ELEPHANTS IN THE LIVING ROOM

Website: elephantsinthelivingroom.com

REFORMING THE LITURGY

S.S. SIMON & JUDE
WESTLAND, MI
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2008

INTRODUCTION

Fr. Tom Lumpkin

Bishop Gumbleton has encountered some traveling difficulties and could not be here to introduce our speaker. If it's Monday, it must be Peru, or something like that (laughter). I think he'll be here before the days over; he wasn't sure if the flight was going to get in on time, and stuff like that.

Well, many of us have a perception, at present, that the Vatican, at present, is trying to take back some of the reforms of the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Liturgy. There's some evidence to that perception. The permission to have the Tridentine Mass more wide spread would be one. There are minor regulations that tend to deemphasize the active role of the baptized in the liturgy and reemphasize the role of the ordained priests. We see a return, I think, to a little bit more archaic language that is supposed to be more faithful to the Latin – that's supposed to be something that's coming.

And my understanding is, if I understand the rationale behind this, all this has been an attempt to return us to a deeper sense of mystery that the promulgators of this kind of return feel like we've lost: a sense of mystery in our worship – lost a sense of transcendence – and this is an attempt to restore that. Again, for many of us, this would seem to be an approach that could be critiqued. One might say that the way to develop a sense of mystery and transcendence in our life and in our worship is not to accent a difference from ordinary life, but to go deeper into ordinary life; that that's where we will find this mystery of God with us, and transcendent mystery, by just delving deeper into our ordinary everyday experience. So it seemed to us that this was an elephant in the living room – this kind of trend backwards – and it was something we should address.

When we were getting together to find a speaker who would do this for us, it was suggested, another Jesuit actually, I told John this, J. Glen Murray was suggested as the speaker then. So Tom Gumbleton approached Fr. Murray and asked him if he could; and he said, "No! No! No! The guy you gotta get is John Baldovin. In fact, he's writing a book on this whole that thing you want to address. And so based on that, we got Fr. John Baldovin – and his book comes out today. He might tell you more about that (laughter). And the head of our Worship Office, after we invited Fr. John Baldovin... when the head of our Worship Office, Dan McAfee, heard that John Baldovin was coming, he said, "You guys are in for a real treat; I had him in a course some years ago."

So we're very encouraged; we think we're going to have a great presentation today. Just a little summary: John is presently a professor of Historical and Liturgical Theology at Boston College. He's past president of, a sort of liturgical trade union, the North American Academy of Liturgy. He served on the international commission that helped translate the text into English long ago. He's written a number of books; and we're very happy to introduce you to Fr. John Baldovin. (Applause)

REFORMING THE LITURGY

Fr. John Baldovin, S.J.

Thank you, Tom. Good afternoon everybody. I had no idea that I was going to be speaking to such a large crowd. I hope all of you in the back can see the screens. So if you ever need me to move, let me know. It is very, very heartening, however, to see so many progressive Catholics in one room, (Laughter and clapping) to know that progressive Catholicism is alive and well.

About ten years ago now, I started realizing that there was a concerted movement, a very strong movement, that was getting stronger, not weaker, in terms of criticizing the reforms of the Second Vatican Council, the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council, the reforms in general. One of the things I'd recommend to you, over and above my own little book (it actually did appear today apparently), is Fr. John O'Malley's *Vatican II, Did Anything Happen? J*ohn O'Malley is a former colleague of mine, and a great professor of church history, and it's a great book, *Vatican II, Did Anything Happen?* It's a real struggle that's going on currently in the Church over the interpretation of Vatican II.

I noticed that this trend was getting stronger; and so I started writing a series of articles on various figures that represented the criticism of the reform. And then, last year, I had the opportunity to have a sabbatical, one of the most blessed words to my ears. I took a sabbatical at Fairfield University in Connecticut; and with the three chapters under my belt, I was determined to finish the book by the end of the semester. And by December 17th, at noon, maybe a quarter of twelve, I was finished with the first draft of the book, and I was very happy to do it. The Liturgical Press has been kind enough to publish it. I called the book *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics*. So I'm going to give you synopses, a pictorial. There are more pictures in this presentation than there are in the book. There are no pictures in the book (laughter) in the interest of transparency – that's what I call it. Although the first time I gave a presentation on it, Paul Lakeland, another good theologian at Fairfield University, entitled it: *Presentation of the Liturgy Wars; a*nd so if you prefer to think of it as *The Liturgy of Wars.*

What I'm going to do first is give you a rundown of the reform, and very, very briefly and sketchy, for some of you, this will be just refreshing your memory; for some of you it will be old hat; and maybe for some of you it will be a little new. And then, I'm going to get into the criticism of the reform itself. But I think in order to understand the reform, the critics, it's necessary to understand the reform itself. I started with two figures. Dom Prosper Gueranger was the founder of Solesmes Abbey in France, one of the places where Gregorian chant was revived in the middle of the 19th century. Gueranger was one of the great leaders in the movement to bring the liturgy back to what he felt prominent position in the Church. He was a great student of medieval liturgy; and so that's the kind of liturgy he worked on very strongly.

In 1903 Pope Pius X revived Gregorian chant and said that liturgy in what is known as *motu propio*, a kind of papal statement which means *on his own initiative* . In his *motu proprio*[1/], that would be in English entitled, "Among the heirs of the present day," he said that, "The liturgy is the indispensible fount, and that the liturgy is the source of active participation in the holy mysteries" – the indispensable fount of our faith and active participation in the holy mysteries. Both of these phrases turn up in Vatican II's *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. Even more important, in some ways, and some of my friends think that this was one of the most significant liturgical reforms of the 20th century, Pope Pius X asserted the importance of frequent communion. We take that so much for granted today but before that time it was not taken for granted at all, that people would frequently receive Holy Communion. And of course he lowered the age for receiving Holy Communion to the age of reason.

Two other figures that become important: in 1909 the modern liturgical movement, as we call it, was launched by another Benedictine, this one, a Belgium named Lambert Beauduin, who founded an Abbey in Belgium devoted to the renewal of the liturgy and to ecumenism. It's very interesting that ecumenism and the reform of the liturgy went hand in hand – and I still think that's true today. One of my dear friends, James White, a Methodist, who used to teach at Notre Dame, which tells you a large part of the story already, James White used to say, "Why teach ecumenism when you can teach liturgy?" Why teach ecumenism when you can teach liturgy, because if you really understand the liturgical development in the history of the Church you understand why it is so foolish for us not to be united to one another. Beauduin in a little book called, *The Piety of the Church,* introduced the idea of pastoral liturgy, not just the subject for historians and scholars of texts and things like that, but something that was actually living in the Church – that the liturgy actually made a difference in the way people lived their Christian lives. In the 1920s and 1930s, based on the popularity of this movement, which took off quite quickly, there was the foundation of a number of monasteries, his own Mount-Cesar Abbey in Belgium and Maria Laach in Germany, which was to become a very important center for liturgical scholarship.

And in 1947 Pope Pius XII issued an encyclical which gave a kind of official approval on the part of the Church to the liturgical movement, an encyclical entitled *Mediator Dei.* There's a lot in that encyclical that I would not find the kind of theology that I would find most helpful today, but it was an important official endorsement of the movement. And from 1948 on, the Vatican was seriously involved in liturgical reform.

The other great pre-Vatican II reforms of the 20th century after frequent communion were the introduction of the Paschal Vigil in 1953, and then, the entire Reformed Rites of Holy Week in 1955 and 1956. Prior to this, it was true that, for example, only the priest received Communion on Good Friday – only the priest received Communion on Good Friday. The washing of the feet was not a common practice. These all entered through the reforms, the pre-Vatican II reforms, of the liturgy.

For my sins I read the blogs – that should get me some time off Purgatory – for my sins I do read these blogs, like the New Liturgical Movement or *Summorum Pontificum*, and what does the prayer really say, and it's not good for acid reflux (much laughter), and probably some psychological problem with masochism; but you get pictures like this constantly on the blogs, and the fancier the better.

The Second Vatican Council and the Liturgy Constitution.

In a couple of weeks I'll be giving another lecture in Chicago for the Office of Divine Worship for the 45th Anniversary of the Liturgy Constitution, 45 years! We've come a long way, actually, when you think of how extraordinary it was, and how quickly the reform took place. That's part of the problem, I think. We probably would have been better off going a little bit slower; we might not have some of the difficulties we have today. And I do think that the critics do have some valid criticisms, as you will see in the course of this presentation. But 45 years ago, on December 3, 1963, most of us were not thinking about liturgy in those weeks, were we? We were thinking about the assassination of President Kennedy, just a few – what's the anniversary, the 22nd, this Saturday, the 45th anniversary?

Some important paragraphs. On active participation: that was quoted in the general intercessions that we just prayed – and yes, I do hope that what we prayed will come true in our gathering prayer – "Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that fully, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations, which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy." [2] This is one of the key phrases of Vatican II, which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy: full, conscious, and active participation on our part as Christ's priesthood, or to use the language that I have become accustomed to using lately: Christ's primary priesthood, as opposed to the secondary priesthood, which people like the ordained people like me have. Secondary priesthood exists to undergird, support and foster the primary priesthood.

It'll be a little theological lecture here, because I can't help myself. What is the priesthood of Christ, and thus of Christ's people, about? Offering the world that God has given us back to God; that is the nature of priesthood. The nature of priesthood is offering – offering the world God has given us back to God, together with Christ. In that great movement that we just heard from, one of my favorite scripture passages (from the prayer service), which I didn't choose, somebody smart chose Philippians, Chapter 2: offering the world back to God. What does the ordained priesthood, ordained ministers, exist for? To enable the Church, to help the Church, in that process of offering ourselves back to God. And of course, that's the purpose of liturgy too. The ultimate purpose of the liturgy is not the liturgy; the ultimate purpose of the liturgy is to enable us to become Christ's priestly people offering the world back to God. If you want a standard of judgment for the success or failure of the liturgy other than growth in faith, hope and love, which is not very different actually from it, it's offering the world back to God. "Such participation," the Council goes on to say, "by the Christian people, as a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people," from the first letter of Peter informs the wonderful first preface for Sundays in the Roman missal in the sacramentaries, "is their right and duty by reason of their baptism."[3]

Now if you've heard this phrase too many times, it probably just rolls off your back, because it's very familiar, which is okay, especially if you've heard it many times; but I think we fail to understand or appreciate how stunningly shocking with regard to an older view of the Church, which was extremely top down – very much the pyramid structure; what a contrast this baptismal ecclesiology is – a theory or

theology of the Church founded on our common baptism. That's why, my friends, Jim White could say, "Why teach ecumenism when you can teach liturgy?" Once you understand the significance of baptism – the pastoral note here for all of you who are involved in the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults – that's why we have to treat candidates for union in the Church who are already baptized very differently from those who have not been baptized, because we take baptism so seriously, and because we honor the baptism of those who have already been Christians: Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, and the like. So I think that is an earthshaking statement. It's our right and duty, all of us, as members of the baptized, not by something that's granted from above by bishops or priests.

"In the restoration and promotion of the Sacred Liturgy, this full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else; For it is," and here is that phrase again from Pius the X: "For it is the primary and indispensible source for which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit, and therefore, pastors of souls," many of us here in this room, "must zealously strive to achieve it by means of the necessary instruction in all their pastoral work" [4/] - the primary and indispensable source. If you have good Protestant friends, some of them might want to say that the primary and indispensable source is the bible. But the interesting thing is that, for Catholics, the bible comes primarily through the liturgy, but never ends at the liturgy; it ends in the street; it ends in our lives.

There's three pillars of the Christian life without which the Christian life cannot stand. One is the Holy Scriptures, another is the sacraments, and the third is ethics, or the moral life, justice etc. Those are the three pillars; and if one of them is not standing, the other two are going to be weakened; so all three are needed. It's another lecture; truth, goodness and beauty, the scripture, ethics and the sacraments.

"In order that the Christian people may more certainly derive and abundance of graces from the sacred liturgy – I'm not going to read you the whole Constitution, just selected paragraphs – "the Holy Mother Church desires to undertake with great care a general restoration of the liturgy itself." [5/] It's quite clear, despite what a lot of the critics say, that the Council really did want a serious and radical reform of the liturgy. "For the liturgy is made up of immutable elements, divinely instituted, and of elements subject to change." [6/] Most of the debates today are around that phrase, I think, around that phrase. And if you could give me a good easy formula that will distinguish the immutable elements and those subject to change, I'll give you all the proceeds of my book (laughter). It's not easy. There is no simple formula to ascertain that. That's what so many of the debates are about today. "These not only may the subject to change, but ought to be changed with the passage of time, if they have suffered from the intrusion of anything out of harmony with the inner nature of the liturgy, or have become unsuited to it." [7/]

One of the problems, I think, of the desire to return to the pre-Vatican II rights today, on the part of a lot of people, which I'm not challenging their good will of course, but one of the problems it seems to me is that they don't recognize that the Church really seriously felt at the time of Vatican II that those elements, a number of elements which distanced us from our liturgy – prime example being Latin – that those elements not only could be, but ought to be changed, because they were preventing us from the fullest way to worship. There's a kind of a nostalgia involved in this, nostalgia by people who were not born, many of them, at the time of the Council, so kind of a taught nostalgia. I've taken to calling it now Amish Catholicism (laughter). The Amish are wonderful; they're beautiful; they're admirable; but it's quaint. And that's how I feel about the Tridentine Mass, you know. It is beautiful, and there are elements of mystery that we've lost, and we need to find ways of recapturing; but to go to Amish Catholicism is not it – not in my opinion, not the way to go. We're dooming ourselves to irrelevance if we go that way!

"In this restoration both texts and rights should be drawn up so that they can express more clearly the holy things which they signify. The Christian people, so far as possible, should be able to understand them with ease, and take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community." [8/] Here's one of the accents of the Council, which is so important, that in every celebration of the liturgy, there is always a communal dimension – there is always a communal dimension – and that is to be preferred above all else. A communal celebration is to be preferred over those that are private. So communal baptisms: some people may groan and moan when they walk in – I see it all the time, you know – they walk in on Sunday mornings and they say, "Oh, no! They've got four baptisms (laughter). We're never going to get out of here." Actually, one of the places I work at on the weekends in Lexington, Massachusetts, they're

delighted; they're delighted. It's a small parish, and they're delighted when there's a baptism, because it means new life is coming into the Church; and it means everything to the people. They've been well catechized, and have a very good liturgy; and that doesn't happen overnight; that's a process of thirty years of hard work, that kind of liturgy, and that kind of communal feeling by which people understand this, is a great thing that we have these four children being baptized so as befits a community. "They may be understood with ease," [9] that's a tricky phrase actually because we are talking about God, and God, at least in my opinion, and I think pretty well founded in the tradition of the Church, God is not easily understood; especially when we start talking about God as Trinitarian, which we have to as Christians, not easily understood at all. So as one great contemporary French sacramental theologian, Louis-Marie Chauvet puts it: "What we really understand now, what we really got a handle on, is that we don't understand;" and I think that's good. There's always appropriate modesty that comes with theology and religion, or should.

Rules for the reform: **"**That sound tradition may be retained and yet remain open to legitimate progress. Careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised." [10] This was work that was going on for well over a hundred years. Scholars, historians work on texts, architecture, archeology, the history of music. So much of that went into the background of the Council itself. "This investigation should be theological, historical, and pastoral. Also the general laws governing the structure and meaning of the liturgy must be studied in conjunction with the experience derived from recent liturgical reforms" [11] – their thinking of things like the restoration of the Holy Week rites – "and from the indults conceded to various places," [12] like the ability in certain sacramental celebrations to use the vernacular – indult is a permission. 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." [13] Here's another one of the great debating points of the last ten years with regard to the question of the reform of the liturgy.

One of the things that the people, like the present Pope, Benedict the XVI, and Alcuin Reid, an Australian writer, who wrote a book called, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy,* and Aidan Nichols, a British Dominican, one of the things that they have focused on is, that they think that the reforms did not take place organically, because they were so radical. But it was quite clear in another place in the Constitution, that they realized, as I pointed out, that a serious and radical reform was needed. As with most of the Vatican II documents, if you have studied them carefully, you realize that sometimes they give away with one hand and take back with the other. So there's a lot of pushing and pulling going on, when you've got 2,000 people writing a document (laughter). Have you ever tried to write a document with a group of ten people, okay? As far as possible, no immutable differences in the rite of adjacent regions must be carefully avoided. That means you should be able to recognize what's going on if you cross over into Windsor.

The character of the rites. "The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity. They should be short, clear and unencumbered by useless repetitions." [14] One of the great debating points, too, after the Council, is what kind of repetition is useless? I don't know. Is the rosary useless repetition? I don't think so. Sometimes it can be useful repetition. They should be within people's powers of comprehension, as I say, so that we can know that we don't understand. "And normally should not require much explanation." [15] This is one of my hobby horses, I have to confess to you. I do not think they should require much explanation, and we often talk them to death. I think we ruin symbols and rituals when we talk about them too much. Catechesis can go on in other places, but in the liturgy itself, we should let the symbols speak for themselves. So instead of pouring two drops of water on somebody's head and saying this is a symbolic drowning, well, drown them symbolically. Don't do it, do no harm. That should be one of the great liturgical laws: first, do no harm.

"That the intimate connection between words and rites may be apparent in the liturgy." [16] "In the sacred celebrations there is to be more reading from Holy Scripture." [17] And this talk I am going to be giving in a couple of weeks in Chicago, that's going to be one of my main points. One of the main themes of my lecture is that the opening up of scriptures – remember when we use to have a one year cycle of readings prior to the Council? A number of you can remember that. Then, we had only two readings per

week, almost never any readings – at least on the ordinary Sunday – almost never readings from the Old Testament. Now we have a richer fare, a much richer fare – and a good deal of the Scripture, you can criticize. There are ways in which the lectionary could be criticized: not enough women stories, for example, but by and large, it's a great improvement.

The reform of the Mass. "The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way as the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts," [18] like why you should be there for the liturgy of the word as well as the liturgy of the Eucharist, as opposed to when I was growing up, it wasn't a mortal sin until you came in after the offertory (laughter), "and also the connection between them maybe more clearly manifested. And that devout and active participation by the faithful may be more easily achieved. For this purpose, the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance, elements with which the passage of time," we saw something like this earlier, "came to be duplicated, or were added, but with 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." [19] An example of duplication: the old Offertory rites of the Mass was called at that point, the Offertory, instead of the Preparation and Presentation of the Gifts. The Offertory rights duplicated what was in the Eucharistic Prayers, such that they became what the great historian of the Roman rite, Josef Jungmann, calls "a veritable jungle." Elements that needed to be restored:

- The General Intercessions. They were gone from the Roman Rite from around, the last time we have notice of them, was 496 A.D., that's a long time, a long *lapses memorie*.
- And the Greeting of Peace, of course, the exchange of peace.

On the vernacular. "Particular, while remaining" – this is part of the push pull – "the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin Rites." [20] But" – and this is a big word too, but – "since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. This will apply in the first place to the readings and directives, and to some of the prayers and chants, according to the regulations on this matter to be laid down separately in subsequent chapters." [21] And then they talk about how it's the local or national bishops' conferences that are suppose to actually take charge of these translations. [22] Part of the fights, ever since the year 2000, and the introduction of a new Roman commission to vet the translations, has been whether Rome has the right to create translations. The Council says, no; that Rome has the right to reject them – that's never been in doubt actually (laughter) – but they don't have the right to create them, which is very interesting, very interesting. That right belongs to the bishops' conferences and the New Zealand Bishops' Conference brought a case on the Vatican on this matter. Well, history is history.

One of the things the critics love to say, "Look! Look, See! Read Vatican II! You people keep on saying you're for Vatican II" (This is why ongoing study of the Council is important, especially for those who want to move forward.) "Look! It never said in the Council that the entire liturgy should be translated into the vernacular." That is true. True enough. But within a year of the promulgation of this Constitution, Archbishop Bugnini, who is the architect, the real architect of the reform, made it quite clear from all of the responses coming from Bishops' Conferences around the world, that bishops were insisting that the entire liturgy once the walls starting rolling, it was crystal clear – I don't know if you remember those years, '64 and '65 – it was crystal clear that the entire liturgy had to go into the vernacular language. And in many ways, except for small pockets of resistance, well going to the Amish Catholics, we did not look back. I mean you do have to ask yourself the question, "Why was this reform so successful, given all its drawbacks?" But why was it unquestioned that the liturgy should be in the vernacular? Why? Sometimes we have to call those things the work of the Holy Spirit. The Mass, which is celebrated with the people, they say later on with regard to the vernacular, "a suitable place may be allowed to their mother tongue." [23] This is to apply in the first place to the readings and the common prayer, which today we call the General Intercessions, but also "as local conditions may warrant, to those parts which pertain to the people according to the norm laid down in Article 36 of this Constitution. Nevertheless," and this hasn't been so heeded by the Council, "Nevertheless, steps should be taken so that the faithful may also be able to say or sing together in Latin those parts of the ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them." [24] And so I think that's not bad; actually, it's too bad that you have to go to an Episcopal church to hear Latin

every now and then (laughter). There's nothing wrong with Latin, I mean, once the vernacular was established, I think it's good to have a Latin Sanctus, or something like that, from time to time.

Some other important reforms**:**

- The importance of communal celebration,[25] which I've already talked about.
- Concelebration,[26] a very odd reform. Concelebration was a way of getting priests to stop saying private Mass; and it was another insistence on the fundamentally communal nature of the liturgy. It quickly – I think, quickly showed its limitations – in the Church of England in one of the liturgical series, there was a pamphlet that came out a number of years ago on Concelebration. It had one woman in a church and there were about thirty clergy people on the other side (laughter). Obviously, you didn't even have to read the pamphlet to understand what the point was. Very quickly, it became clear that Concelebration might be appropriate for certain circumstances; but in general it did not seem to make sense to people.
- The revival of the Catechumenate.[27] How many of you come from a parish where you have the RCIA? Yes, I expected almost everybody's had to go all the way. That is one of the greatest reforms of the Council, because it put that whole idea of a baptismal ecclesiology in the forefront of our minds, and what it means to experience ongoing conversion for the rest of us, because conversion is the project of all of our lives, not just people who are becoming Christians or becoming Catholics. The liturgical year was reformed so that Sunday might have greater prominence. That's a hard one to do. Two Sundays ago we had John Lateran; not only John Lateran, we had adoption Sunday in my church, which they informed me fifteen minutes before I started Mass; but anyway I'm not going to get into that.
- Lectionary. "The treasures of the Bible…" [28] I've already talked about this so I'm going to say this very briefly. We changed the lectionary cycle from a one year cycle to a three year cycle, which was enormously important for us. "The liturgical year is to be revised so that the traditional customs and disciplines of the sacred season shall be preserved or restored to suit the conditions of modern times" – to suite the conditions of modern times." [29] So what happened? The old Ember Days went. They were supposed to be replaced; I don't know if you remember the Ember Days? They were four: Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, periods of fasting at the turning points of the seasons, that were part of the Roman agricultural year. That's how they were founded. Well, what the Council said in the subsequent general norms of the calendar said: Bishop's Conferences should find ways in which national or regional groups can do kinds of fasting. So, for example, in the United States, the only way in which this has been adapted is a national day of fast or recommended day of fast on January 22nd, the anniversary of Roe vs. Wade. That's the only adaptation of the Ember Days that's taken place. Septuagesima Season: there were three Sundays prior to Lent, and they were originated because they were really very specific – their origin was very specific to the political and cultural situation of Rome.
- On Music. Now here is a subject that nobody ever disagrees about. "The Church acknowledges Gregorian chant" – this is once again the push pull – "The Church acknowledges the Gregorian chant as especially suited to the Roman liturgy; therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services. But," – the inevitable but – "other kinds of sacred music especially polyphony" – my favorite music – but I don't think it really works as liturgical music myself. I love the great polyphony of the 16th Palestrina, and all that; but it doesn't work for liturgy, "are by no means excluded from liturgical celebrations, so long as they accord with the spirit of the liturgical action." [30] Up until about a year or two – I have the exact dates in my book – up until about a year or two of the end of the Council, it still was not allowed to substitute other songs for the liturgical texts themselves, like what we call the Introit of the Mass, and some of the people thought that was one of the most significant reforms.

Of course, the great hero, and in some ways the problem of the reform, was Pope Paul VI. You should read Fr. John O'Malley's book on this subject. I am in agreement with John O'Malley that Paul VI was kind of a tragic figure. I am convinced by my own reading of the history of the Council that Paul VI was terrified, terrified, haunted by the thought that he could be destroying the Church; haunted, because there was not a majority by any means. It was a very small but significant minority of people who insisted, conservatives at the time of the Council, insisted that the Church was being destroyed. Now the only

practical result of that was the Lefebvre Movement, which was really miniscule, really; but Paul VI was terrified; and this worked itself out on things like the Constitution of the Church in other ways that I'm not going to get into today for the sake of time. One of the things that Paul VI did, which was unfortunate, I think, was to appoint a special office for the reform of the liturgy at the end of the Council. Why do I say that it was not a good idea? He left the Vatican Congregation of Rights in place, and then brought a bishop in from outside of Rome, Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, the Archbishop of Bologna, very respected, wonderful figure, in to be President of that special commission, that special department. So what you have happening from 1964 until 1969, when a great deal of the basic work of the reform was actually being done, what you had going on was, you had a war within the Vatican itself; and Paul VI unfortunately set up the conditions for that war. The other person who was actually the man on the ground was Annibale Bugnini, a Vincentian priest, who became an archbishop and secretary of this commission, and is roundly vilified.

Post Vatican II Reform.

- The first instructions on the implementation of the Constitution introduced the idea, which was not in the Council itself, of a free standing altar. Here's another fascinating, for me, fascinating development in the reform of the liturgy. All the rules ever say is that "the altar must be free standing so that the priest may face the people." What happened immediately after the Council? The priest turned around immediately, right? So that it was almost, not totally, but almost unheard of that the priest should use what they call the eastward position, or what's now popular among the critics, facing toward the Lord, as if the Lord were (laughter). Now that's the debate, isn't it?

  About ten years ago I taught in South Africa for a semester at the National Diocesan Seminary and we changed the – I'll never change another stick of furniture for the rest of my life (laughter) – and if any pastor has done any renovations or built a church, I'm sure, appreciates this more than I do, but we changed the chapel around so that there would be like a U shaped chapel. "I don't want to be looking at Joe Schmoo when I'm celebrating the liturgy or when I'm at Mass celebrating the liturgy. When I'm at Mass I want to be looking at the Lord." But you have to ask yourself the question, why nobody ever made a rule about this? Nobody ever made a rule about it. Why was it so incredibly successful? Did somebody say the Holy Spirit? Ah! You got it. I think we don't know these things like 2 plus 2 equals 4, but it certainly seems to make sense to me.

- 1967 came the instruction *Musicam Sacram*, which made the great statement that "the choice of music and the choice of style should be guided by the ability of participants," which actually we didn't mean we should give up training people how to sing, but sometimes I fear, we might have done. The chants, and this is a very, very important phrase, the chants of the Roman Missal may be substituted by other suitable songs.

  And Versus Populum of a sort, this is the high altar, the main altar of St. Peter's in the Vatican in which the priest always faced the people because what was important in the early Church was actually not that the priest faced the people or not, that was not a concern of theirs at all; it was whether you faced East or not, it was facing toward the rising sun. And St. Peter's in the Vatican is in the western part of the city, looking directly over where the sun rises over the hills on December 21st, on the winter solstice, but close enough to Christmas that Leo the Great in one of his sermons says to the people "I know you people are hedging your bets", I'm translating loosely (laughter) "You're hedging your bets. I know it. I know you worship the sun before you come in here to worship the real Son, the true Son of righteousness. So stop it." Popes have been known to correct people for a long time. So this is Versus Populum of a sort, and of course, this is the kind of thing that Benedict wants actually, the six candles on the altar with a cross in front of it - and soon we'll have the Icon screen (laughter).

The second Instruction:

- 1967. It's been three years now since the death of the manible, that useless garment that is now seen more and more.

- In 1968 the reform of the ordination rites – I'm just teaching a course on the theology of ordained and lay ministry – another advertisement. I have become absolutely convinced that lay and ordained ministers should not be, that it is almost sinful, to train them separately, almost sinful; but the Church of today absolutely requires that we train lay and ordained ministers together; not without respect to some of the differences in what they need in training, but together basically. So I talked about ordinations this past week – so I run the risk of giving another hour lecture in the middle of this lecture, but I won't.
- In 1969 on the principles of translation – interestingly enough, a document that was never in Latin, it was in French, appropriately so, *Comme le prevoit,* as it was foreseen – there the preference for the translations was for what's called dynamic equivalence. In other words while respecting the meaning of the language, in the donor language, Latin, the receptor language should in many ways determine how the translation goes, because actually the meaning is not going to be communicated unless you can really hear it in the receptor language. That has been reversed by *Liturgiam Authentican* of 2000. It's been reversed for this last eight years, and that's the principle behind the current translations; and I think in many ways, it's a dreadful principle, because Latin does not translate well with what's called formal equivalence. Formal correspondence does not translate well certainly into English, and, I'm pretty sure, into a lot of languages.
- In 1969 came the Roman Missal and the General Instruction, that is, its preface together with the three new Eucharistic prayers.
- 1969 again the rite of Baptism for Children, the first time in the history of the Church that a rite specifically geared towards children for Baptism was created. Before that, what we had was death bed or sick bed baptism, somewhat modified to suit the condition of children;
- and in 1969 a new Rite of Marriage;
- 1971 Confirmation and the General Instruction on the Liturgy of the Hours;
- 1972, the RCIA and the Anointing of the Sick,
- and then 1974, Penance, the three forms of the rite;

In ten years – I went through those quickly – in ten years, all the major liturgical books of the Roman Church. This was a mammoth undertaking, and so soon began the second round of additions. And that's what we have now. We have, for example, in the Roman Missal, we have the third edition of the Missal.

The architect of the reform was Archbishop Bugnini. By 1975 the critics of the reform were – the first great movement of the reform ended in 1975, that's three years before the election of Pope John Paul II – when Paul VI removed Bugnini as secretary for the Office for the Congregation of Divine Worship and sent him to Tehran, as an out of the way place that nobody thought would ever be heard of again (laughter) - sent him to Tehran to be the Papal Nuncio, to get him out of town; and it was an overnight; and it was a real coup. The opponents of the reform had won; and it's been stepping back ever since. '75. It's a long time ago. I never realized it until I started really working on the book that it was that long ago. John Paul II, of course, his long pontificate has had a serious impact on the critics of the reform; and I think it is safe to say, he has been a great supporter of the critics of the reform. Once again, John Paul II is funny, you know; he says he likes the Council, and at the same time he did a lot of things that it looks like are not going in the direction of the Council.

1980 – so this is only within two years of his election – he writes a Holy Thursday letter to priests, a series that he started in that year called *Dominicae Cenae*, with a very clear theology of the priesthood, which is a theology of the priesthood which starts the move toward emphasizing the difference between lay and ordained – exacerbating the feeling and emphasizing it far more than needs to be emphasized. It was followed by an instruction from The Congregation for the Divine Worship called *Inestabile Donum*, which put teeth into his arguments and had lots and lots of restrictive propositions in it. 1994. The next big liturgical document came out on enculturation, which I like to call a not enculturation. It's a document that's really meant to put the brakes on the idea of enculturation, and I think it's a pity, because the Latin Rite does need to be enculturated into various cultures. I think we make a mistake, frankly, when we think that enculturation should be done on the basis of what, I think, should be done or what we think should be done in our parish. I think that bishop's conferences should do it; but they should take it

seriously so that we have some consistency and enculturation because too often enculturation becomes what I like or what I don't like.

1997. It was the beginning of The ICEL Crisis. In 1990 the Ordination Rites received their second addition and were sent out to all the conferences throughout the world for translation. By 1994, ICEL, the International Commission on English in the Liturgy, had sent it's translation – by 1993, it had sent its translation in – and by 1994 all of the bishops conferences that comprised it; eleven major English speaking conferences had sent, by two-thirds vote – these things don't go by majority vote – they're two-thirds votes of the Episcopal Conference had sent their approval of the translation of the Ordination Rites in. Three years later we received a document that listed 114 errors in our translation; and these are not just the beginnings said Cardinal Medina Estavez of Chili, the president of that Congregation at that time. It was all out war; and it's a pity. It does tell you something about the state of the Church. Think of this: you're in a Bishop's Conference, two-thirds of you – well over two-thirds of you – have voted to approve a translation and sent it to Rome; and it's sent back with basically insulting criticisms; and the bishops said nothing. The bishops did not protest. This is a serious problem. The ICEL crisis ended – and this is all in my book.

The details are in my book with the dismissal of the long time executive secretary, John Page, who is really a kind of a saint of the liturgical reform, and a whole new approach with a new Vatican oversight etc. – *vox clara.* 2000 came *Liturgiam Authentican,* which rescinded the previous document on translation. Now the preference is for formal correspondence versus dynamic equivalent vetting the music. Very interesting! The American bishops punted on this one. And if you have seen the new document that came out, "Sing a New Song to the Lord," last November from the Bishop's Conference – each Bishop's Conference is suppose to have a list of songs that it approves – well, our Bishops' Conference knew, talk about conflict that this would create – far too much conflict – and so instead of doing that they said, the archbishops or the bishops of the cities – they happen to be archbishops, where liturgical music is published and there are only two major ones in the country, Portland and Chicago – the archbishops: they're in charge of saying whether something is acceptable or not acceptable (laughter). There you have it, okay.

Just a few more things in the papacy of John Paul II, which was quite productive liturgically – the third edition of the General Instruction of the Roman Missal and the third edition of the Roman Missal: not much change in the Missal except for many, many saints added, of course, because of that pope's predilection for canonizing saints. Then 2003: his encyclical on the Eucharist, *The Church That Arises Out of the Eucharist*; it's a great theme, not well developed, I'm afraid to say, in the encyclical followed, once again, by a specific instruction. This is the one that put all those chalices on the altar. The cynical side – somebody groaned – the cynical side of me says that the real reason, the stated reason, is that chalices might spill, might be knocked over. I'm sure that anything that can happen, has happened; and I'm sure that has happened in the history of the liturgy; but it seems to me that the real reason was to restrict the giving of the chalice; because that's part of the restoration that is degenerate is, that the giving of the cup to the laity was obviously – what that said was without our ever saying it in plain English was: the Protestants were right about that – not right about everything, but the Protestants were right about that – and to say that any chink in the armor is a bad thing, and that certain mentality about reform.

And then the next year came what is actually one of the best documents written by John Paul II, in my opinion, *Mane Nobiscum Domine*, *Lord Stay With Us*, from the great Emmaus episode, Luke 24. This was his initial letter for the year for the Eucharist, and together with *Dies Domini*, his 1998 letter on Sunday, the celebration on Sunday, I think those are the two best liturgical things that came out of his pontificate, it wasn't always bad.

There's a new papacy in 2005, and a new example of enculturation (much laughter). There's a huge beer stein, which I think is as far as from the current Pope as you're going to get. But I couldn't resist, in fact, I ran across it when I was writing. I couldn't resist.

Here's some of the critics whose work I've been talking about, only one of them is really beautiful. These are some of the figures I treat in my book:

- Klaus Gamber is a German Monsignor, self taught, an enormous number of books mainly on the liturgy texts, classifying texts, things like that, rather technical work.
- Ganger was one of the first after the Council to criticize the Constitution, and then, to criticize the way that the reform was going. A very ardent critic, especially of Mass, facing the people; and the current pope is one of his disciples,and uses a lot of his work, his own criticism of Mass, facing the people.
- Josef Ratzinger of course, the current pope, has written quite a bit on the liturgy. One of the longest chapters of the book really is about the work of Ratzinger, now Benedict XVI.
- Aidan Nichols, a short book, *Looking at the Liturgy* – if you want a real short book that summarizes the critique of the liturgy, read Nichols book.
- Aidan Nichols O.P. is a very, very prolific English Dominican writer.
- Joseph Fesssio, another great critic of the reform is a former student of Joseph Ratzinger, one of the people who christened the phrase "Reform of the Reform" – you might be familiar with that phrase.
- Alcuin Reid: he'll probably be the first person with a very critical and negative review of my book up on the internet on Amazon (laughter). I will be checking day by day to see.
- And then finally Catherine Pickstock, a very interesting and very intelligent critic, actually not a Roman Catholic, an Anglican, part of what's called the movement of radical orthodoxy, a professor at Cambridge in England. I would recommend the book to you, but it's impenetrable. It's called *After Writing on the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy;* and in many ways, it's a brilliant book, kind of takes the whole sweep from Plato to post modern philosophy. It's as dense as you could possibly imagine, but she's got some very interesting criticisms of the liturgy.
- There are a number of other critics, some of them from the field of anthropology and sociology, like Kiernan Flanagan; there's no lack of them actually.

The shelf of my books that I collected while I was writing was about that long. I divided my book into talking about different approaches of the critics. So I devote a chapter to each of these approaches:

- The first is the philosophical approach. Catherine Pickstock is one of the main writers in this approach. Also, Jonathan Robinson, he's a Canadian oratorian. *The Mass and Modernity* tries to criticize a lot of the reforms of the Council on the basis of nineteenth century philosophy that he felt was un-Catholic.
- Then the historical approach: Klaus Gamber and Reid, whom I've mentioned. One of the better of the critics, who actually accepts the reforms of the liturgy, but thinks that they've been implemented poorly in many cases, is a Frenchman named Denis Crouan, T*he History and the Future of the Roman Liturgy*. Almost all of this you can find published by Ignatius Press in San Francisco.
- The theological approach, Joseph Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy,* is probably his most accessible. There's a newer book, *God is Near Us,* which is actually mainly sermons he gave from the late 1970s, when he was archbishop of Munich. And they are very nice, actually, a lot of them are very good. But if you really want to get what he thinks about the liturgy, you should read *The Spirit of the Liturgy* of the year 2000.
- Then, as a said earlier, there's the sociological and anthropological approaches: Kieran Flanagan, a British sociologist and David Torevell, interesting book called *Losing the Sacred and the Famous,* a British American anthropologist. And Victor Turner, who was a convert to Catholicism, and who never liked the reforms, an interesting article in 1976 in *Worship.*

The Types of the Reform.

Francis Mannion, who used to be at Mundelein Seminary, is a priest of Salt Lake City. Francis Mannion, in a couple of articles, talked about five different approaches to the reform that I find helpful as a kind of a template:

- Supporting the official reform: taking what the Vatican says and trying to put it into practice as best you can.
- Back to the preconciliar, today – the Amish Catholics.

- Reforming the reformed: the kind of movement of the current pope and Fr. Fessio and Gamber, who liked certain things about the Scripture readings in the vernacular, but would prefer to go back to a one year cycle and to have the priest facing away from the people and to have one Eucharistic prayer. Those are the basic features of the reform, and to return to Gregorian chant.
- Enculturating the reform, which is, he characterizes it, has the North American Academy of Liturgy, of which I'm a member, a people who are really trying to figure out how it is our own culture can appropriately enact, i.e., actualize the Catholic liturgy, as we know it.
- And then what he calls re-catholicizing the reform. He says, "The question of the reform is not so much this or that text, or this or that rite, that needs to be changed, as much as we need a spiritual appreciation of it." I find that very attractive by the end of my book actually.

Myself, I tell you, I'm kind of a mixture of one, four and five on that list. I do think that one of the major things is, not that we have tried the Roman Catholic reform liturgy since the Council and found it wanting, but the fact that we have not tried it at all. We have not tried it at all. I don't think we have really implemented it, and implemented in its spirit, and, well, been educated in it enough – of course partially, what I am trying to do today, and what you're doing in coming to a presentation like this.

The critics say, "Well there's the old Mass versus the new Mass:"

1.	Atmosphere of reverent worship	Social classroom atmosphere
2.	Profound reverence for Real Presence	Indifference toward Real Presence
3.	Fidelity to Catholic Doctrine	Systematic omission of Catholic Doctrine
4.	Antiquity	Novelty
5.	Stability	Constant change
6.	Priest as sacrificer	Priest as presider.

I'm proud of being one of the people who has introduced that term, presider, as opposed to celebrant.

Some important issues:

- The position of the priest presider or celebrant. The current pope has said that he is not going to try to turn things around again, but the sentiment that's being called the Benedict Rite, the Benedict Altar with about six candles and the large cross in the middle, is becoming more and more popular.
- The whole question of the language of the liturgy. I've spent some time talking about – if you want to read a devastating critique, devastating of the 2000 document, *Liturgiam Authentican,* read Peter Jeffery's book, *Translating Tradition. You should read* it with asbestos gloves, it's such a critique.
- The layout of churches. The idea that, for a church you get the sense that the people are gathered around the altar, gathered around the table of the Lord as one worshipping body of Christ, a holy priesthood; and I think that's what we've tried for in contemporary reform, some successful, some not
- The question of where the tabernacle goes. You know you've got a new pastor and he's changed the tabernacle yet again, from the side to the center, from the center to the side, the side to the center so.
- And the return of the Pre-Vatican II liturgy, which is what I'm calling Amish Catholicism.

I saw a number of new churches when I was out in Kansas City about a month ago and I was very impressed by the quality of the newer churches that I've seen. Now Pope Benedict XVI, his first document on the liturgy was *Sacramentum Caritatis – it's* one of those, after you've had a synod of bishops, the pope writes a long letter. This was a grab bag of all sorts of things. One idea that I really find intriguing, and that I hope is implemented actually, and that is to change the greeting of peace from its present position in the Communion Rite, to a position between the end of the General Intercessions and the Presentation of the Gifts. I think that would be a very good move for lots of reasons. It's a natural point of letting down a little bit, of exhaling a little bit, during the liturgy, and a little bit more

relaxed, and a better timing for that than before the reception of communion. I think the way we do it now breaks that meaning. And then of course there's motu proprio, his letter on liberalizing, to use a word badly, the use of the older rites, which is filled with – I have an article coming out about that in *Worship* in March on *Summorum Pontificum* – I mean it's filled with problems like what is the right formula for giving Confirmation. There's one in the old rite and it was changed in the new rite by Paul VI. So there's a host of problems, which if you've got a parish that has both forms of the rite being celebrated, what calendar do you follow because there are very serious differences in the two liturgical calendars. So where to go from here?

Francis Mannion's three characteristics – once again, Francis Mannion of contemporary culture, I think, he says that enculturation really has taken place in the Roman Catholic liturgy much more in many ways than we realize, because culture is really part of the air we breathe, or it's like the water that a fish swims in. So what we often think of as culture as exotic, it's those exotic dances or things that other people do? Well no, culture is those basic, fundamental, presuppositions that we live by, that are unquestioned, like my unquestioned – although I like to question it more and more as I get older – my unquestioned assumption that's driven my life which is, "hard work is a good thing." That is a cultural presupposition, and the fact that too many people hearing that would be utter heresy it would be worse than my saying, "There are four persons in the Blessed Trinity." A lot of people would say, "What! Is he crazy to question the value of hard work?" Now, unfortunately, my life betrays the fact that I live by that value but… and more and more, I don't want to. So culture really is what is deep, deep, deep, deep inside of us; and those are the things that are most interesting to question. He calls the three characteristics that aren't always good for liturgy:

- Subjectivism. In other words I will judge the value of a liturgy by how I react to it. Another friend, Fr. Robert Taft, wonderful scholar and liturgical theologian, says, when people say to him, "I don't like to go to Mass because I don't get anything out of it." He responds "What one gets out of it," quote and unquote, "is the inestimable privilege of worshipping Almighty God." And I think that there's a lot of truth to that.
- Intimazation. Warmth is God. I'm not going to be intimate with the 300 of you sitting here. This is not that kind of a – you know we can be friendly, but we have to be formal because that's the social situation demands it – that's the structure of our social situation. But, very often, people say, "Well the church doesn't really work unless we're intimate." Well, in that basis, you really couldn't have church with more than ten people in a room.
- Politicization, turning the Church into a political agenda. He does not mean that the Church has nothing to do with politics and with social justice, because that's essential it seems to me to the liturgy.

My suggestion:

- First and foremost is, receive the liturgy as a gift. You're familiar, I'm sure, with the etymology of the word *liturgy* as the work of the people; its yes and no. The Greek word was originally meant "a work for the people" A *letrovia* was a benefaction, like, if I built a fountain out here, that would be a letrovia, a public work, a public benefaction on someone's part for the sake of the community. So liturgy is first God's work for us, and then, by way of response, it's our work. It certainly is our work. But it's first, and I think that's what I tend to forget too often, is that it's first God's gift to us that's symbolized, especially by the scriptures which we receive as the word of God.
- The second is respect ritual. I think we have to modify the comments of the priest, not that they're a bad idea. The Council said that the priest could introduce things in his own words. That in principle is not a bad idea, but in practice, it seems to me, it has not worked; because if I start off a liturgy with, "Hi, it's nice to be here today. I see it's kind of snowing outside. I hope we don't have a hard time getting home, etc.", I may have created a homey atmosphere, but I don't think I've helped us enter into the worship of God, at least in my opinion. There's time of course for more informal comments, the homily and after Holy Communion with the announcements; so I would respect ritual in that way.
- Three, Three, construct or renovate churches so they look less like slightly out-of-date living rooms. I think we've turned that corner. There was a point in which, certainly in Jesuit communities, most of our chapels looked like always slightly out-of-date living rooms.

- Fourth – and I think this is very important, very important – watch what you're comparing. There's a tendency for both sides, whether progressive or regressive, to take a caricature of the bad liturgies of the other sort and compare them. In pre-Vatican II there was nothing but sloppy, quick, private Masses, without music, and totally lacking participation. In post Vatican II there's nothing but clown Masses, where people are irreverent, and they're blowing up balloons, and having pizza and coke. Obviously, both of those are ridiculous caricatures – well the first not as bad as (much laughter) – I said betraying my own principle, but to be fair you have to compare the best with the best, and the worst with the worst. So you know taking potshots at the deficiencies of whatever you are looking at, whether you're looking at one side or the other, is not very helpful to make an honest evaluation. I think it's important to see the beauty in some of the things in the older liturgies. There were a lot of beautiful things. Not that we have to imitate them now, but we can learn from them, I think. There's a lot of things to learn, and I think our liturgy can improve; but it should be the liturgy that we're celebrating now, which is basically, fundamentally strong and worthwhile.

Just to finish up, two of the people that I dedicated my book to:

- One of these people is Aidan Cavanaugh, who was my own professor of Liturgy, great writer on adult baptism and the RCIA. Cavanaugh was a Benedictine monk.
- The other is Fr. William Leonard, a Jesuit of Boston College, who was one of the great pioneers in the Boston area.

Also:

- Msgr. Fred McMannus, who was the first chair of the Bishops Committee on Liturgy in the United States, and an advisor at Vatican II, and Vice President for Catholic affairs at the Catholic University of America, and a great canon lawyer, and one of the leading lights of ICEL. He had enormous memory, and still has that ability, and he believed in hard work, and still managed to get to Wimbledon every year. He was a great fellow.
- Fitzgerald Eller another Jesuit, taught for many years at St. Mary's in Kansas.
- Joseph Jungmann, another Jesuit, the man who wrote the *Mass of the Roman Rite*, a great two volume work, which in many ways is the basis of his history that inspired the reforms of Vatican II.
- Bernard Botte, a Belgian, who was very influential after the Council in the actual work of the reform.
- Godfrey Deitmann of St. John's in Collegeville, another Benedictine, who was for a long, long time the editor of *Worship*, and a great member of ICEL and a great professor and theologian.
- Thomas Tally for an ecumenical.

They were all my former professors that I dedicated this book to; three of them: Cavanaugh, Tally, who's an Anglican, taught for many years at General Theological Seminary, was an expert on the liturgical year, and finally Fr. Edward Kilmartin, who's a Jesuit who taught me when I was first studying theology at Westin, back in the 1970s, and was an extremely wise theologian about the Eucharist.

Well there is more time that I should have taken a long perhaps presentation on the reforms, and where the liturgy stands today, and some reaction to the critics of the reform. I hope you've learned something by the presentation, and I hope we have a good question and answer period, after we have a break of 15 minutes. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Transcribed by
Bev Parker
20081205

1/ Pius X's encyclical, *Tra le sollecitudini.*
2/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §14.
3/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §14.
4/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §14.
5/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §21.
6/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §21.
7/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §21.
8/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §21.
9/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §21.
10/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §23.
11/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §23.
12/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §23.
13/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §23.
14/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §34.
15/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §34.
16/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §35.
17/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §35
18/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §50.
19/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §50.
20/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §36.1.
21/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §36.2.
22/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §36.3
23/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §54.
24/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §54.
25/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §27.
26/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §57.
27/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §§64-66.
28/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §51.
29/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §107.
30/ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, §116.

.