoral situations. Some, such as Monsignor Gamber, feel that the missal of Paul VI placed too much emphasis on rubrical requirements for external participation
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without giving freedom to “modern man” in liturgical involvement. A simultaneous encouragement to take a more physical and intelligent part in the liturgy mixed with a respect for the freedom of the individual to participate in the way he feels is most conducive may foster an organic response. This would result in a very slow and gradual movement towards a more external and relational participation without falling into the excessive extreme of “activism,” as well as guard against the alienation of those who attend the Extraordinary Form due to dramatic change. This is in opposition to the other extreme of a restrictive environment that sees “rubricism” as a dictating principle where the lay faithful have no role and the development of the liturgy is restrained and allowed no growth.

Once the first step grows to a substantial point it may serve as the foundation towards a prudent implementation of the second step: gradual change to the missal of the Extraordinary Form itself.

The Second Step: Missal Revision through Organic Growth and Mutual Enrichment

The second step, as explained previously, would require legal permission in its effort to proceed with liturgical development. This legal permission must proceed in accordance with the principles of organic growth; it must begin at the local level depending on the pastoral situation, and grow gradually from forms already existing. Johnston notes that allowing for changes in the Extraordinary Form could come by way of a bishop’s conference, as “a conference of bishops can follow established procedures to request of the Apostolic See approval for adaptations within their conference.”

Allowing for flexibility in the Extraordinary Form through a regional bishops’ conference would entail a more detailed and explicit guideline concerning proper organic development, as argued in chapter one. Any change to the liturgy would firstly be a pastoral response on the local level, developed from already existing liturgical practice, retaining continuity with the rite itself and the theology of the Mass. The Holy See would be principally
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responsible for guarding such liturgical growth, but some delegation would be given to the
bishops. Such a model would reflect the earlier practice of slow organic change through the
guardianship of the proper ecclesiastical authority. In this instance, a sharp distinction must be
made between novelty and “innovation” as described in the first chapter, which is purely
inventing a liturgical practice and artificially inserting it into the liturgy. This should be avoided.
Many have noted that in today’s pastoral situation there appears to be a lot of liturgical creativity
and abuse. In light of this, it is necessary to guard against abuse in this process of development.
At a minimum, delegation to bishops or their conferences must be maintained and coupled with,
once again, the approval of the Holy See for any further changes.

**Prudent Options: The Avoidance of Mandatory Change**

Mutual enrichment in the Extraordinary Form in the second step should see firstly a
pastoral prudence with a mind towards guarding against dramatic change that could alienate some
people. Once again, the rubrics should initially allow for changes as options in order to see if such
practices will organically take hold or simply fall into disuse. A notable present day occurrence of
this was mentioned earlier with the Holy See’s allowance for the option of reading Scripture in
the vernacular during Low Mass. Fr. Paul McGavin explains that a future process of adding
options could easily be instituted the 1962 missal by way of the “textual apparatus of brackets and
footnotes.” He explains that this is a feature that the missal of Paul VI adopted in its various
options and methods of celebration. He notes, for example, that the “*Orate fratres*” has a footnote
which allows the option of saying “pray brothers and sisters” instead of “pray brethren.”

Hence, any future substantial change in the Extraordinary Form should be inserted as an
option after following the usual criteria: it must be theologically sound and reflect the truths
contained in the context of the specific liturgical function, it must organically and gradually grow
from existing forms, it must be in a response to a pastoral need whether to benefit the people
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directly or to benefit the glorification of God, and finally it should reflect a pastoral prudence and not something that harms the objective liturgical tradition.\textsuperscript{278} If such a practice were to see a widespread usage over a substantial period of time, then it could move towards a more mandatory codification, as in the example of Pius V and the “Last Gospel.”

The concept of “options” should not be taken to an excessive level. Options in the Extraordinary Form that jettison traditional and originally developed prayers and ritual in favor of newly constructed ones should be avoided. Inserting a novelty as an optional substitution could be viewed as an excuse to ignore organically developed and traditional elements. It is also sometimes considered a precedent towards liturgical experimentation that accommodates the sensibilities of the presider and congregation in an excessive manner. Some, such as monsignor Gamber see the many “may-instructions” in the Ordinary Form as helping to entice an atmosphere that has “paved the way for the liturgy to be changed at will and quite arbitrarily.”\textsuperscript{279} The allowance of options should be prudent, not used as an excuse to jettison traditional elements, and guarded by the Holy See, yet their admittance may be permitted through the “sound judgement of the bishops or local pastors.”\textsuperscript{280} In the next section, examples of what kind of options may be allowed in the Extraordinary Form in order to form a foundation for its continued organic growth and to cultivate the active participation of the people will be explored.

\textit{Priest, People, and Choir: An Alignment}

The 20\textsuperscript{th} century Liturgical Movement’s overall goal was to promote the active and intelligent participation of the people and this was adopted by the Second Vatican council. The Council taught that the faithful must obtain a “good understanding of the rites and prayers” so that they can take part in Holy Mass, “conscious of what they are doing with devotion and full collaboration.”\textsuperscript{281} A simple and initially optional change to the Extraordinary Form in this second
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step would be an alignment of some of the priest’s and server’s roles with that of the faithful and the choir in the ordinary parts of the Mass. This was seen in the brief life of the 1962 missal’s revisions during the 1960s: the so-called 1965 and 1967 missals. These prescriptions were handed down by the Concilium in the document Inter Oecumenici, “The celebrant is not to say privately those parts of the Proper sung or recited by the choir or the congregation. The celebrant may sing or recite the parts of the Ordinary together with the congregation or choir.”

As mentioned previously, the ordinary parts of the Mass are the prayers that remain the same in the 1962 missal, such as the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei. In the Extraordinary Form, the priest prays these prayers inaudibly while the choir, and sometimes the congregation, sings them audibly. The result is that the priest finishes his prayers first and sits down, waiting for the choir to finish. This does not occur in the Ordinary Form, which, in many instances, aligned these separated roles into one single prayer. Sacrosanctum Concilium taught that each individual, whether a minister or layperson, should participate in those parts “which pertain to his office by the nature of the rite and the principles of liturgy.” Certain prayers of the Mass are reserved for the priest alone; however, in an effort to reduce “useless repetition” and arguably to promote “simplification,” the implementation of Sacrosanctum Concilium saw the elimination of the repeated prayers of the priest, people, and choir, as these prayers belong to the entire assembly. Thus, the priest would not pray the Gloria, for example, in a seemingly private manner while the people and the choir sang it publically.

The Extraordinary Form could follow the example of the Ordinary Form and subsequently the Second Vatican Council’s directives. Initially, aligning some of the prayers of the priest and people could be introduced as an option and pertain to the ordinary parts of the Mass. The faithful could then pray with the priest via “physical participation.” Johnston explains

---
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this would be a “basic step in reuniting priest and people in celebration of the liturgy of the Mass together.”\footnote{Johnston, Care for the Church and Its Liturgy, 245.} Making this change optional would represent both pastoral prudence and a cultivation of organic growth. Those accustomed to the 1962 missal would not have to dramatically change their routine, yet they would be encouraged to participate together with the priest in “dialogue” or in unison through the Ordinary parts of the Mass in the simple plain chant.

\textit{The Third Scripture Reading}

The council also directed that Scripture be given a “more representative portion” during Holy Mass through a “prescribed number of years.”\footnote{Sacrosanctum Concilium, 51.} The increase in Scripture readings was an idea of the Liturgical Movement, which suggested that this could be accomplished either through a two or three year reading cycle. Currently, the 1962 missal has only two Scripture readings, the first is usually an epistle reading from the New Testament and the second is the Gospel. This system is on a one year cycle, as opposed to the Ordinary Form’s three year cycle. An additional Scripture reading in the Extraordinary Form could enrich the people’s exposure to Scripture and give an opportunity for “relational participation” through the hearing and mediation of the new reading.

The principle of organic growth and pastoral sensitivity should be foundational in any alternations to the lectionary. This proposal recommends that a slow and gradual growth for the Extraordinary Form that respects its one year reading cycle is possible. As explained previously, Gamber suggests that the use any additional Scripture readings in the 1962 missal should be left to the priest’s discretion.\footnote{Gamber, Reform of the Roman Liturgy, 92.} This can be both in terms of giving the option to use the additional reading in the first place and the freedom of the priest, or some local authority such as the bishop, to choose what Scripture passages to use, excluding a Gospel reading. This would reflect a model of organic growth seen in the past, where local needs are accommodated and allowed the freedom to grow, while at the same time, guarding the integrity of the liturgy’s traditional model and
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slowly developing it through the passage of time. The future result of such a method may see a
codification of the additional Scripture reading if certain books or passages eventually gain
widespread usage.

*The Prayer of the Faithful*

The Church desired to restore some liturgical practices that were lost “through the
accidents of history… as may seem useful or necessary.” The Council explicitly names one
such practice, the “prayer of the faithful,” a feature seen in the Ordinary Form immediately after
the Nicene Creed. The intention of these prayers is a deeper relational participation of the people
who interceded for the Church, civil authorities, social issues, and for the “salvation of the entire
world.” In the Extraordinary Form, this practice could be restored, but once again on the
principle of organic growth through “rubrical ‘bracketing’ that would provide for their use before
the offertory.” In 1964, the commission in charge of implementing the Second Vatican
Council’s liturgical reform interpreted the restoration of the prayers of the faithful as a feature
that should be left to “the competent territorial authority” in deciding whether or not to introduce
it. The placement was to be before the Offertory, “after the Oremus,” with provisions that it
may be prayed at either the priest’s chair, the altar, the lectern, or “the edge of the sanctuary.”

Regarding the ritual itself, the traditional form of the prayers of the faithful should be
retained, as it represents the general form of the prayers as they have been organically developed.
The formulas for these prayers, therefore, should be derived through the historical evidence, and
as noted by the Council, are mostly fixed subjects for the Church and the world. These include,
“prayers for all men, for the Church and her ministers, for the state, the poor, their enemies,
travelers, prisoners, for those who bring gifts, in short for all classes of people.” Jungmann
argues that these themes are actually still contained in the traditional Roman missal, but are only
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used in the Good Friday intercessions.\(^{294}\) Hence, following the Council’s directives on restorations and following the principles organic development which respects the objective liturgical tradition, the optional usage of the prayers of the faithful could be incorporated into the Extraordinary Form. Such an option should be based on these fixed intentions and derived the formulas from the Good Friday intercessions. This fixed formula is in opposition to the more freely worded method as seen in the Ordinary Form, which some, like Dobszay, consider as generating a “fickle impulse for variety.”\(^{295}\) However, he does feel that at least one prayer could reflect the local circumstances of the faithful, but that the structure as a whole should be based on the traditional form of these prayers.

The addition of these prayers call the faithful into a more active role in the liturgy as they are formally called upon to prayer for these intentions as the Mass flows into the Holy Sacrifice. A restoration of this kind, because of its antiquity in the Roman rite, should not be considered antiquarian. This is firstly because the prayers of the faithful or “the General Prayer of the Church” was a feature lost to history, as opposed to being superseded by a feature that is objectively superior. Secondly, its restoration is not merely for the sake of its age, nor does its revival have the goal of restoring it to the most ancient possible point in its history. Additionally, letting the Prayer of the faithful organically take hold in the Extraordinary Form would not constitute a dramatic alteration of the missal and its traditional formulas. This feature would serve to “invigorate the traditional rite” as well as spur the congregation’s physical and relational participation especially before offering the Eucharistic sacrifice.\(^{296}\)

*The Offertory Rite*

A feature that organically development in the Roman missal was the offertory rite.\(^{297}\) The Roman Mass possessed this “offertory rite” as early as the 8th century. Here, the people would
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bring gifts to the Pope before the offertory prayer but ultimately this became cumbersome.\textsuperscript{298} Eventually, the Pope and his assistants came down from the sanctuary in order to collect the offerings of the people, most notably the bread and wine that would be used for the Holy Sacrifice.\textsuperscript{299} In comparison to the current Offertory Procession found in the Ordinary Form it is clear that the ancient Roman rite allowed the people to bring their gifts up to present to the priest, but a style in which there is a formalized procession through the entire nave of the Church does not appear in the historical data.\textsuperscript{300} Additionally, the people brought their own gifts instead of the parish church supplying the material to be offered. A later development in the Roman rite is derived from John Burchard, a papal master of ceremonies, in his \textit{Ordo} of 1502.\textsuperscript{301} The rubric describes the priest standing on the epistle side of the altar and receiving gifts from the people, who kiss his maniple. The priest then prays over them saying, “may your sacrifice be acceptable to God” or, “may you receive an hundredfold and possess eternal life.”\textsuperscript{302} This ritual was expunged during the reforms of Pius V in the 1570 missal. The reasons for its absence may have to do with the fear that it would “induce greed” among the clergy.\textsuperscript{303} Another reason may be due to the fact that people simply did not “take advantage of the opportunity” to participate so formally within the Mass and it was simply not included during the Tridentine reforms.\textsuperscript{304} In any event, a modified form of the offertory ritual was created for the missal of Paul VI based on the evidence of a developed ritual that is generally considered a feature that disappeared “through the accidents of history.”\textsuperscript{305} Thus, its optional reintroduction to the Extraordinary Form may be plausible, but only within the scope of what is known in the historical analysis.
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Even with the rubrics of Burchard there is, once again, no indication of a formal procession through the nave of the Church and it is clear that the people brought their own gifts to the priest. In essence, the exact ritual style of the Offertory Procession as seen in the Ordinary Form is not known to have occurred in the history of the Roman rite. However, organic development could see such a manifestation in the Extraordinary Form in time, as the last known use of an Offertory ritual by the people had an option for them to come to the priest and present gifts, which could indicate either a procession through the nave of the Church or simply walking to the sanctuary from their current location. This restoration, therefore, should be prudent, respecting the ritual as much as it is known, its insertion should be optional, and it should be placed in its traditional location, following the Creed and the Prayers of the Faithful. The form of the ritual may follow Burchard’s rubrics, but in light of the issues that an offertory ritual has caused over the course of history with regards to greed and lofty gifts in a show of status, the traditional form of simply offering bread and wine may suffice.

Such an offering, if the faithful so choose to actually make unleavened bread to be consecrated at the Holy Mass, may prove to be a means of participation, both physical and relational. The laity would offer their work to the priest, who would use such gifts to offer the Holy Sacrifice, which in turn would return to the people in Holy Communion as Christ Himself. This provides the laity a way to “visualize their participation in the Sacrifice.” An Offertory ritual may, once again, fulfill the pastoral desires of the Liturgical Movement and at the same time respect the objective liturgical tradition and organic development through its use of the traditional formula and optional employment. In the absence of knowledge regarding how the people brought gifts to the priest, it would be prudent for the time being to simply have them bring offerings up directly from their pews in the same manner that they would come up to receive Holy Communion.

---

New Prefaces and Saints

The introduction of new Prefaces and Saints for the Extraordinary Form has been previously noted as the explicit desire of Benedict XVI in his vision of continued development and enrichment. There have been many new Saints since the codification of the 1962 missal and their incorporation, along with the appropriate propers, should not be much of a problem, as this has always been done throughout the history of the Church. New Prefaces are to be considered in “moderation without disturbing the natural balance of the structures of the Roman Mass.” New Prefaces, derived from pre-Tridentine Roman Sacramentaries, would be beneficial. The justification for this can be examined in the 1962 missal, which contained anomalies. For example, the missal contained a preface for the Trinity “which is said throughout the Advent season [and] a Preface for St. Joseph, but none for the feasts of other important saints.” Additionally a “modest variety” of new Prefaces would enrich the Extraordinary Form while maintaining its “stability” insofar as maintaining familiarity without an excessive number of prefaces so that recollection could impart “a deeper impression on the minds of those participating.” The benefits of additional prefaces also include a more proper and fitting prayer for the specific feast, which would consequently enrich those who pray by orienting them more closely to the meaning of what is being celebrated.

The “Prayers AT the Foot of the Altar” and the “Last Gospel”

Several figures in the Liturgical Movement called for the possibility of eliminating the priest’s personal prayers at the beginning of Mass, the “prayers before the foot of the altar.” Subsequently, they also suggested the elimination of another private prayer, the “Last Gospel,” or the first 14 verses of the Gospel of John recited after the final blessing. Others called for the recitation of these prayers to be made during the procession to and from the sacristy, which was
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their original form during their early development in the Middle Ages. However, the continued use of these prayers has produced some quasi-participation from the lay faithful. During the Last Gospel there is a particular point which reads, “And the Word was made Flesh,” where the priest kneels. Several hand missals from the 1940s through the 1960s, as well as reprints today, instruct that, “here all kneel” or genuflect. The result was that the people mimicked the priest in the genuflection, participating in a Scripture reading they cannot hear, but can only follow with the use of their translated hand missal or by memory.

Hence, the suggestion here would be to render the Last Gospel audible and at least sung during solemn celebrations. Reciting the Last Gospel in this manner is similar to what was done in many countries during the Middle Ages, where “the Gospel of John was recited by all present, a practice which obviously was planned to strengthen its function as a blessing.” Additionally, it is a legitimate liturgical feature that organically grew with the liturgy through the Middle Ages until its codification under Pius V. If given the option of audibility, it can serve as an enrichment not only to the priest as a personal devotion, but also to the laity. Its pastoral benefits may prove fruitful as it is represents a greater exposure to an important part of Holy Scripture, expressing the Mystery of Christ becoming flesh for our salvation and highlighting His divinity in the face of the present day’s “deplorably low Christology.”

The Prayers at the Foot of the Altar should be retained for the edification of the priest, as the text is derived from Psalm 42. There is a possibility, however, that some optional modifications to Extraordinary Form may be made here in light of the people’s participation. In order to maintain the integrity of the objective liturgical tradition and the organic development that it has undergone, this proposal suggests that the “Prayers at the Foot of the Altar” undergo no
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textual change. However, in most Extraordinary Form Masses, the choir begins to sing the *Introit* while the priest begins the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar. The choir’s *Introit* runs through the *Confiteor* as well, rendering it said only by the priest and his assistants, inaudibly.

This particular situation in the Extraordinary Form is complex, but there may possibly be an optional adjustment that can be implemented. One possible solution would be to start the *Introit* in its normal fashion at the beginning of the priest’s entrance procession. This was originally done in the Roman rite and there was an attempt to restore it to its proper place in the early 20th century.\textsuperscript{317} The priest could enter the sanctuary and begin the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar in the inaudible fashion, as this prayer pertains him. During this time, the assembly could sing together with the choir, but due to the *Introit* belonging to the propers, this may prove difficult, so instead they could sing the *Gloria Patri* together, as it one unchanging feature of the *Introit*. After the *Introit* and the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar have been completed, the *Confiteor* may be prayed after the priest’s *Confiteor* or together with the priest, audibly and intoned. When the priest finally approaches the altar, and after incensation, he may begin to pray his *Introit* or even eliminate it altogether.

Such an elimination would have to be carefully considered and follow the precepts of organic development and the identification of accretions, with respect to the objective liturgical tradition and pastoral situation. An argument may be made supporting this elimination because the *Introit* was prayed by a choir during the longer precessions early in the Roman rite, even into the latter Middle Ages, and not performed by the priest per se in Solemn Masses.\textsuperscript{318} Further, the influence of the “low Mass” is described by Jungmann and Fortescue as having the gradual effect on the “high Mass” or “Missa Cantata” with regards to the *Introit*.\textsuperscript{319} During Low Mass the priest, due to the lack of a choir, had to pray the *Introit* on his own. The result of the priest...
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praying the *Introit* was that it eventually found its way into the High Mass as the second *Introit*, prayed by priest after the choir had finished. Thus, in the case of the *Missa Cantata*, optional adjustments to the beginning of the Mass could be reflective of a simplification, in similar fashion to Pius V’s elimination of *tropes*. It also returns to the laity a chance to participate in the *Introit* and then the *Confiteor* since the “second *Confiteor*” before Holy Communion was eliminated during the last modification in the rubrics to the traditional Roman rite in 1961. The detailed restructuring above is only a suggestion; its practice and retention is based on the principle of organic growth. It responds to the pastoral desires of the Liturgical Movement by giving the people a more active role coupled with modest simplification. It does not affect the objective liturgical tradition, as all the prayers, as they have developed, have been maintained.

The above suggestions for the Extraordinary Form of the Roman rite are certainly not exhaustive and are designed to reflect what has already been suggested during the Liturgical Movement, some of which have already been attempted after the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Additionally, it purposely avoids any great attempts at creating any “innovations” as defined in the first chapter. Instead, the suggestions focused on existing features found in the history of the Roman rite coupled with simplifications and modest adjustments, all of which are optional, and some of which come from the example of the Ordinary Form. The goal here is to attempt to start a slow and gradual development of the traditional Roman rite once again, respecting the objective liturgical tradition and the sensibilities of those who now use this form of the Mass through adherence to the pastoral desires of the Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican Council. Only through a long process of organic development, guided by pastorally minded prelates, can any major innovations spring to life. In the next section, the same principles will be utilized for the Ordinary Form of the Roman rite with an emphasis on pastoral necessities and enrichment form the Extraordinary Form.
The Continued Development of the Ordinary Form

The Harmonious Existence of each Form

The difficult task that some, such as Monsignor Gamber and Fr. Christopher Smith, share is the preliminary step in the process of the mutual enrichment of the Ordinary Form: the expansion of the use of the Extraordinary Form. The proponents of mutual enrichment envision that in most parishes an Extraordinary Form Mass would be celebrated “as part of the ordinary Sunday Mass schedule.” Exposing the faithful and priests to each Form of the Mass would cultivate familiarity and would establish the foundation of organic development and mutual enrichment. The Extraordinary Form requires growth beyond its current isolation, intentional or not, in designated parishes and needs to be slowly inserted into most parish’s normal Sunday schedules. Cardinal Hoyos, formally the Prefect of the Congregation for the Clergy and former president of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei, has reported that even Benedict XVI wished that every parish would have a regular Extraordinary Form Mass. The existence of the Extraordinary Form within normal parish life may increase the pace and the effects of enrichment. Conversely, the Ordinary Form can establish a stronger link with the Roman tradition, using the Extraordinary Form as a point of reference to draw from in its own enrichment. Benedict XVI wrote that the Extraordinary Form “remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful.” The harmonious existence of each form of Mass in most parishes across the Latin rite should be pursued as one of the foundational steps towards mutual enrichment and a stronger establishment of organic development.

The First Step: Changes without altering the Missal

In the same manner as in the Extraordinary Form, but to a much greater extent, the first step involves various options that can be utilized in the Ordinary Form and consequently can be considered treasures of Catholic tradition suited to mutual enrichment. Also, as stated previously, there always must be a continual education on the part of parish pastors concerning the proper ends and truths of the sacred liturgy and consequently, the use of various more traditional elements that have existed in the Roman rite for centuries but have fallen into more general disuse in the Ordinary Form. For example, one area for enrichment can be seen in the Ordinary Form’s General Instruction, which directs that priests bow their head at the name of the Divine Persons, the Blessed Virgin, or the Saint whose feast day they are celebrating. Fr. Finigan observes that often priests do not follow this practice and that the Extraordinary Form, which routinely and frequently requires such a small gesture, could enrich the Ordinary Form through priests who avail themselves to celebrate both uses. In this manner, many lay persons may take notice and mimic the practice, which can in turn help their participation and respect for the name of God and His Saints. Features such as these can be found throughout the rubrics of the Ordinary Form and require no change to the missal itself. We will now explore in detail additional traditional elements that can be slowly employed as the pastoral situation demands.

The use of the Latin Language

The Second Vatican Council permitted the use of vernacular in the liturgy, highlighting the possible advantages for the faithful that could be gained from understanding certain parts of the Mass, such as the Scripture readings as well as “prayers and chants.” This directive did not specify how much vernacular was to be employed, giving the bishops the authority “to decide...
whether, and to what extent, the vernacular language is to be used.\textsuperscript{327} Its directives also indicate that the use of Latin was to be preserved in the Latin rites and additionally, it called for the laity to be able to “sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them.”\textsuperscript{328} The value of the Latin language has never been discredited by the Church. \textit{Sacrosanctum Concilium}, in describing Latin Gregorian chant, states that Latin has a “pride of place” in the liturgy. Therefore, Latin chant, along with the general use of Latin, should be reintroduced in normal parish life.\textsuperscript{329}

Cardinal Ratzinger, while acknowledging the council’s admittance of vernacular and praising many aspects of the liturgical reform, notes that the loss of Latin has helped to blur the lines between liturgy and society, “to most people the liturgy seems to be rather something for the individual congregation to arrange.”\textsuperscript{330} This is, in part, due to a liturgical language’s ability in helping cultivate an elevation out of the natural everyday experience into an encounter with the supernatural. The common marketplace language is replaced by a mysterious and elevated approach, which can help lift the heart and mind to a sense of the sacred and the mysteries of God. In a way, this may quell the “activism” previously examined and situate persons to cultivate a more interior and relational participation. In describing the Extraordinary From, Benedict XVI notes that the Church’s “Latin liturgy” has “inspired countless saints in their spiritual life, confirmed many peoples in the virtue of religion and enriched their devotion.”\textsuperscript{331} This inspiration and enrichment was done in a liturgy that was entirely in Latin, suggesting that the language is not necessarily a barrier. Bishop Marc Aillet explains that the use of Latin in particular places during the Mass helps participants gain a sense of mystery and divine transcendence through the
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use of an uncommon tongue.\textsuperscript{332} He writes that the increased use of Latin would “make it possible for the spiritual life and interior life to grow.”\textsuperscript{333}

The culmination of Holy Mass is seen in the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, the death of Jesus, who was both God and man, an act of love, but also a sacred mystery. To this end, Archbishop Athanasius Schneider explains that the use of Latin is a constant sign that expresses the mystery of Redemption.\textsuperscript{334} Christ’s sacrifice on the cross is the ultimate act of love, an act that transcends the boundaries of time. Latin can become a symbol of this mystery through familiarity with its words and phrases; it does not constitute a largely unfamiliar language, but it can assume a mode of a recognizable yet mysterious quality. Latin can become very familiar to the laity through the repeated parts of the Mass. Yet, its mysterious quality remains even through repetition that produces familiarity. This is because not every single word can be precisely deciphered, yet some Latin word and phrases may become familiar in one’s mind to the point that one will recognize what is currently being prayed, hence enabling participation. Thus, it reflects the mysteries of the Catholic faith: understandable and familiar, yet not fully grasped because of the infinity of God. Hence, there is a pastoral advantage to the use of Latin, even alongside vernacular. It can help cultivate a sense of the sacred and mysterious, drawing the community towards the wonder of God and instilling an increased sense of reverence towards the sacred, albeit if executed properly. Therefore, this proposal suggests that the Ordinary Form, influenced by the Extraordinary Form, should slowly reestablish the use of the Latin language, a venerable liturgical tradition spanning well over 1,000 years.

However, the reintroduction of Latin should in no way alienate the faithful, and it should not impede on their active participation. Therefore, such a move should be very slow and adopted in a pastorally prudent manner. The ordinary parts of the Mass, the prayers that are repeated,
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should be the obvious choice in adopting the Latin language, or Greek in the case of the *Kyrie*. The reintroduction of Latin in the prayers of the Mass may be employed in these repeated parts, such as the Lord’s Prayer or the Creed, which can be “set to simple melodies” so that their recitation would not be cumbersome and require a trained schola, as is needed for the more advanced polyphonic compositions. If done properly and if it bears fruit, the Latin language may possibly gradually and organically be reincorporated into normal liturgical life without hindrance to active participation.

*Considerations for Ad Orientem*

The *ad orientem* posture is the position of the priest and lay faithful facing in the same direction during the Mass. This is the posture of the priest in the Extraordinary Form the vast majority of the time with only some instances of his facing the people directly, such as at the various addresses of “*Dominus Vobiscum.*” There are some pastoral considerations supporting its restoration in the Ordinary Form. Some, such as Fr. Joseph Fessio, argue that this posture is more suited to the celebration of the Holy Mass in many instances. He warns that if the priest faces the people, there may be a danger of the priest being seen as a “performer” while the congregation are spectators. Others argue that this unintended consequence has already occurred, creating an “informal and conversational style of celebration,” which has the further danger of “clericalism” as the priest becomes the main focus point of the people’s attention. When the priest and people face the same direction, they are less focused on each other and orient their attention towards the altar and the imagery surrounding it, including imagery or even icon on the priest’s vestments. The orientation “towards the Lord” more perfectly represent the “pilgrim Church on the way to our goal” journeying in the same direction. As Fessio says, “we want to look *with* each other and with the priest towards the rising sun.”

---

Theologically, this position more acutely demonstrates Catholic doctrine concerning worshiping God and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Monsignor Guido Marini, Master of Pontifical Liturgical Celebrations, argues that the Mass is principally an action that is addressed to God through Jesus Christ. Hence, he considers it more suitable when the intercessory and sacrificial actions of priest are done in an ad orientem position. He argues that the orientation of the priest to face the congregation during at least the Eucharistic Sacrifice “would be a grievous error.”

The priest’s role includes being the leader and presider, as well as what makes possible the people’s participation in the Paschal Mystery. Hence, his orientation supports the “interior participation of each individual in the liturgy” and thus, his ad orientem posture guides the people’s attention in facing the Lord, along with the priest, in offering the Holy Sacrifice and giving due worship to God.

Cardinal Ratzinger also expressed his wish that whenever possible Catholics “should definitely take up again the tradition of facing the east, both in the building of churches and in the celebration of the liturgy.”

This orientation, for at least the “Eucharistic prayer,” represents a common worship with both the priest and the lay faithful facing in the same direction towards “the One who is to come.”

Ad orientem posture expresses a common movement forward, rather than being as a “closed circle” as Ratzinger describes the orientation of facing the people. He further describes ad orientem as both the priest and people facing he same direction in a common act of Trinitarian worship; “a cosmic symbolism… the true location and the true context of the eucharistic celebration is the whole cosmos.”

This is because “facing east” was seen as a hope the resurrection, the second coming of Christ in the Parousia, and a focus point of the Passion of Christ. Ratzinger notes that priest and people facing each other may put too much emphasis on the aspect of the “community character of the Eucharistic celebration” and this can give rise to

340 Ibid.
341 Ratzinger, Spirit of the Liturgy, 70.
342 Ibid., 81.
343 Ratzinger, Feast of Faith, 139.
344 Ibid., 140.
the idea of an “autonomous, complacent community.” Hence, there is a strong theological content in ad orientem which can generate a more perfect orientation of the worshiping community. It shows a movement which the entire Body of Christ is facing towards the Lord unified together in the same “direction for prayer.”

Whether or not a return to the priest and people “facing east” in whole or in part is feasible would be left to organic growth and a necessary amount of education. The lay faithful’s reception of this in the modern environment would not be a simple task, but if the Extraordinary Form were to grow and became a part of many regular Sunday schedules, this posture would become more and more common. Thus, in some instances, the Ordinary Form could adopt this ad orientem posture, such as during the Liturgy of the Eucharist or at least the Eucharistic prayer. There is one feature that could serve as a stepping stone towards the use of ad orientem, and this is the example of Benedict XVI’s use of the crucifix on the center of the altar flanked by candles, serving as a “readily visible” focus point. This can give to both the priest and people a common focus point, much like ad orientem, “[a] fundamental orientation that has given rise to the great heritage of Christian ritual throughout the centuries.”

Thus far, we have examined various features of the Ordinary Form that are contained in the tradition of the Roman rite that are already permitted for use but see little execution in our present day. Some of these features were demonstrated to have potential pastoral benefits for the faithful. The influence of the Extraordinary Form in normative parish life may exert influence on the Ordinary Form to slowly spur the use of these traditional features once again. In the next section, we will explore some suggestions for the alteration of the Ordinary Form, which once
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again respects the objective liturgical tradition, are generally optional in nature, are pastorally driven, and may potentially fall under certain categories as seen in the first chapter, mainly “restorations” in light enrichment form the Extraordinary Form.

**The Second Step: Missal Revision through the Principle of Organic Growth and Mutual Enrichment**

The second step for the Ordinary Form operates in a similar manner as the Extraordinary Form. Many features, prayers, and ritual of the 1962 missal can be inserted into the Ordinary Form through “brackets and footnotes” or initially as options. Fr. Thomas Kocik sees this step as absolutely necessary to further carry out the goal of mutual enrichment where the priest “imports” features of the 1962 missal into the Ordinary Form but at first, only those which would “cause little or no confusion to the faithful,” such as several inaudible prayers the priest alone makes.³⁵⁰ Another priest, Fr. Finigan, argues that such a process should not alarm anyone insofar as it is not a total repudiation of the liturgical revisions following the Second Vatican Council and instead views it as a “growth and progress that takes place without rupture.”³⁵¹ This process follows Benedict XVI’s statement that the 1962 missal is sacred and enriching and that any adopted elements from it should be seen as a part of the “historical pedigree” of the Roman rite. *Summoroum Pontificum*’s directives signal Benedict XVI’s concern regarding the post-conciliar liturgical reforms, which is seen more clearly in his other writings, as has been previously explored. Hence, he wishes to heal the “rupture” and supposed discontinuity between the two Forms by allowing for the use of elements from the 1962 missal and subsequently letting the flow of time and organic development determine if they should continue to be used or simply discarded altogether. We will now examine in detail some of the recommendations for the
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enrichment of the Ordinary Form via the restoration of traditional features and ritual influence form the Extraordinary Form.

*Prayers AT the Foot of the Altar: A Restoration?*

The prayers at the foot of the altar was a feature that slowly developed throughout the Middle Ages and was eventually mandated to be prayed at the altar by Pius V in 1570. These prayers were recited inaudibly by the priest and the server; this was even done in sung Masses as the choir sang the *Introit*. Many in the Liturgical Movement sought their elimination as a superfluous prayer during which the choir involved itself with something entirely different. Some argued for its retention but moved back to its original starting point in the sacristy, while the priest was preparing for Mass, and ending once he reached the altar. An argument can be made for its restoration, but only insofar as it respects the active involvement of the laity. This specifically means that it would not be recited during an entrance hymn, for example. The value of the priest’s prayers, for his own preparation, and hence the benefit of the people has been described previously by Cardinal Ratzinger. Although he does not specifically mention the prayers at the foot of the altar he does remark, “the number of these priestly private prayers has been greatly reduced in the liturgical reform, but, thank God, they do exist.” This suggests a disappointment in some of the removed personal prayers, but more explicitly it indicates the value of these silent prayers so that the priest may remind himself of his personal task via the sacramental priesthood, “so that he may give his whole self to the Lord.”

In the previous section concerning the Extraordinary Form, the suggestion for prayers before the foot of the altar, or Psalm 42, was that they would be retained and that the accompanying prayers of the *Introit* and the *Confiteor* would see a possible altering of their execution. Their preservation was for the benefit of the priest, whose ministry entails the
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sanctification of his flock and the administration of the Sacrament. This is because the brief but inaudible prayers allow him to focus on his ministry. As Ratzinger explains, “the silent prayers of the priest invite him to make his task truly personal, so that he may give his whole self to the Lord.”

In addition, these prayers organically developed throughout the centuries and they neither saw gradual widespread disuse nor were they unnecessary accretions. This is due in part to the fact that it draws upon the richness of Scripture and was meant to prepare the priest in offering the Holy Sacrifice: “These prayers allow the priest to understand - not only on the intellectual level, but with the involvement of his full personality - that now he is about to stand in front of God, he is to perform a service in the name of the Church, on behalf of the people of God.”

Thus, these personal prayers aid in the priest’s preparation in his duty as presider and sacramental minister. The importance of this duty marked when, even before ascending to the altar, he prepares himself in a proper and fitting manner. Additionally, the lay faithful during this time may enact a silent participation, readying themselves for the Mass, or, if the prayer is done audibly, in a relational manner by absorbing the meaning of this scripture and prayer.

The “Last Gospel”

In a very similar manner to the prayers at the foot of the altar, the Last Gospel could become an optional feature of the Ordinary Form. As previously examined, this prayer was codified by Pius V for use in the priest’s private prayer after the final blessing. During the Liturgical Movement there appears to be some participation by the lay faithful during this prayer, a natural outgrowth of the laity’s encouragement to participate. This can be observed in their genuflection with the priest and also when they make the sign of the cross with the priest, as Jungmann observes even in the middle of last century.

The Second Vatican Council wished to open up the richness of Scripture to the people and this desire was generally conceived through
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adding additional readings in the lectionary.\textsuperscript{360} However, as suggested previously for the Extraordinary Form, the Last Gospel could become a feature for the Ordinary Form, albeit optional, and prayed audibly by the priest before the dismissal.

The pastoral implications of this are twofold. The first is that the Last Gospel is a “coda that sums up the whole meaning of the Eucharistic action that has preceded it.”\textsuperscript{361} It demonstrates that Christ was in the beginning, that all things were created through Him, and that He is God, the light which shines through every person. It shows that He became flesh “and dwelt among us,” the only begotten of the Father, so that every single person may become a child of God. Secondly, it gives the Church a very important section of Scripture which expresses that Christ really is divine, which is all the more necessary “in an age of often deplorably low Christology.”\textsuperscript{362} Finally, its value is still seen today, as the Last Gospel was given as an optional feature in the Mass of the Anglican Ordinariate by the Holy See.\textsuperscript{363} Its rich theological content and its edifying effect as scripture should not be discounted.

\textit{Holy Communion}

There are several considerations for enrichment involving Holy Communion that stem from a concern about the fitting means of handling the Sacred Species and, as an extension, a pastoral concern regarding the proper respect and attitudes of the laity. Specifically, this concern centers on the handling of the Sacred Species by the non-ordained. The pastoral concern over the reception of Holy Communion in the hand is seen in Cardinal Ranjith’s description of it as a contributing factor in the “weakening of the attitude of reverence towards the Sacred Eucharistic Species.”\textsuperscript{364} He argues that the previous practice of the Roman rite, reception kneeling and on the tongue directly from the minister, better safeguards reverence and by extension may also assist in

\textsuperscript{360} Sacrosanctum Concilium, 51.
\textsuperscript{361} Nichols, “Salutary Dissatisfaction,” 207.
\textsuperscript{362} Ibid.
fostering a clearer perception of the Catholic doctrine concerning Christ’s Real Presence. This interpretation is based on a pastoral observance of a “spirit of carelessness” after reception where individuals display attitudes “as though nothing extraordinary has happened.”

Archbishop Athanasius Schneider explains that reception on the tongue while kneeling helps to express a “heightened regard for the Sacrament of the Eucharist.” This is manifested through the reception’s careful consideration for particle loss and the fact that reception in this manner is extraordinary in that, unlike common food which is taken with the hands, it is rather given to the faithful by Christ’s ministers. Further, the bodily posture of reception is explained by Archbishop Schneider as being tied to proper dispositions. The Extraordinary Form’s practice of kneeling at Holy Communion is a type of genuflection, an act that shows both humble unworthiness and respect, an “act of adoration.” It is also a feature that humbles the person to receive in a childlike manner, as this posture mimics a child receiving food from his parent.

Hence, what is proposed here is an enrichment of the Ordinary Form regarding the handling of the Sacred Species as exemplified in the Extraordinary Form.

Holy Communion’s reception in this manner and by extension the distribution of the Sacred Species by ordained clergy is also an organic development that reflects the Church’s Eucharistic theology as it developed. As its theology developed, the Church gradually moved away from reception in the hand and the handling of the Eucharist was done by the ordained. The handling of the Sacred Species by ordained clergy, outside of emergencies or extreme necessity, helps to manifest a sense of the sacred, which serves to visibly demonstrate Catholic doctrine in a clearer manner, contributing to a healthy formation of the faithful, and thus gives due respect to Jesus Christ. This, in turn, facilitates the active participation of the faithful as the external ritual more clearly reflects the doctrine of the Eucharist, making it “a visible testimony to the faith of
the Church in the Eucharistic Mystery and even something that heals and teaches our modern culture.” The goal of the Liturgical Movement was to assist the laity, both in education and through the reform of the ritual, so that they may understand and actively participate in the Mass via that understanding. The Second Vatican Council affirms that in the general restoration of the liturgy the ritual should be revised so that it more clearly manifests the “holy things which they signify.” While reception on the tongue, kneeling, and from the hands of the clergy was already the norm during the Council, it can be argued that it is still a clearer manifestation of “holy things” compared to its present day counterpart, and hence, it may be seen as more in line with the desire of the Council.

Reception of the Holy Eucharistic on the tongue, kneeling, and with the absence of non-ordained extraordinary ministers is currently possible in the rubrics of the Ordinary Form. However, if the clergy previously considered are correct, there is a pastoral need and continuity supporting favoring the more traditional mode of reception and handling of the Sacred Species. John Paul II expressed his view on the handling of the Sacred Species in his letter *Dominicae Cenae*

> To touch the sacred species and to distribute them with their own hands is a privilege of the ordained, one which indicates an active participation in the ministry of the Eucharist. It is obvious that the Church can grant this faculty to those who are neither priests nor deacons, as is the case with acolytes in the exercise of their ministry, especially if they are destined for future ordination, or with other lay people who are chosen for this to meet a just need, but always after an adequate preparation.

John Paul II indicates that the normative touching of the Eucharist is the “privilege” of the ordained and the subsequent allowance of lay Extraordinary Ministers of Holy Communion is something that is “granted” for necessary situations. His allowance for the extraordinary ministers was evident even in the Papal liturgies that he presided over and in their use across the Latin

370 Ibid., 50.
371 *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 21.
Church. However, Benedict XVI attempted to manifest a stronger restoration of the traditional practice when possible through his example of giving Holy Communion to those kneeling and on the tongue.\(^{373}\) In the historical analysis of the Roman rite, it was already demonstrated that accretions and abuses saw their eventual elimination after some time, as with the case in the Offertory Ritual. In a similar way, one may argue that there is a concern that “extraordinary ministers of Holy Communion” are too often an “ordinary” occurrence and may constitute “serious theological, liturgical, and pastoral problems, affecting our theology of the Eucharist and the priesthood.”\(^{374}\) This is due in part that their use visibly communicates that the event is more ordinary and detracts from the extraordinary and holy. Hence, the pastoral concerns coupled with the due respect that should be shown towards the Holy Eucharist should merit a serious consideration regarding the handling of the Sacred Species by the non-ordained, which perhaps should be severely curtailed if not eliminated altogether.\(^{375}\)

**Conclusion**

In this chapter we offered arguments highlighting new pastoral concerns regarding the state of the liturgy that affect both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite. The first part focused on explaining the reasons that the Extraordinary Form should not simply rest in its static state of the year 1962. The principle of active participation as cultivate by the Liturgical Movement and directed by the Second Vatican Council was not fully implemented in this form of the Mass. Conversely, the Ordinary Form was seen by many clergymen as having a positive effect, yet there was also a serious loss of liturgical tradition and some potentially inauthentic developments. This was linked to the current pastoral situation in the Church, including the drop in Mass attendance, liturgical ignorance, and liturgical abuse. Hence, the first part of this chapter focused on the major reason that each form the Roman missal should continue to undergo development in light of organic develop and the pastoral situation in the Church.
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In the second part of chapter three, we explored various recommendations for both the Extraordinary and Ordinary Forms of the Roman rite in order to respond to the situation demonstrated in the first part. These recommendations also take into consideration the pastoral desires of the Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican Council, both of which carry over into our present day concerning the ongoing liturgical renewal that the Council envisioned. This pastoral vision has as its foundation the active participation of the lay faithful. The recommendations also attempted to follow the principle of organic development by respecting objective liturgical tradition, giving room for gradual development through optional adoption of various liturgical features at the local level, and attempted to follow Benedict XVI’s desires for a “mutual enrichment.” The suggestions here are by no means exhaustive, and in fact they are merely the starting point towards the restoration of the gradual and organic development of the liturgy. Constructing a vision for the far future on what the Mass may look like is not the intent of this work; the distant development of the Mass should be conceived through a slow and organic process, guided by the Church, and not by means of hasty and artificial crafting. We hope, therefore, that this work may assist towards the larger discussion on how to move forward with liturgical renewal in the Church.
CONCLUSION

A Brief Review of Our Study

The overall goal of this thesis was to promote the organic development of the Roman rite through the mutual enrichment of the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms. We sought to accomplish this by considering the historical development of the Roman missal in order to understand how organic development has operated in the past and from this, to elucidate principles that could guide our suggestions for mutual enrichment in light of the current pastoral situation. In the first chapter, we saw that in general, the development of the Roman missal was gradual, organic, and usually driven by a pastoral need. In the second chapter, we saw how the Liturgical Movement of the 20th century responded to the modern pastoral situation of inadequate lay participation. The third chapter sought to take the concept of “active participation,” which was first pursued by Pope St. Pius X and adopted by the Liturgical Movement through the Second Vatican Council, and draw out a more explicit definition. By identifying three subcategories of active participation we attempted to properly balance its internal and external aspects. This was vital because any future reformation efforts must have as their foundation the proper understanding of active participation. From here, we moved into the final chapter, which first demonstrated the necessity of the continuing development of both forms of the Roman rite and then offered a series of recommendations in light of organic development and active participation with emphasis on “mutual enrichment.” Overall, we had sought to demonstrate that the development of the Roman missal is not possible without a sense of the current pastoral situation.
and should be marked by prudence, which means that reforms should be optional, gradual, and first implemented on the local level.

**Organic Development**

The first chapter was an exposition of the general principles of the organic development of the liturgy. The goal of this analysis was to demonstrate the historical development of the Roman rite in order to emphasize the value of the objective liturgical tradition as it slowly matured throughout the centuries. Studying organic development also serves as a necessary basis for any current reforms and future attempts at developing the Roman missal. The concept of organic development is multifaceted. Organic development includes the gradual change through innovations from already existing forms, the restoration of previous liturgical features that seem pastorally beneficial, simplification of the rite to remove accretions, and even wholesale eliminations of items deemed superfluous.

Liturgical “innovations” are new forms that “in some way grow organically from forms already existing.”\(^{376}\) These growths are historically gradual, prudent, and often pastoral. Innovations are features cultivated at the local level whose usage gradually becomes more widespread and are eventually codified for Church-wide use. Liturgical “simplification” is when “pruning” is employed to eliminate accretions or overgrowth that obscures the ritual. The simplification of the liturgy often attempts to reestablish its structure to a point in time before its development was obscured. The principle of simplification should also avoid antiquarianism, which seeks to return liturgical features back to its most primitive form and thus rejects legitimate development.

Liturgical “restoration” was defined as a principle which, through pastoral consideration, restores a previous liturgical feature that was lost due to the accidents of history. The restored liturgical feature must not have been superseded by the development of a superior ritual; it must be a feature that was lost because of a historical condition that forced it to be eliminated. The

“elimination” of a liturgical feature may come by way of gradual disuse or through historical circumstances involving the abuse of the ritual, such as with the offertory rite after the Council of Trent. Further, eliminations may be authorized due to other historical situations, such as the removal of the unnecessary prayer for the Holy Roman Emperor in the 1950s. Additionally, the Second Vatican Council promoted eliminations based not only on historical adaptations but also as means of streamlining of the ritual due to items such as “useless repetitions.”

Having considered legitimate organic development, we also discussed the misconceptions about and problematic tendencies found in Liturgical development.

Pope Pius XII’s encyclical Mediator Dei was one of the guiding foundations of the Liturgical Movement in the middle of the 20th century. Pius XII attempted to explain liturgical development in both the positive and negative senses. Our examination focused on serious misconceptions identified by Pius XII that may still persist in the present situation, making his concerns valuable to consider in any future development of the Roman missal. One of the larger problems addressed was the concept of “antiquarianism,” which is the restoration of features from antiquity that disregards its successive development through history. Pius XII himself identified antiquarianism in several examples, including a reform that would reduce the altar to its “primitive table form.”

He also compares the liturgy’s development to that of doctrinal development where doctrine acquires a fuller, richer meaning throughout the history of the Church. This demonstrates that antiquarianism is the rejection of legitimate later developments of the Roman missal and is not merely a return to the past for its own sake.

Other liturgical developments that do not appear to be organic were termed “fabrications” and “splicing.” Fabrications were defined as on the spot inventions, without a slow and organic development from preexisting forms, hoisted upon the liturgy from the top down. Fabrications are artificial constructions that may be made in a response to a pastoral need, yet their
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implementation is almost pure novelty, without a foundation that has organically developed from the liturgical tradition. The danger of fabrications is that they can often originate from the liturgical preferences of those who are constructing these new features. This can generate an overly subjective view of the liturgy and create an atmosphere in which artificial development and new liturgical creations must occur throughout successive generations, thus endangering the value, meaning, and symbolism of the objective liturgical tradition.

Splicing was defined as a construction of several liturgical features from different rites that are artificially joined together to create a new entity. This endeavor may also be seen as a fabrication insofar as the splicing of rites is done in a hasty and artificial manner in order to construct a new liturgical entity that is divorced from a gradual and slow development. One example we discussed was the Braga rite of Portugal. The Braga rite underwent a transformation that may be deemed an “accident” as elements of the Roman rite were grafted onto it. This splicing eventually resulted in major losses of the objective liturgical tradition found in Portugal’s native rite. This issue was resolved by Popes Benedict XV and Pius XI when they undertook the project of the liturgical restoration of the Braga rite ending in the 1920s.

Overall, the first chapter attempted to demonstrate the general norms of the development of the liturgy while at the same time identifying harmful means of changing the Mass. Our recommendation based on this analysis for the future development of both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite is that they should have as their foundation organic growth. Organic development is a general concept that includes several different principles, all of which respect the objective liturgical tradition. The Roman missal should have the ability to gradually cultivate growth from already existing forms in response to a pastoral need. However, caution and prudence must be maintained in any liturgical development. Any future reform attempts should adopt the more traditional and established method of gradual, organic development, as opposed to the implementation of numerous, hasty, or novel liturgical features. The integrity, value, and deep theological meaning of the objective liturgical tradition must be
guarded and at the same time legitimate, prudent, and gradual change should be maintained in the liturgy.

*The Liturgical Movement: A Pastoral Response*

The second chapter explored the foundation for the liturgical reforms proceeding the Second Vatican Council. It was necessary to explore this Movement in order to establish continuity with the pastoral goals desired by the Church when discussing potential contemporary development. As was the case during the Liturgical Movement, the active participation of the People of God in the Holy Mass is still the main principle of reform and implementation in the Church today. The Ordinary Form of the Roman rite is the attempted implementation of the Council’s desire to enact a more active and intelligent participation of the lay faithful. The Extraordinary Form was the authorization of the 1962 missal, which had experienced some reform due to the Liturgical Movement’s efforts in the 20th century. Both Forms of the Roman rite can be seen as intimately associated with the reform efforts of the 20th century’s Liturgical Movement. Hence, understanding the goals of the Liturgical Movement provides a precedent for the future development of both Forms.

The second chapter, therefore, briefly explored the goals and desires of the Liturgical Movement leading into the 1950s. Pope St. Pius X’s motu proprio *Tra le Sollecitudini* formed the foundation of the modern Liturgical Movement by calling for the “active participation” of the laity in sacred music. While not a ritual alternation, Pius X desired the participation of the laity in the Church’s sacred music, including Gregorian chant. Pius X’s efforts were the beginning of the modern Movement’s goal of bringing lay persons into a deeper contact with the Roman missal by becoming more actively involved with its contents and worship beyond the realm of sacred music.

Dom Lambert Beauduin’s work adopted Pius X’s principle of active participation in sacred music and developed it to meet the pastoral need of further generating a life of intelligent,
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active, and spiritual engagement with the liturgy among the laity. His proposals included hand
missal translations for the laity and the revival of liturgical traditions at home. Beauduin also
believed that proper education about the liturgy would assist the faithful in their liturgical renewal
and that a deep knowledge of the liturgy would entail a fruitful understating of the doctrines of
Christ. Pope Pius XI also encouraged the Liturgical Movement, stating that the laity should not
assume the role of “silent spectators” during Mass. He also gave permission for the “dialogue
Mass;” promoting the people’s responses and hence interaction with the priest as they prayed the
Mass together.

The Liturgical Movement quickly progressed from promoting greater participation and
education to advocating for ritual reform. The pastoral observation was that in order to achieve a
liturgical renewal through active participation, the Roman missal must undergo some type of
development to accommodate the present situation. After 400 years of near stagnation, the
Liturgical Movement perceived ritual reform as the next logical step.

Many figures in the movement advocated for various changes. One example we
discussed was Virgil Michel, who suggested that some amount of vernacular be incorporated or
that various rituals such as the “offertory procession” be restored. Ritual simplifications and
eliminations were also suggested. Several figures, such as Fr. Roger Schoenbechler, proposed that
the second Confiteor before the distribution of Holy Communion be eliminated because they saw
it as an unnecessary duplication. The Liturgical Movement was not without its differing
opinions; we saw that some members advocated for a slower approach that focused more on
education and left ritual development as a gradual process. One such member was Fr. William
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Busch, who warned that individualistic piety was focusing too much on the subjective worship experience, which could potentially be harmful to the objective liturgical tradition.\textsuperscript{386}

Pope Pius XII also expressed concerns with some of the proposals of within Liturgical Movement in \textit{Mediator Dei}. At the same time, he encouraged the Movement’s pastoral efforts regarding active participation and approved various ritual reforms during the latter part of his pontificate. Pius XII encouraged active participation and explained that the primary mode of participation was interior, but not to the exclusion to exterior participation.\textsuperscript{387} Pius XII also explained that the liturgy should not remain static, but can change through “successive development” and even the restoration of lost practices, opening the way to legitimate change in the missal itself.\textsuperscript{388} However, he warned against “novel liturgical practices” and the reckless revival of outdated liturgical forms and identified this as “antiquarianism.” Pius XII desired a liturgical renewal that would strengthen the glorification of God and the edification of the lay faithful: “to foster and promote the people’s piety and intimate union with Christ and His visible minister.”\textsuperscript{389} In the Mass, the laity are supposed to unite themselves with their priest in offering the Holy Sacrifice through him. To promote this, not only did Pius XII encourage the laity to sing, but he also encouraged the dialogue Mass and other forms of prayerful interaction. As we saw, the Liturgical Movement continued in the 1950s and made further suggestions for ritual change, such as a restoration of the Prayers of the Faithful and a \textit{Pax} rite, increasing the number of prefaces, making audible parts of the canon, and eliminating some features, including the Prayers before the Foot of the Altar and the “last Gospel.” Many suggested aligning the prayers of the priest with the prayers faithful, such as Gloria and the Creed, to eliminate unnecessary duplication and to foster more relational and physical participation with the priest.
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Overall, the purpose of this chapter was to reestablish the goals and pastoral concerns of the Liturgical Movement because these concerns are still relevant in today’s Church, whose post-Conciliar reform efforts focus on the implementation of the Second Vatican Council’s liturgical reforms, which in turn were an attempt to fully implement the Liturgical Movement’s pastoral goal of active participation. Having reestablished the goals and proposals of the Liturgical Movement and its connection to our present situation, the third chapter delved into the Movement’s foundational goal, the concept of “active participation,” more fully. This was done by identifying three subcategories of active participation. By identifying these components, we aim to help alleviate current pastoral concerns and better situate the development of the Roman missal.

Active Participation

The overarching theme of the entire Liturgical Movement and the Second Vatican Council’s efforts was the increased active participation of the People of God in the liturgical life of the Church. In the second chapter, we demonstrated the pastorally prudent and organic development of the liturgy with regards to active participation is vital. In the third chapter, we examined how active participation has met success and misapplication. In the 20th century, many liturgists identified the problematic lack of involvement that the laity had with the liturgy. Conversely, liturgists considering our contemporary situation, such as Joseph Ratzinger and Cardinal Arinze, identify the issue of “activism,” the excessive exterior participation that deters interior participation. Our consideration of the various facets of active participation sought to find the mean between these two extremes to establish a foundation towards future development of both Forms of the Roman rite. In a similar manner to other disciplinary and doctrinal features in the Church, it is natural and necessary to develop this concept in order to meet the needs of the current pastoral situation.

Hence, we recommend that active participation be categorized in three subcategories which are distinct, yet related to each other. The first subcategory was “relational participation’’
where the individual, even by not doing something physical, may still assume an active role. This can be achieved by, for example, listening to the prayers being said by the priest and uniting oneself to these prayers in an intelligent and active manner. The next subcategory was “silent participation” whereby the liturgy would proceed into several instances of silence. Here the individual may participate in an actively, albeit in a more individualistic manner, by meditating on the Mysteries of God in relation to the liturgical event. The final category is seen in “physical participation” which encourages people in their external participation: singing, responding, and bodily gestures.

By taking the concept of “active participation” and identifying these three subcategories, we attempted to balance the objective and subjective participatory aspect of the individual and community. The 20th century reform of the objective liturgical tradition was directly motivated by desire to foster active participation. This liturgical renewal is still ongoing. Further, several clergymen have identified issues that still remain with regard to a lack of participation or even an overly excessive exterior participation. In this light, any future undertaking of development of the Roman missal should take into account a clear understanding of “active participation” in order to stave off any deficiencies and excesses that may result, in part, due to altering objective liturgical features. In our final chapter, we attempted to show the pastoral necessity in continuing to reform and developed both forms of the Roman missal. We further attempted to incorporate the first chapter’s principles of organic development, the second chapter’s pastoral motivations from the Liturgical Movement, and the third chapter’s development of “active participation” in order to serve as a foundation for the future growth of the Roman missal.

The Development and Mutual Enrichment of the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman Rite

The fourth chapter of this work explored firstly the justification for continuing the development of the Extraordinary and Ordinary Forms of the Roman rite. Next, we made a series of recommendations which took into consideration organic development, pastoral concerns over
active participation, and the restoration of liturgical features with emphasis on mutual enrichment. In the 1950s, Pius XII approved various changes to the Roman missal in order to adapt it to the modern pastoral circumstances to help foster the active participation of the people. Most notable were the changes of Holy Week, including the permission to celebrate the Holy Thursday’s Mass of the Last Supper in the afternoon and the Holy Saturday Vigil in the evening. Various ritual changes also included the reduction of the “prophecies” during the Easter Vigil liturgy from 12 to four and the shortening of the blessing of Palms on Palm Sunday in order to emphasize the procession that succeeded it, which involved the laity. These reforms demonstrate that there were attempts to reform the traditional Roman mass in light of the Liturgical Movement’s call for active participation.

The Second Vatican Council made an effort to take the Liturgical Movement’s vision and implement further changes to the Roman missal. The Extraordinary Form of the Mass, which is essentially the Roman missal of 1962, stands between the Liturgical Movement and the changes implemented by the Second Vatican Council. This missal, given much more liberty to be celebrated in the Church by Benedict XVI, must continue to undergo a gradual and organic development with emphasis on mutual enrichment from the Ordinary Form so that it will not be frozen in the year 1962. Likewise, the theologians and clergy we examined have identified several issues with the implementation and current usage of the missal of Paul VI. This was one of the motivations for the restoration of the traditional Roman missal by Benedict XVI. His vision was to enact a mutual enrichment of each form with the hopes of injecting more physical participation in the 1962 missal and conversely, to restore some of rich liturgical traditions that were lost after the promulgation of the 1970 missal.

Therefore, in chapter four we made many proposals for the mutual enrichment of both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman rite. The beginning of this growth relies on the application and widespread usage of the Extraordinary Form. The gradual influence of each Form on the other is the next step in this process and includes small changes in the Mass that would not
breach the current rubrics but could serve as an enrichment. The changes we proposed included the use of Latin and *ad orientem* in the Ordinary Form and an alignment of the prayers of the Extraordinary Form that are often duplicated between the priest and the people/choir. The third step in the process of enrichment would be to implement various reforms of the rituals themselves. We emphasized that such reforms must develop through a slow and gradual process that offers optional changes and allows them to be cultivated at the local level. Some examples we proposed included the possible introduction of an Offertory ritual in the Extraordinary Form and the introduction of an audible “Last Gospel” in the Ordinary Form.

**The Purpose of Our Study**

Our hope for this thesis is that it may modestly contribute to the discussion of liturgical development. This was done firstly by demonstrating the general principles of organic growth, which should be seen as a guiding principle for any current and future reforms. Next, the focus on the Liturgical Movement and subsequently the Second Vatican Council’s pastoral initiatives was another foundation in which to direct the discussion as to not lose sight of the Church’s desire for the active participation of the laity. In light of pastoral circumstances, it was necessary to briefly elaborate on the concept of “active participation” in the third chapter as a response to the issues several pastors have identified. This was done in order to stave off any excessive tendencies towards and overly physical, noisy concept of participation. It was also done to balance the interior an exterior aspects of participation so that both “silent spectators” and noisy activism would not be the fate of the Roman ritual in considering future change. Finally, in this proposal, we did not seek to invent entirely new ritual features for each Form of the Mass and the recommendations we offered are not absolute. Rather, they rely on gradual and organic growth, which means that they may or may not see widespread usage. The current state of the liturgy, as identified by many pastors, must gradually take steps towards the restoration of liturgical treasures and at the same time remain open to new ritual developments. These developments must be framed around the increased active participation of the people, which was the foundation of an
entire century of liturgical development and continues to be a pastoral need. All of this is oriented towards the fundamental goal of uniting the people to Christ and His Mystical Body so that they may be transformed in Him and give greater glory to God.
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