



**Assumption
University**

Digital Commons @ Assumption University

Honors Theses

Honors Program

2023

Ever Ancient Ever New, Liturgical Development at Vatican II: October 1963 (Oh what a Council!)

John Morales

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.assumption.edu/honorstheses>



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), and the [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#)

**Ever Ancient Ever New, Liturgical Development at Vatican II:
October 1963 (Oh what a Council!)**

John Morales

Faculty Supervisor: Rachel M. Coleman, Ph.D.

Theology Department

A Thesis Submitted to Fulfill the Requirements of the
Honors Program at Assumption University

Spring 2023

Table of Contents	
Acknowledgments.....	2
Introduction.....	5
Chapter 1	
Chapter 1.1: The Popes and Liturgical Reform.....	8
Chapter 1.2: Theologians of the Liturgical Renewal Movement.....	11
Chapter 2	
Chapter 2.1: <i>Ressourcement</i> and <i>Aggiornamento</i>	17
Chapter 2.2: The Liturgy of Vatican II.....	19
Chapter 2.3: Two Sides of the Same Hermeneutic.....	19
a: A Traditionalist Hermeneutic of Rupture.....	20
b: The Progressivist Hermeneutic of Rupture.....	24
c: <i>Communio</i> , <i>Nouvelle Théologie</i> , and the Hermeneutic of Continuity.....	28
Preface to Chapter 3.....	32
Chapter 3	
Chapter 3.1: What the Council Wanted.....	33
Chapter 3.2: What Changed?.....	37
Chapter 3.3: Implementing the Reforms.....	41
a: Actual implementation.....	41
a.i: Liturgical Music.....	42
a.ii: Vernacular.....	42
a.iii: Orientation.....	43
a.iv: Implications.....	45
b: Intentional Implementation.....	45
b.i: Liturgical Music.....	46
b.ii: Vernacular.....	46
b.iii: Orientation.....	47
b.iv: Implications.....	48
Conclusion.....	49
Bibliography.....	51

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank God who is the author of all things. Secondly, I would like to thank my family who gave me life and raised me. My friends Alexander Ruston, Samuel Baker, Caleb White, and Julie Dwyer for assisting me with my thesis by reading and critiquing it. I would also like to thank my spiritual director Fr. Alfredo Porras for not only giving spiritual guidance, but also assisting me in recommending literature on liturgy. Finally, I would like thank translators Fr. Donato Infante III, Br. Daniele Caglioni A.A., and Dr. Rachel M. Coleman for translating some of the documents used in my thesis.

*Et introibo ad altare Dei, ad Deum qui laetificat juventutem meam...Spera in Deo,
quoniam adhuc confitebor illi, salutare vultus mei, et Deus meus. Psalm 42:4,6*

Introduction

All humans by nature desire to worship: it seems to be fundamental to human nature to reach outside of itself and dedicate itself in one way or another to something *more*, something *greater*. Liturgy—which is often the form worship takes—comes from the Greek word *leitourgia*, which translates to work of the people. *Leitourgia* is an ancient word that predates Christianity, though it is now most often thought of as a Christian term. But we should notice immediately that worship, while most often directed to that which is outside of or above human nature, also seems always to carry the sense that it should be done with other humans—it is not an individual act. Therefore, liturgy is important to understand because though each person worships individually, he is also meant to worship in community.

The Catholic Church, which traces its history back 2000 years to the suffering, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, understands worship to be about the people uniting themselves to the sacrifice Christ made on the cross and hope for the resurrection,¹ which is done most poignantly and effectively in the Catholic liturgy. Although the Catholic Church has been in existence for two millennia, and although it places utmost importance on the liturgy, it would be a mistake to think that the liturgy of the Church has looked the same, or that it looked exactly the same in all places at all times. In fact, the question of how liturgy should work, what it should look like, and the roles of the faithful in it is always up for discussion, because the Church is not a museum that simply displays forms of worship that were practiced 2000 years ago. Rather, the Church's main theological principle when it comes to both liturgy and many aspects of the faith is that of continuity and dialogue: how best to serve the faithful while remaining continuous with her Tradition.

¹ This differs from Protestant worship, which focuses on the commemoration of the last supper. For Protestants this is thought as merely a symbol, rather than re-enactment and re-presentation

Prior to 1955, the dominant liturgy in the Roman Catholic Church was the Tridentine Latin Mass (TLM) which was formally promulgated at the Council of Trent, convened in 1545 in response to the Protestant Reformation. At the Council of Trent the Church decided to make the liturgy all in Latin, the Church's official language, and uniform for fear that Protestants could infiltrate the Church and the liturgy.² The TLM is known for having strict roles for the priest and the altar servers; only servers are instructed to give responses, and no one in the congregation participates vocally in any formalized way. The liturgy prior to 1955 had been virtually unchanged since the Council of Trent, but in the first half of the twentieth century, a movement—now known as the liturgical renewal movement—began to ask questions and push for some changes, the foremost being the congregation having more active and vocal participation in the liturgy. It seems to have arisen through the recognition of many theologians that there was a seeming disconnect between what the priest was doing on the altar and those in the congregation. Therefore, those participating the liturgical renewal movement saw it fit to examine how the liturgy could be reformed to make more clear the involvement of the people actively praying with the priest.

The liturgical movement gained some traction in reforming the liturgy when Pope Pius XII promulgated revisions to the Holy Week liturgy in 1955. This included shortening prayers used in Holy Week and the use of vernacular during the Easter Vigil. At the time these reforms were seen as sufficient, however, Pius XII's successor, Pope John XXIII saw need to further reform the liturgy. Reformation of the liturgy grew out of larger concerns and movements within the Church, which was its engagement with the modern world. The Church was, to put it somewhat oversimply, experiencing a great deal of stagnancy and confusion during the latter half

² Some Protestants would pretend to be priests and teach Protestant doctrines to Catholic laity.

of the nineteenth century, which continued into the twentieth. The world looked very different after industrialization and two world wars, and the Church was not quick to respond to the changes. Because of this Pope John XXIII convened the Second Vatican Council, beginning in 1962. The charge of the Council was to bring about a renewal of the faith through liturgy, sacraments, and teaching. Reform of the liturgy was a part of a greater call for renewal and reform within the Church. The primary focus of this thesis will be liturgy, specifically how the liturgical movement of the twentieth century influenced the writings of the Council document *Sacrosanctum concilium* and how the document was implemented after the Second Vatican Council.

Chapter 1

1.1: The Popes and Liturgical Reform

Before examining the Second Vatican Council and what was altered in the liturgy it is important to understand the roots of liturgical development prior to the liturgical renewal.

Liturgical reform began well before the renewal and started with popes emphasizing different aspects of liturgy. This is first seen in Pius X's Motu Proprio—a papal decree—*Tra Le Sollecitudini*. The purpose of Pius X's Motu Proprio was to make Gregorian Chant standard in worship, as Pius X had noticed liturgical music was becoming superfluous.

During Pius X's papacy it was popular to use liturgical music from Mozart or Palestrina; he saw this as problematic as most of the time it made liturgy about the performance of the choir instead of prayer ordered toward God.³ He writes, “the Mass must preserve the unity of composition proper to the text. Therefore, it is not licit to compose them into separate pieces, in such a manner that each one of these forms a complete musical composition in itself, and be capable of being separated from the rest and substituted by another”.⁴ This highlights the trend in most churches when it came to liturgical music: lots of them would make different parts of the liturgy musically different to attempt to captivate the people. While part of liturgy is meant to captivate the faithful, when the faithful are more captivated by the music it switches that to which the person is ordering himself.⁵

³ Fr. Sean Conroy, Fr. John Nepil, Fr. Eric Gilbaugh, “The Liturgical Ideal of the Church,” *Catholic Stuff You Should Know*, 30:50, December 12, 2022, <https://catholicstuffpodcast.com/podcast/2022/11/17/the-liturgical-ideal-of-the-church.html>.

⁴ “de la misa deben conservar la unidad de composición que corresponde a su texto. No es, por tanto, lícito componerlos en piezas separadas, de manera que cada una de ellas forme una composición musical completa, y tal que pueda separarse de las restantes y reemplazarse con otra”. *Tra le sollecitudini*, 11.

⁵ We should note here that, breaking with convention, the title of this Motu Proprio is in Italian rather than Latin. The title of the Motu Proprio in the vernacular could indicate that Pius X sought to bring vernacular back to the liturgy.

Gregorian chant, in contrast, is made of simple tones which are easier for a congregation to understand over liturgical music of the counter-reformation era. The underlying principle in Pius X's reform seems to be simplicity in the liturgy. This simplicity comes from making things easier to understand for the congregation, ordering the liturgy toward how it can better the faithful instead of making it look ornate.

After the death of Pius X, Pius XI continued his predecessor's work on liturgical development in the Church. He expounded on liturgical development by reiterating what previous popes have said the purpose of liturgy is. This is seen in his papal bull, *Divini cultus*. There, Pius XI outlines that to which liturgy is ordered: he writes, "For this reason Celestine I believed that the canon of faith was expressed in the venerable formulas of the liturgy. In this regard he states: '*The law of prayer determines the law of faith*'".⁶ "The law of prayer is the law of faith" is one of the central principles that guides the Church's governance of worship. Primarily it shows how liturgy grounds the faithful in prayer. This is because how the people pray can influence how they offer themselves to God in liturgy. *Divini cultus* sets forth clearly what the role of liturgy is in the life of the faithful, which is that the liturgy influences how the faithful come to know who God is.

Following the death of Pius XI, Pius XII contributed to his predecessors' work on liturgical development. Pius XII gives a more holistic approach to the understanding of liturgy. He does this by expounding on what the roles of the priest and laity are in the liturgy, and how the Church guides the liturgy to allow the faithful to grow. The encyclical *Mediator Dei* outlines how Pius XII desired to develop how the liturgy is understood. He notes that the liturgy should be both an interior and exterior act. Exteriorly, the liturgy is prayed with the body--this is seen in

⁶ "Per tale motivo Celestino I riteneva che il canone della fede si trovava espresso nelle venerande formule della liturgia. In proposito egli afferma: '*La legge della preghiera determina la legge della fede*'. *Divini cultus*, 11.

the congregation's standing, sitting, and kneeling throughout the liturgy. The priests and servers partake in the exterior act by using incense, chanting readings from scripture, and using the same postures the congregation use. Pius XII notes that the interior and exterior acts are supposed to work together: "It should be clear to all, then, that God cannot be honored worthily unless the mind and heart turn to Him in a quest of the perfect life, and that the worship rendered to God by the Church in union with her divine head is the most efficacious means of achieving sanctity".⁷ The goal of liturgy is then to order the person to God and to understand God's love through Christ's sacrifice on the cross and His resurrection.

Pius XII notes the redemptive and sacrificial nature of the liturgy when he writes, "It is an unquestionable fact that the work of our redemption is continued and that its fruits are imparted to us, during the celebration of the liturgy, notable in the august sacrifice of the altar. Christ each day acts to save us".⁸ Understanding the relation of the interior and exterior acts of a person during liturgy and what liturgy means in a Christian understanding can allow us more deeply to understand what liturgy is. Liturgy represents Christ's sacrifice on the cross through the priest offering the bread and wine, which he transforms to the body and blood of Christ. Redemption through the resurrection of Christ is found through the Church's understanding that receiving the body and blood of Christ allows a person to participate in communion with God. The exterior act intrinsically relates to a person's interior disposition to liturgy, because when a person receives Christ's body and blood he develops a relationship with Christ. The relationship is made stronger through praying with the liturgy exteriorly. Pius XII's encyclical on liturgy is the precursor for *Maxima redemptionis*, which made practical changes to the liturgy.

⁷ *Mediator Dei*, 26.

⁸ *Ibid*, 29.

On November 16, 1955 Pius XII promulgated *Maxima redemptionis*, a decree which reformed the Holy Week liturgy, referred to from this point on as the 1955 reforms. Holy Week recounts the week of Christ's life before he underwent his suffering and death. The Holy Week liturgies are the highest in the Church's liturgical calendar and the apex of worship for Catholics. They recount Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection, the central mystery of the Catholic Church. The 1955 reforms sought to change the liturgy in order better to accommodate the faithful. Pius XII mentions that "the Paschal Vigil especially, torn from its characteristic nocturnal seat, has lost its native clarity and sense of words and symbols".⁹ This clarifies that Pius XII saw the participation of the faithful in the liturgy as imperative to their understanding. Furthermore, Pius XII began to notice that the faithful were not attending Holy Week liturgies as often because they were too long. As he writes, "celebration had now long been postponed to the morning hours, when schools, factories, and public affairs of every kind, everywhere in the world, are usually conducted on weekdays".¹⁰ Because of this Pius XII shortened the liturgy to make it more convenient for the faithful to attend and tend to their duties such as work and school. This seems to mark a beginning of reforms in the Church that were more practically minded, which indicate her recognizing that adaptations to the liturgy may be helpful to the laity.

1.2: Theologians of the Liturgical Renewal Movement

While liturgical reforms were not instituted in the liturgy until 1955 there were theologians that were contemporaneous with Pius X, Pius XI, and Pius XII who assisted in liturgical reform. The Liturgical Renewal Movement (LRM) sought to bring about a greater

⁹ "Solemnis praesertim paschalis vigiliae liturgia, a propria nocturna sede avulsa, nativam perspicuitatem ac verborum et symbolorum sensum amisit" *Maxmia redemptionis*, 3.

¹⁰ "celebratio iam diu ad horas matutinas anteposita fuerat, quando scilicet scholae, opificia et publica cuiusque generis negotia, ubique terrarum, diebus ferialibus peragi solentet peraguntur", Ibid 5.

understanding of the role of the priest and the laity during liturgy, specifically, how both can participate in the liturgy. The goal of the movement was to have the faithful better understand what the liturgy meant theologically and how God works actively in the life of a person. This was done by promoting participation of the laity in the liturgy.

Though the beginning of the LRM cannot be pinpointed exactly, it is largely accredited to Fr. Dom Beauduin, OSB. In 1906 Beauduin became a Benedictine monk, and while at the monastery he took up liturgical theology and ecumenism. His ecumenical focus was the relationship between the Anglicans and Eastern Orthodox.¹¹ As Michael Driscoll puts it, “Beauduin established a new approach toward separated Christians that was founded on respect and love rather than one based on the desire to proselytize.”¹² It consisted in listening to an individual to know and understand him or her but still remaining true to one's own convictions”.¹³ While Beauduin's work in ecumenism does not seem to relate directly to liturgy, his vision of listening to individuals and bringing Christians together speaks to his idea of liturgy as unity.

Beauduin forwards this view in his definition of liturgy. He states, “above all the Liturgy is one Unity of belief, of discipline, of common fellowship, must necessarily show itself in worship; and despite certain divergences the liturgy is fundamentally, profoundly one”.¹⁴ Though liturgical forms and rites are very different, all liturgy is one. This is because everyone in the Church is praying and reliving the sacrifice and resurrection of Christ during the liturgy.

¹¹ Michael S. Driscoll, Review of *Un pionnier, dom Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960): Liturgie et Unité des chrétiens*. *The Catholic Historical Review* 94, no. 4 (2008): 841-842. [doi:10.1353/cat.0.0178](https://doi.org/10.1353/cat.0.0178).

¹² Proselytization in this sense implies a coercive conversion instead of conversion as a choice freely made.

¹³ Michael S. Driscoll, Review of *Un pionnier, dom Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960): Liturgie et Unité des chrétiens*, 841-842.

¹⁴ Qtd in. Alcuin Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005),70.

Although Protestants and Orthodox are separated from the Catholic Church they can still be united to Christ in some aspect in attempting to make an earnest sacrifice.¹⁵

Catechesis of the faithful also becomes part of LRM's focus on participation of the faithful in liturgy. Catechesis is instructing someone in Christianity for the sake of bringing the person to be baptized or deepening the faith of the those who are already baptized. Beauduin elaborates, writing, "aiming to give regular liturgical education to circles, associations, etc., and to employ all the customary methods of popularization to this end".¹⁶ This describes that part of understanding liturgy not only comes through being part of the liturgy, but being instructed outside of liturgy what it means to partake in liturgy. This is important because it allows the faithful to understand how to strive for unity with God in and outside of liturgy. Beauduin is an important figure in the LRM because he lays the scaffolding for the main theological principles LRM theologians after him use—like what the purpose of liturgy is and what it means for the faithful to participate in the liturgy. This sets up other LRM theologians to interpret best how the principles can be best implemented in liturgy.

Fr. Romano Guardini, who was ordained a priest in 1910, and is another influential figure in the LRM. In 1911 he became the leader of a youth group in Mainz, Germany, which often discussed topics like literature, art, and theater. He also engaged with the youth through retreats and social events.¹⁷ The interaction between Guardini and his faithful seems to show that Guardini was focused on the Church's relationship between the clergy and faithful. This comes out in his theology, particularly in how he views the role of the laity in the liturgy. This is

¹⁵ Depending on the particular denomination of Protestantism some have valid sacraments. Such is the case with the Anglican Church and some of the bishops being validly ordained. Most Orthodox have valid sacraments, but some do not. This is the case with the Antiochean Orthodox who do not have a validly ordained patriarch.

¹⁶ Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*, 73.

¹⁷ Rober Krieg, *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the sacred to the modern world* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1995), 20.

emphasized in his most popular work *Spirit of the Liturgy*, which stresses the question of what the role of the laity is in liturgy.

Guardini elaborates that liturgy is the fundamental way of worship for humans. Regarding the faithful who are in the Church, he recognizes that liturgy is what makes the Church Catholic. Liturgy is both the universal prayer of the Catholic Church and also edifies the individual. He clarifies, “the liturgy does not say ‘I’ but ‘We’, unless the particular action which is being performed specifically requires the singular number . . . the liturgy is not celebrated by the individual, but by the body of the faithful”.¹⁸ Guardini argues that liturgy is not only a person offering himself to God with the priest performing the sacrifice, but the faithful gathered together performing the sacrifice with the priest. The faithful partake in the sacrifice through prayer, which unites them with the priest and the whole Church.

Fr. Josef Jungmann, SJ, joined the Jesuits in 1917 and taught liturgy and catechetics at the University of Innsbruck, and was also Guardini’s contemporary. During his time teaching catechetics and liturgy Jungmann made sure to ask his students what their pastors’ relationship with the parish was like.¹⁹ He took this information and changed how he taught seminarians and priests. This made him a better professor because it allowed him to see the lacunae in the liturgical and catechetical formation of the priest and the people. This reveals that Jungmann has the same mindset as others in the LRM who focus on the relationship between the priest and the laity, and how that can be expressed in liturgy.

Jungmann’s focus on catechesis and liturgy led him to write *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origin and Development*. Its purpose was for people to have a proper history of the Roman

¹⁸ Romano Guardini, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. Ada Lane (New York: Crossroad Publications, 1998), 26.

¹⁹ Michae Horan. “Liturgical Pioneers, Pastoral Musicians, and Liturgists,” liturgical leaders Blogspot, January 24, 2023, <https://liturgicalleaders.blogspot.com/2008/09/josef-jungmann.html>.

Rite with citations explaining development in liturgy. As Jungmann writes in his introduction, “I wanted to build a solid structure that did not rest on conjecture and on the unexamined acceptance of the data of earlier authors”.²⁰ The theological significance of this for the LRM is that there was a focus to understand how the early Church was able to have the role of priest and laity distinct, but also work together well in the Church.

The Mass of the Roman Rite is part of laying the groundwork for considering how the laity interact with the priest. Jungmann stresses participation in liturgy when he writes, “nowadays we appear to be stressing more and more the participation of the laity in the liturgical function, this is only a result of a return to that larger concept of the Church which circumstances of the time and the demands of the cure of souls have forced upon us”.²¹ Jungmann shows that an emphasis on participation is good for the Church because it shows how much she cares about the salvation of her people. Furthermore, it shows that the Church desires her people to be active in the Church, and this activity begins in prayer. Jungmann’s emphasis that participation is a return to the early Church highlights the goal of the LRM--that is, to go back to the early Church Fathers and interpret them faithfully in light of modern day. This lays the groundwork for the Second Vatican Council to be set in motion.

Fr. Joseph Ratzinger and Fr. Louis Bouyer were also instrumental in implementing the principles of the LRM. Ratzinger studied for seminary at the University of Munich from 1945 to 1951. From 1946 to 1951, Romano Guardini was a professor at the University of Munich. While teaching in Munich, Guardini heavily influenced Ratzinger’s theology, especially on the liturgy. German journalist Peter Seewald notes Guardini’s influence on Ratzinger in his biography

²⁰ Josef A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origin and Development*, trans. Rev. Francis A. Brunner (South Bend: Christian Classics, 2012), 4.

²¹ *Ibid*, 2-3.

Benedict XVI: A Life. Quoting Ratzinger, he writes, “The church came alive for us above all in the liturgy and in the great wealth of its theological tradition”.²² This points out that Ratzinger saw Guardini’s view of participation in liturgy as life-giving to the Church. This means that the Church is most alive spiritually when bringing the laity and priest together to actively participate during liturgy.

Ratzinger brought his understanding that the Church is alive in his reflections on the Council. He says, “did it make sense for 2.500 bishops, not to mention the other faithful there, to be relegated to the role of mere spectators at a ceremony . . . was not the fact that the active participation of those present was not required symptomatic of a wrong that needed a remedy?”²³ Ratzinger articulates that participation is necessary to liturgy, because it is what brings the Church together.

Bouyer joined the Church in 1936 and was appointed to the preparatory commission of the Council. In this position, Bouyer examined the documents that would make up the teaching of Vatican II.²⁴ Being able to examine the documents would allow him to provide input on how the theology of the LRM could be implemented at Vatican II.²⁵

²² Peter Seewald, *Benedict XVI: A Life*, trans. Dinah Livingstone (London: Bloomsbury Continuum 2020), 227.

²³ Joseph Ratzinger, *Theological highlights of Vatican II*, trans. Henry Traub, SJ (New York: Paulist Press, 1966), 21.

²⁴ Though my primary focus is seeing how his position played a role in liturgical reform.

²⁵ Louis Bouyer, *Memoirs*, trans. Anne Englund Nash (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2015), 243.

Chapter 2

2.1: *Ressourcement and Aggiornamento*

Aggiornamento, Italian for progress, was Pope John XXIII's guiding phrase when he convened the Second Vatican Council. John XXIII's aims for convening the Council are made clear in Fr. John O'Malley's historical account of the Council, *What Happened at Vatican II*. O'Malley cites John XXIII: "the enlightenment, edification and joy of the entire Christian people... a renewed cordial invitation to the faithful of the separated communities to participate with us in this quest for unity and grace, for which so many souls long in all parts of the world".²⁶ John XXIII sought spiritual renewal in and for the Church. This began through John XXIII's understanding that the role of the Christian should be to participate in the Church. He believed that for Christians to go through spiritual renewal it has to come through unification with other Christians. This relates to the liturgical understanding that prayer unifies Christians. John XXIII calling for unity laid out his goal for the Council, which was a better formation of Christians and unity.

After John XXIII's opening statement to begin the Council, he began to survey the opinion of the bishops who were going to participate in the Council. Out of all the responses, there were only a few that desired more lay involvement in the liturgy and the use of vernacular in the liturgy. Despite this, the Council went forward with reform in how the Church interacted with the world, especially reform of the liturgy. On October 11, 1963 the Council was convened. The theological principles the Council operated on were as stated just above *aggiornamento*, but also *ressourcement*, a theological movement that encouraged returning to the sources of the Church—i.e., the Patristics—and development. Development here means the understanding of

²⁶ John O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010), 17.

how doctrines of the Church can unfold to become more holistic in their consideration, that is, how can the doctrines of the Church best interact with the modern world. The vision John XXIII had for the Council was to bring the Church to the present while considering both the past and the future. O'Malley clarifies this: "one basic, crucial assumption underlay all three as they were understood in the Council: the Catholic tradition is richer, broader, and more malleable than the way in which it had often, especially in the nineteenth century, been interpreted".²⁷ Vatican II then had the Church seek to interpret tradition faithfully in light of present times and what could come. This means the Church wanted to show that her tradition is not something that is meant to stay in the past, but can interact with modern man.

When the *ressourcement* movement was taken up by Catholic theologians, non-Catholics began to notice that the way theology was viewed began to change. One of the most prominent non-Catholics who commented on this was an American Protestant named Ernest Koenker. He was a professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago, and took interest in what was happening in the Church at the time.²⁸ Although all of his works were written prior to Vatican II, Koenker noticed how theology was changing before that. He writes, "the old magic sacramentalism of the Roman Catholic Church will be completely overcome. A new, evangelical spirit may be infused into the relationship between spiritualized and Christianized. If the renaissance can continue unhindered, there may be a new 'Liturgical Springtime'".²⁹ Koenker saw the Church's change as positive, and he understood it to demonstrate that the Church was willing to catch up with the times. This however, seems to be a misinterpretation of the *ressourcement* movement. Because *ressourcement* theology sought to interpret tradition

²⁷ Ibid, 37.

²⁸ It is interesting that even non-Catholics are curious as to what the Church has to say on matters. This shows that there is a sense that the Church speaks with some kind of authority on all matters.

²⁹ Qtd in. Alcuin Reid, *The Organic Development of the Liturgy*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), 208.

faithfully for modern times. Koenker's view helps us understand how the world outside of the Church thought of Vatican II. Reid clarifies this by expounding on Koenker's view of liturgy: "For Koenker, then, the fundamental question is: How can the Liturgy be adapted to come closer to "the masses", preferably drawing on practices on the early "uncorrupted Church . . . In other words, Koenker rejects the priority of objective liturgical Tradition and the legitimacy of its organic development in history".³⁰ The understanding of Vatican II by the modern world, then, was to view the liturgy as something that can be changed at the will of man for any of his desires. Koenker's understanding of Vatican II speaks to a view which started to become popular at the time: that the Church could change with the spirit of the age. While Koenker is a Protestant his attitude toward the Church began to be adopted by some Catholic clergy after Vatican II. This view became known as a hermeneutic of rupture.

2.2: The Liturgy of Vatican II

At the end of Vatican II the liturgy was changed from what it looked like prior to the Council. The whole liturgy was no longer completely in Latin, predominately used vernacular, and allowed the priest to face the people instead of facing away. This change in liturgy was so drastic that a completely different missal was developed for the liturgical changes. This was known as the *Novus Ordo* (new order) missal. After the release of the *Novus Ordo* missal certain groups in the Church reacted differently to the significant changes in the liturgy.

³⁰ Ibid, 207.

2.3: Two Sides of the Same Hermeneutic

In the aftermath of Vatican II there were two main camps in the Church: those who followed a hermeneutic of rupture and those who followed a hermeneutic of continuity. A hermeneutic of continuity in the context of Vatican II is understanding the Council as being in continuity with the tradition and doctrine of the Church. A hermeneutic of rupture would state that the Council deviated from the tradition of the Church. Within the hermeneutic of rupture there are two different kinds: a traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture and a progressivist hermeneutic of rupture. The traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture focuses on going back to how the Church taught doctrine before Vatican II and not altering the liturgy in any manner. A progressivist hermeneutic of rupture seems to fixate on the Church constantly changing to whatever the culture at the time desires. For the progressivist hermeneutic of rupture, what is most important is changing Church teaching and rapidly changing the liturgy to fit the spirit of the age. I will describe what both hermeneutics of rupture are and explain how they misunderstood what Vatican II intended. After I will expound on what the hermeneutic of continuity is and how it seeks to interpret Vatican II in a charitable manner that shows how it is in continuity with the Church. Finally, I will explain how each hermeneutic ties into how doctrine develops in the Church using John Henry Newman's essay "On the Development of Christian Doctrine".

2.3.a: The Traditionalist Hermeneutic of Rupture

While the start of the traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture cannot be pinpointed to a particular group, it is largely accredited to Archbishop Lefebvre and his group the Fraternal

Society of Saint Pius X also known as the SSPX.³¹ Lefebvre decided to start the SSPX as a group of seminarians who desired to be formed as priests were prior to Vatican II. While Lefebvre was well-intentioned for assisting the men who wanted to learn the TLM, his approach to those who were being formed in the *Novus Ordo* seemed to be an emotion of disgust. He writes in his *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, “among those who observe the course of events with sadness and anguish but are nevertheless afraid to attend a true Mass, in spite of the desire to do so, because they have been persuaded that this Mass is forbidden”.³² While Lefebvre is speaking to the laity in this quote, it still indicates what he believes about the new way seminarians are formed. He seems to suggest that seminarians formed after Vatican II do not know what true liturgy is. The desire for old priestly formation led traditionalists to hold steadfast to not changing how things are done in the Church.

Another mark particular to a traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture is disobedience to bishops in the Church—particularly the Bishop of Rome, also known as the pope, who occupies the seat of Peter. This is seen poignantly in Lefebvre’s exchange with Pope Paul VI. Paul VI says, “You condemn me, you condemn me. I am a Modernist. I am a Protestant. It cannot be allowed, you are doing an evil work, you ought not to continue, you are causing scandal in the Church”.³³ Lefebvre responds, “Holy Father, I come here, but not as the head of the traditionalists . . . On the one side we desire to submit to you entirely, to follow you in everything, to have no reserves about your person, and on the other side we are aware that the lines taken by the Holy See since the Council, and the whole new orientation, turn us away from

³¹ Along with the traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture there is also a romanticized view of the Church. This means that many traditionalists believe that prior to the Council the Church had no problems.

³² Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre *Open letter to Confused Catholics*, trans. Fr. M. Crowdy (Kansas City: Angelus Press, 1985), 68.

³³ “Vous me condamnez, vous me condamnez. Je suis moderniste, je suis protestant! C’est inadmissible, vous faites une mauvaise œuvre, vous ne devez pas continuer vous faites un scandale dans l’Eglise”. Jean Madiran, “Conférence de Mgr Lefebvre à ses séminaristes” *Itinerary*, no. 208: 142. trans. Rachel M. Coleman.

your predecessors”.³⁴ This exchange shows how traditionalists who believe in a hermeneutic of rupture approach the Church. The traditionalist seems to see the Church after the Council as pseudo-protestant and not in continuity with the Church. Furthermore, the traditionalist seems to become more skeptical of authority for fear that the Church hierarchy will take away the Tridentine liturgy from them.

This misses the mark of the intention of Vatican II, because it idolizes a liturgy over Christ. The idolatry comes from noticing how liturgy was poorly implemented after Vatican II. Liturgist Denis Crouan provides examples of liturgical abuse after the Council in his book *The Liturgy Betrayed*. He writes, “in many dioceses in France, the bishops themselves have given a bad example either by improvising the liturgy in whole or in part or by using loose-leaf binders . . . bishops tolerate liturgical abuses, but punish candidates for the priesthood who want to respect the current Roman Missal”.³⁵ Crouan uses this example to show why traditionalists would cling to the Tridentine liturgy, because they are dissatisfied with the state of the current liturgy. When traditionalists see abuses in the liturgy they come to believe that there has been a rupture in the Church, because they are used to the seemingly reverent and structured liturgy that was before Vatican II. No wonder then the traditionalists hold steadfast to the old liturgy! The reverence and ornate decorations are no longer obvious in the new liturgy, given the drastic changes that have been made.

³⁴ “Très Saint Père, je viens ici, non pas comme chef des traditionalistes. . . D’une part nous avons le désir de vous être soumis entièrement, de vous suivre en tout, de ne faire reserve dans votre personne, et d’autre part nous nous rendons compte que les orientations qui sont prises par le saint-siège depuis le concile et toute cette orientation nouvelle nous éloignent de vos prédécesseurs” Ibid, 142-143.

³⁵ Denis Crouan, *The liturgy Betrayed*, trans. Marc Sebanc (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000), 73.

The ceremonies in the liturgy are what give traditionalists a security that the liturgy is something that is familiar since there is no deviation in how it is celebrated. Crouan expounds on this:

attention was fixed on the unchanging, exterior forms of the act of worship: the white gloves of the bishop, the pastor's lacework alb, the ringing of the bells at the elevation . . . when neo-liturgists did away with all of this, they deprived many of the faithful of the secure points of reference that they had invested with an eternal significance solely because these were the points of reference they had always known.³⁶

This shows that for traditionalists what is most important is not altering the liturgy to give some kind of familiarity. Familiarity, means that there are things in the liturgy that are unchanged, but accidental to the liturgy. This is contrary to the liturgy understood as ever ancient, ever new. Liturgy is not meant to stay completely static, rather it needs to be dynamic. This is because liturgy is supposed to speak to people at a particular time while holding to eternal truths. The Swiss theologian Fr. Hans Urs von Balthasar comments on the importance for liturgical reform in his book *A Short Primer for Unsettled Laymen*. He explains, "the Mass was in urgent need of renewal, especially in regard to the active participation of the faithful in the sacred act, which was a matter of course in the first centuries".³⁷ He highlights that the liturgy, especially before Vatican II, needed renewal, because the laity no longer understood their role in the Church. Therefore, the traditionalist view on liturgy cannot be compatible with the Church since it looks to retreat to how things were in some romanticized vision of the past. If the Church sought to retreat constantly she could never answer the questions that modernity brings to her.

The traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture lacks continuity in understanding how doctrine develops. The traditionalist seems to understand Church doctrine as something that is set in stone

³⁶ Ibid, 63-64.

³⁷ Hans Urs Von Balthasar, *A Short Primer for Unsettled Laymen*, trans. Michael Waldstein (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), 116.

rather than the living being that it is. While it is true that Church doctrine does not change substantially, traditionalists fail to make a distinction of how things change in Church teaching. Substantially doctrine does not change, but when new questions arise how the doctrine is implemented and understood changes. Put shortly: divine revelation still penetrates the liturgy, but how it is expressed is what changes. John Henry Newman writes, “A true development, then, may be described as one which is conservative of the course of antecedent developments being really those antecedents and something besides them: it is an addition which illustrates, not obscures, corroborates, not corrects, the body of thought from which it proceeds”.³⁸ A traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture then is not a proper development of doctrine. Development of is understanding things as a whole and seeing how they fit together. Therefore, there needs to be some sense of continuity in keeping to what has already been said and what is being said in the Church. If the traditionalist understanding of doctrine is no development and going to back to what is chronologically earliest, then the Tridentine liturgy would not even exist. Taken to its logical conclusion what liturgy would look like for a true traditionalist would just be the words of institution and the reception of communion. No traditionalist would hold a position this absurd on liturgy of course, therefore even traditionalist who holds to a hermeneutic of rupture understand development is necessary.

2.3.b: The Progressivist Hermeneutic of Rupture

Similar to the traditionalists, there is no particular group that can be pointed toward contributing to a progressivist hermeneutic of rupture. However, some point toward the academic journal *Concilium* for influencing and perpetuating progressivist thought in the Church.

³⁸ John Henry Newman “An Essay on Development of Christian Doctrine” 5:6.

Concilium was founded in 1965 with the intent of focusing on the *aggiornamento* spirit at Vatican II.³⁹ This spirit is primarily drawn from what the *Concilium* theologians thought the relationship was between the Church and the world. Philip Gonzales clarifies how the *Concilium* theologians viewed the Church by examining their ecclesiology. He writes, “For is the mission of the Church to entirely spill all of its form and content out into the world, thereby abdicating Christian grammar, vision, and form, as seemingly proposed by Schillebeeckx’s ‘extra mundum nulla salus’”.⁴⁰ The Church, by the standards of the *Concilium* theologians, is a being that pours herself out to man. While the Church does pour herself out to man in a sense, such as through the sacraments, God pours out to man to form him and elevate him to heaven. If the Church were only to pour out man would take what the Church has to offer and make it fit his desires.

Attempting to change the Church for one’s own theological desires will inevitably alter how one understands active participation in liturgy. Crouan gives examples of this: “confusions of roles, especially regarding priestly ministry and role of the laity (indiscriminate shared recitation of the Eucharist Prayer, homilies given by lay people, lay people distributing Communion while the priest refrains from doing so . . . the manipulation of liturgical texts for social and political ends)”.⁴¹ Crouan notes that these are liturgical abuses not only because the priests and laity are not following the rubrics that the Church has instituted, but because they pervert what liturgy is. Liturgy becomes perverted when there is no longer a distinction between the role of the priest and the laity.

Even though the progressivists pervert liturgy, it is not done out of a desire to destroy the Church from within. Their desire comes from showing the laity how much their role matters in

³⁹ Philip Gonzales, “The Trajectory of Twentieth-Century Catholic,” *Church Life Journal*, February 28, 2023, <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-trajectory-of-twentieth-century-catholic-thought/>.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Denis Crouan, *The Liturgy Betrayed*, 50.

the Church came from the lack of participation that was present prior to Vatican II. John Cavadini, Mary Healy, and Thomas Weinandy address this in their article “The Liturgy Prior to Vatican II and The Council’s Reforms”. They claim,

The spiritual high point for the faithful was reverently receiving on their tongue Holy Communion...However, they had little awareness that the privilege of receiving Holy Communion was founded upon their having participated in Jesus’s once-for-all sacrifice of himself to the Father for the forgiveness of sins and the outpouring of the divine life of the Holy Spirit.⁴²

It makes sense then why progressivists in the Church wanted to show the laity that their involvement was more than standing in the pew and attending liturgy. The laity for the most part misunderstood their participation in the liturgy. They are to be active in liturgy, which allows them to understand what Christ’s sacrifice was and how they participate in in God’s divinity. However, progressivists took it to such an extreme that the laity become the main focus of the liturgy. This is obvious in Crouan’s analysis of liturgical abuses in the Church. The progressivists in the Church wanted to interact with the world, but it came at the cost of misunderstanding what liturgy is, and what the role of the priest is in worship. The priest is to come down and be Christ to the laity, while the laity receive what Christ desires of them. They reciprocate by participating in the liturgy and meditating on His divinity.

The goal, then, of the progressivists seems to be to make Christ accessible to all by showing how theology interacts with modernity. This however comes at the cost of propagating poor theology. Gonzales clarifies, “Concilium thinkers think that modernity offers the ability and opportunity to bring Catholic thought up-to-date by grounding Catholicism in the move towards the subject and the general secularization enacted through the Enlightenment, Marxism, and

⁴² John Cavadini, Mary Healy, Thomas Weinandy. “The Liturgy Prior to Vatican II and The Council’s Reforms,” Church Life Journal, October 26 2022, <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-liturgy-prior-to-vatican-ii-and-the-councils-reforms/>.

modern thought”.⁴³ It seems that the effort of the *Concilium* thinkers is not to destroy the Church, but to attempt to interact with the world by making the Church as similar to the world as possible. This is directly in contrast to the traditionalist movement which seeks to go back to how theology was pre-Vatican II. While the problem of the traditionalist movement was not interacting with the modern world enough, the progressivists have the opposite problem: they entertain modernity so much that modernity influences their theology poorly. Ratzinger comments on this kind of theology writing, “without having produced anything genuinely new, people could pretend to be interesting at a cheap price. They sold goods from the old liberal flea market as if they were new Catholic theology”.⁴⁴ Ratzinger highlights that those in the progressivist camp tend to use theology as a means of masking secular ideas.

The progressivists seemingly believe in development, but if we dig into their understanding of doctrine, we see quickly that is not the case. There is a distinction between development of doctrine and evolution of doctrine. Newman describes development using the example of animals. He explains, “The adult animal has the same make, as it had on its birth; young birds do not grow into fishes, nor does the child degenerate into the brute, wild or domestic, of which he is by inheritance lord”.⁴⁵ Newman claims development of doctrine is similar to a natural organism: an organism cannot substantially change as it grows. It is still the same, but how it exists is different. This is different than evolution of doctrine, which seems to disregard the original doctrines and substitute them for new doctrines. Evolution of doctrine gives the appearance that it is in continuity with what comes before even though it is not. This shows that a progressivist hermeneutic of rupture is also not viable. This is because taken to its

⁴³ Gonzales, “Twentieth Century Catholic Thought.”

⁴⁴ Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, “Communio: A Program,” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 19 (Fall 1992): 437.

⁴⁵ Newman “Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine” 5:1.

conclusion, if the goal of the Church is to continue to evolve then she would look unrecognizable from her original message, which as Christ said is to, “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you”.⁴⁶ If the goal of the Church is to evangelize and to teach as Christ commanded, then adopting things that come with every new age cannot be a proper way to understand the Church in a hermeneutic of continuity. This leaves the progressivist position as an unsound way to judge development in the Church.

Even though traditionalists and progressives have a different way of approaching how they see the result of Vatican II, they are similar in the methods they use to justify their beliefs. Both of them use vagueness to their advantage. The traditionalist treats ambiguity as license to do something so long as it is not specified in a rule. An example of this would be to continue to do the pre-1955 Holy Week when the pope has said traditionalist group are only allowed to use the 1962 missal. The progressivist reads vagueness as liberty to do what he wants with the liturgy, so long as the faithful desire it. An example would be to allow dancing during liturgy. The progressivist would say that the missal neither permits or discourages dancing, therefore, it is allowed. Both of these hermeneutics give the appearance that they are being obedient even though they are abusing the intent of the liturgical reforms, which is to follow the reforms as outlined by the Church obediently.

Examining both forms of the hermeneutic of rupture leads us to a seeming crossroads to understanding the role of theology and man in light of modernity. The traditionalists desire to retreat and attempt to answer new questions with answers that are no longer entirely applicable to the modern world. The progressivists desire to adopt whatever the world has to offer and

⁴⁶ Mt 28:19-20

disregard doctrine and dogma that has been. Since neither view of the Church is tenable for a hermeneutic of continuity we need to explore a hermeneutic of reform. This is an attempt to understand Vatican II in light of tradition.

2.3.c: *Communio*, *Nouvelle Théologie*, and *the Hermeneutic of Continuity*

In hindsight it is obvious that understanding the goal of Vatican II was quite difficult. However, in 1972 theologians Joseph Ratzinger, Henri De Lubac, and Hans Urs Von Balthasar began the academic journal *Communio* in order to help people interpret Vatican II in continuity with the Church. Ratzinger and De Lubac, having been at Vatican II, understood the vision the Council had in mind. Even though Balthasar was not at the Council, he shared a similar vision with Ratzinger and De Lubac. This vision was that the Church needed reform and their answer would come from understanding what the Church Fathers had to say, and consider what modernity was saying at the time. Each of them was part of a bigger movement in the Church that sought to bring back more study of the Church Fathers among theologians and in seminary formation, which became known as the *Nouvelle Théologie*⁴⁷ movement. The goal of the *Nouvelle Théologie*⁴⁸ is well put by Paolo Prosperi: “The return to the Fathers meant stressing not only a more direct influence of dogma on the lives of believers, but likewise a more direct influence of the life of faith on the expression of dogma”.⁴⁹ *Nouvelle Théologie* began to notice that there was a disconnect between theology as a scholastic science versus theology as a science that brings one to prayer. This means theology became so focused on minute questions that it no longer asked the most important theological question: how can man love and serve God better?

⁴⁷ This was initially meant as an epithet by theologian Garrigou-Lagrange.

⁴⁸ The *Nouvelle Théologie* movement is also called the *Sources Chrétiennes* movement or the *ressourcement* movement. Those in *Communio* are also considered to be part of this school of thought as well.

⁴⁹ Paolo Prosperi, “The Birth of *Sources Chrétiennes* and the Return to the Fathers.” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 39 (Winter 2012): 643-644.

Nouvelle Théologie sought to bring forward that fundamental question to theology again by studying the Church Fathers.

The *Nouvelle Théologie* movement is important too in light of the goal of the Vatican II and a hermeneutic of continuity. This is because the problem *Nouvelle Théologie* noticed in the Church and its goal in theology was the same for those at Vatican II: a disconnect in the relationship of the Church and the laity. The goal thus for both *Nouvelle Théologie* and Vatican II was for the Church to relate to modern man well in light of tradition. The purpose of *Communio* theology and in turn the hermeneutic of continuity on which it is founded is to understand what Vatican II sought to do for the faithful.

Benedict XVI expounds on a hermeneutic of continuity, what he calls the hermeneutic of reform, in his Christmas Address to the Roman Curia. He explains, writing, “the ‘hermeneutic of reform’, of renewal in the continuity of the one subject-Church which the Lord has given to us. She is a subject which increases in time and develops, yet always remaining the same, the one subject of the journeying People of God”.⁵⁰ Benedict proposes that the hermeneutic of continuity is recognizing how God works in what the Church has given the people and how it relates to what she has previously said. This seems the best way to approach the Church in a Catholic framework. If theologians are already presupposing that the Church is founded by Christ it would only make sense to interpret a Church Council in continuity with the Church. As Christ says in scripture, “And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it”.⁵¹ This is related to the hermeneutic of continuity because if the Church were not to be instituted by Christ it would mean that there can be error in what she teaches.

⁵⁰ Benedict XVI, “To the Roman Curia Offering them his Christmas Greetings” (Vatican City, 22 December 2005)

⁵¹ Mt 16:18

The hermeneutic of continuity seems to fit best with how Newman understands how doctrine develops. He asserts, “harmonious order, dispose the imagination most forcibly towards the belief that a teaching so consistent with itself, so well balanced, so young and so old, not obsolete after so many centuries, but vigorous and progressive still, is the very development contemplated in the Divine Scheme”.⁵² Development of doctrine in the hermeneutic of continuity is then interacting with the modern world and at the same time holding steadfast to what has been taught. This shows that a hermeneutic of continuity is truly in continuity with the Church, because it is similar to how God interacts with the world as it is, the world constantly changes, but He remains substantially unchanged.

Seeing how each hermeneutic plays out in its understanding of Vatican II is helpful to consider what parties were at play when it comes to liturgical implementation. Understanding hermeneutics is crucial to seeing what prevailed in the liturgy after Vatican II, and what the intention of the Council was for the liturgy.

⁵² Newman “Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine” 2:2.

Preface to Chapter 3

In the first chapter I covered why theologians in the Church thought there needed to be change in the liturgy. I also discussed what principles the theologians were working from to promote liturgical development. In the second chapter I wrote about how the theological principles came out of the Council through the hermeneutic of continuity, and how those who believe in the hermeneutics of rupture failed to see the goal of the hermeneutic of continuity theologians. Therefore, in this chapter I will describe what the intention of Vatican II was liturgically, how it was perverted, and how liturgy was implemented after the Council. Regarding implementation, I will divide it into two parts. Actual implementation in which, I will define as how things came out after the council. Intentional implementation: how after the Council Popes and bishops would attempt to clear up the mess that was made of the liturgy.

Chapter 3

3.1: *What the Council Wanted*

The intention of the Council was clear from the beginning. In John XXIII's opening address to the Council, he states,

it is now clear for what is expected of the council. . . I desire to transmit pure and integral, without lessening or deforming the doctrine which has been around for twenty centuries. . . It is our duty to not only study that precious treasure as if it was its antiquity we only cared about, but also dedicate ourselves with diligence and without fear to the labor our time requires, continuing the path which the Church has gone on for twenty centuries.⁵³

The goal of the Council, according to John XXIII, was to reaffirm Church teaching while also understanding how the Church can interact with modernity. This was especially important with regard to the liturgy. The Church wanted to keep with tradition, while making the liturgy understandable for modern man.

After the death of John XXIII, Paul VI continued the work his predecessor began on Vatican II. One of John XXIII's desires for the Council was to draft a document to outline reforms for liturgy. Paul VI began this by forming a group focused on drafting a document on liturgical reform. This document was known as *Sacrosanctum concilium*. Regarding liturgy Paul VI speaks in a more pointed manner when he addresses the bishops in the session which was drafting *Sacrosanctum concilium*. He says, "and this is your second most delicate office: the study of liturgical expression in word, music, and song, and in gesture and action of the rite . . . to preserve the rich doctrinal meaning for liturgical prayer and to proportion its cultic language

⁵³ "ya está claro lo que se espera del Concilio, en todo cuanto a la doctrina se refiere... quiere transmitir pura e íntegra, sin atenuaciones ni deformaciones, la doctrina que durante veinte siglos... Deber nuestro no es sólo estudiar ese precioso tesoro, como si únicamente nos preocupara su antigüedad, sino dedicarnos también, con diligencia y sin temor, a la labor que exige nuestro tiempo, prosiguiendo el camino que desde hace veinte siglos recorre la Iglesia". John XXIII, "Solemne Apertura del Concilio Vaticano II" (Vatican City, 11 October 1963).

to its dogmatic content”.⁵⁴ Paul VI notes that liturgy is of utmost importance of the Council, because it is what conveys doctrine to the people. Therefore, part of the intention of Vatican II liturgically was not to admonish the Tridentine liturgy, but to preserve the truth in the liturgy. The truth in the liturgy needed to be more accessible to the faithful, because understanding Latin was no longer common place in the Church. Paul VI further reveals his intentions saying,

one can say prevalent in the intentions of the liturgical reform; that is, to make the liturgical ceremony accessible, in understanding, expression, execution, to the majority of the faithful . . . And also the effort to adapt the forms and language of the sacred rite to pastoral needs, to the catechetical purposes of worship, to the spiritual and moral formation of the faithful, to the need for union with God.⁵⁵

Paul VI sought to make the liturgy catechetical and easy to understand for the faithful.⁵⁶ This shows what the true purpose of liturgy is. It is to be ever ancient, ever new, in order to edify the spiritual and moral needs of the faithful. Paul VI seemed well intentioned regarding the reform of the liturgy. He was trying to implement the spirit of the Council. The goal was to reach modern man, but not compromise on tradition.

Even though it is evident that Paul VI had good intentions regarding the reforms, some argue that he allowed the liturgy to be too loosely structured. The argument goes something like this: if the liturgy is loosely structured this allows for errors to seep into the liturgy much easier than in the Tridentine rite. Some might go as far as to say that Paul VI was indifferent to what the bishops did regarding the liturgy, which allowed for some bishops to put error in the liturgy. At first glance this argument seems to be convincing, especially considering the abuses in the

⁵⁴ “Ed è codesto il vostro secondo delicatissimo ufficio: lo studio dell’espressione liturgica, sia nella parola, che nella musica e nel canto, e sia nel gesto e nell’azione del rito... di conservare cioè alla preghiera liturgica un suo ricco significato dottrinale e di porzionare il linguaggio culturale al suo contenuto dogmatico” Paul VI “Consilium ad ad exsequendam constitutionem de sacra Liturgia (Vatican City, 13 October 1966),” trans. Fr. Donato Infante III.

⁵⁵ “si può dire prevalente negli intenti della riforma liturgica; e cioè quello di rendere accessibile, nella comprensione, nell’espressione, nell’esecuzione, alla generalità dei Fedeli... Anche questo sforzo di adattamento delle forme e del linguaggio del sacro rito alle esigenze pastorali, ai fini catechetici del culto, alla formazione spirituale e morale dei Fedeli, al bisogno d’unione con Dio”, Ibid.

⁵⁶ See Chapter 1.2, above.

new liturgy outlined in chapter two. However, this argument seems to miss the mark of what the Church is. If the liturgy were purposely made loose to allow error, then that would mean that Christ's Church can allow things to be promulgated that can promote error in the Church. Christ makes clear, "whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven".⁵⁷ This shows that when it comes to spiritual nourishment for the faithful, the Church by divine guidance cannot allow error to be instituted in her liturgy. The abuses in liturgy that were mentioned in chapter two these errors came from men and not the Church herself. Therefore, when it comes to error it can only be done by men who fail to understand the mission of the Church.

It is obvious that Paul VI did not desire error to be widespread in the liturgy, but rather the opposite. He exhorts,

watch over the trial phase of the innovations that are being tested and introduced in the individual ecclesiastical regions, and to correct the deviations that can occur here and there, to curb unauthorized arbitrators, who can generate disorders in the right discipline of public prayer and perhaps even insinuate doctrinal errors; thus it is up to you to prevent abuses, to stimulate latecomers and dodgers to reawaken energies, to favor good initiatives, to praise the well-deserving.⁵⁸

Paul VI not only discouraged error in liturgy, but encouraged any error to be immediately taken care of by anyone on the liturgical committee. Therefore, Paul VI's vision for the liturgy seemed to be to have a faithful liturgy while also allowing some leeway within the liturgy depending on what the faithful need. It is also important to note that Paul VI was aware of the development of liturgy in different regions of the Church. It seems that he encouraged some

⁵⁷ Mt 16:19

⁵⁸ "vegliare sulla fase sperimentale delle innovazioni, che nelle singole regioni ecclesiastiche si stanno provando ed introducendo, e correggere le deviazioni che possono qua e là verificarsi, frenare gli arbitri non autorizzati, che possono generare disordini nella giusta disciplina della preghiera pubblica e insinuare errori dottrinali; così a voi tocca impedire gli abusi, stimolare i ritardatari ed i renitenti, risvegliare energie, favorire le buone iniziative, lodare i benemeriti". Paul VI "Consilium ad ad exsequendam constitutionem de sacra Liturgia" (Vatican City, 13 October 1966). trans. Fr. Donato Infante III.

variety in the liturgy while also keeping to orthodoxy. Liturgy can have variety if it is understood as ever ancient, ever new, because new practices can be added to the liturgy, so long as it benefits the prayer of the faithful. This shows that liturgy is meant for the edification of the faithful while also staying unchanged in doctrine. After Paul VI addressed the those on the liturgy committee, and after those on the committee agreed on what liturgical developments would be good for the faithful, they drafted *Sacrosanctum concilium*. The document itself seems to be a summation of the full enactment of the theology principles that were developed in the LRM. The Council sought to make a modest proposal for liturgical development--those at the Council wanted to make sure the development was as organic as possible. This means that there could be changes in the liturgy that benefitted the faithful but did not look entirely foreign to the faithful. This seemed to be the intention of the Council. Some critics of *Sacrosanctum concilium* say that the document made the liturgy too loose and allowed for change to come too quickly. However, that does not seem to be the case if one looks at the claims in the document:

“Regulation of the sacred liturgy depends solely on the authority of the Church, that is, on the Apostolic See and, as laws may determine, on the bishop . . . Therefore no other person, even if he be a priest, may add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority”.⁵⁹

Liturgical development then was given to be implemented by an organization such as the Congregation for Divine Worship (CDW) and the bishop of Rome. This in turn seems actually to make liturgy stricter when decrees are coming from top down instead of development starting locally. Therefore, the new liturgy being considered loose seems to be a misunderstanding of what the document actually promulgated. The *Novus Ordo* is considered more loose in its appearance, though it is clear in *Sacrosanctum concilium* that it is not. The opposite is also true

⁵⁹ *Sacrosanctum concilium*, 22.

for the Tridentine liturgy, which appears strict, but in its rubrics for the faithful is actually quite loose. Furthermore, liturgical development coming from papal and conciliar decrees is actually quite novel in the Church. Prior to the Council of Trent, liturgy was actually quite loose. Liturgical development was actually instituted by local bishops, and in some cases, parish priests. The more rigorous structure of the *Novus Ordo* though indicates that the liturgy is more intentionally focusing on the faithful, instead of the priest and servers. Intentionality with the congregation shows that the influence of the LRM clearly came out in the structure of the liturgy.

The LRM's influence on *Sacrosanctum concilium* is obvious, given the pride of place of Gregorian chant and the usage of the vernacular in conjunction with Latin in the liturgy. The document states, "The Church acknowledges Gregorian chant as specially suited to the Roman liturgy: therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services . . . the vernacular language is to be used; their decrees are to be approved, that is, confirmed, by the Apostolic See . . . the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites".⁶⁰ The proposals to change the liturgy seem to desire to keep in continuity what has already been established in the liturgy, while altering things to make it more palatable for the faithful. Considering these as the major changes in the liturgy the Council seemed not to propose any drastic changes to the liturgy. However, the proposals of the Council do not seem to fall in line to what actually happened in the liturgy. This begs the question of why these changes were not realized in the liturgy.

⁶⁰ SC 36, 116.

3.2: *What Changed?*

How the liturgy was perverted is not entirely clear. Someone who takes a position in alignment with a traditionalist hermeneutic of rupture may say it was an infiltration of freemasons in the Church that ruined the liturgy.⁶¹ Progressivists may say that change did occur, but it was what was needed and just “the spirit of Vatican II” which guided the change. The desired change they are talking about of course is the liturgy succumbing to the spirit of the age.⁶² Even these possible answers are not even sufficient enough to explain what happened for the liturgy to change so drastically from what was outlined in *Sacrosanctum concilium*. One factor, even though it is quite broad, is the major cultural change at the time of Vatican II. Western culture, especially American culture was becoming more loose in how religion and morality was viewed.⁶³ Pope John Paul II comments on this in his apostolic letter *Vicesimus quintus annus* which commemorates the twenty fifth anniversary of *Sacrosanctum concilium*. He writes, “liturgical reform has met with difficulties due especially to an unfavorable environment marked by a tendency to see religious practice as something of a private affair, by a certain rejection of institutions, by a decrease in visibility of the Church in society, and by a calling into question of personal faith”.⁶⁴ John Paul II explains that religion as a whole was no longer seen as an outward expression of faith. Worship became something that people only do by themselves and do not share in community. This explains why the Church sought to reach out to modern

⁶¹ This claim is largely considered conspiratorial and does not have much foundation. Chiron writes, “This rumor spread *sotto voce*, then became public in the press, and is repeated to this day”. Yves Chiron, *Annibale Bugnini: Reformer of the Liturgy*, trans. John Pepino (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2018) 171.

⁶² After the Vatican II around the mid 1970s in a majority of progressivists circles in the United States especially, there were liturgies pejoratively called ‘Clown Masses’ and ‘Dorito Masses’. A clown mass was when the priest dressed up as a clown for the congregation. Dorito Masses were liturgies where instead of consecrating a host, a priest attempted to consecrate a Dorito.

⁶³ This is largely accredited to the creation of the birth control pill which influenced the sexual revolution in the cultural shift of morals. See John Grabowski, *Sex and Virtue: An Introduction to Sexual Ethics*, (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003) 7.

⁶⁴ *Vicesimus quintus annus*, 11.

man, who began to see worship as private. However, reaching out could have been taken to such an extreme that liturgy loses its mystery and attempts to put on a performance instead of showing how God interacts with man.

The culture also clearly affected the liturgy when it came to the use of vernacular. *Sacrosanctum concilium* called for the usage of the vernacular that was accurate to the Latin from the Roman Missal. However, due to a laxer culture people tended to make poor translations. Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy parse this out in their article “The Implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly”. They claim, “translations produced by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) were not fully in accord with the Latin original. Many biblical references and allusions were obscured, and the collects and other prayers were rendered in a prosaic manner, losing their spiritual and theological beauty”.⁶⁵ It is not clear why the Vatican would have approved poor English translations. It could be the case that the Vatican assumed that every bishop and priest was following the reforms closely. However, there is no evidence supporting such a claim. The closest thing to an answer would be a spirit of laxity that came upon the Church after the Vatican II, which could be due to a greater cultural shift in relaxing of morals and religion.

Another common argument that is used to explain who caused a drastic degradation of the liturgy is blaming Fr. Annibale Bugnini. Bugnini was the secretary of the *concilium*, a group that formed the liturgical reforms. Bugnini’s role in Vatican II was to oversee different groups working on crafting the new liturgy. Bugnini would speak to Paul VI and ask him what he

⁶⁵ Cavadini, John, Mary Healy, Thomas Weinandy, “The Implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly,” Church Life Journal, October 26 2022, <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-liturgy-prior-to-vatican-ii-and-the-councils-reforms/>.

desired in the liturgy, and then report to all the committees he was overseeing what the Holy Father desired. Fr. Louis Bouyer recounts the following exchange with Bugnini in his *Memoirs*.

at the sight of me not only did he go pale, but he was visibly aghast...he supposed I was coming from the pope's residence [Paul VI] said to me: 'but why then, did you stick...in this reform' naturally I responded 'but quite simply because Bugnini told us that you absolutely wanted' [Paul VI] reaction was immediate: 'Is that possible? He said to me personally that you were unanimous in this respect'!⁶⁶

Bouyer's point here, it seems, is that Bugnini was uncomfortable with the fact that anyone other than himself was meeting with the Holy Father regarding the reforms. While this evidence seems quite damning against Bugnini, some counterpoints could be made against Bouyer. Since this is an account from Bouyer's *Memoirs* there is no outside corroboration. Bouyer was also known to not have a good relationship with Bugnini. The reason for the strain in their relationship is unknown. However, this could be used in Bouyer's favor to paint a negative picture of Bugnini.⁶⁷

Bugnini and his work on liturgy is also painted in a positive light. This is highlighted by Yves Chiron's biography *Annibale Bugnini: Reformer of the Liturgy* Chiron explains how Bugnini approached liturgical commissions. Chiron explains, "at the meetings he allowed the members and consultants to express themselves freely and never voiced an opinion specific to himself. The most he ever did was to bring a meeting to a close with general considerations or a methodological instruction".⁶⁸ Bugnini's approach to liturgical committees seemed quite hands off. He only seemed to provide input when it came to how to implement liturgical changes. This neither proves nor disproves Bouyer's account. This possible exchange between Bouyer and Bugnini may seem inconsequential, but in some ways indicative of one of the many largest

⁶⁶ Louis Bouyer, *Memoirs*, 261.

⁶⁷ Another claim that is used against Bugnini is that he was a closeted freemason. He denies this claim in a letter to Paul VI. He writes, "I NEVER whether directly or indirectly, whether in act or by formal membership have been part of Masonry, or of any other group or movement that approaches or resembles it". Qtd in Chiron, *Annibale Bugnini: Reformer of the Liturgy*, 172-173.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 81.

issues facing questions and thinking on the liturgy today: it is simply not clear how we arrived to where we are today.

There does not seem to be a clear answer to what perverted the liturgy seemingly to lean more toward a progressive hermeneutic of rupture. If there is any answer to this question it is that the spirit of the age affected how people in the Church behaved in response to the reforms. Even though the reforms were well intentioned it is important to recognize that this is the state of the Church after Vatican II.

3.3: Implementing the Reforms

3.3.a: Actual implementation

Immediately after Vatican II what the reforms sought to implement were not met. While I have written above about this regarding in other nations,⁶⁹ my focus will be on how these were not met in the United States. Particularly, the use of liturgical music vernacular in liturgy, and orientation of the priest which influenced the overall catechesis of the faithful. These are considered the three most significant things regarding liturgy now because of the effect they have on people. The purpose of liturgical music is to elevate the soul to God. As *Sacrosanctum concilium* puts it, “Sacred music is to be considered the more holy in proportion as it is more closely connected with the liturgical action, whether it adds delight to prayer, fosters unity of minds, or confers greater solemnity upon the sacred rites”.⁷⁰ Music is what orders the soul to unity toward God, because it is a form of participation within the liturgy. Vernacular is important to liturgy because it is how the faithful come to understand what is going on during liturgy. This calls back to the LRM, which desired to use the vernacular not only to promote liturgical

⁶⁹ See chapter 2.b.

⁷⁰ SC, 112

participation, but so the faithful could understand what is going on. Both of these influence catechesis, because if done properly they show the faithful the reverence that is owed to God and what their role in the Church is.

Section 3.3.a.i: Liturgical Music

The reform regarding liturgical music was written in order to allow the faithful to be able to sing along with the music during liturgy. While Gregorian chant was still given pride of place in the Church, the Church also allowed for vernacular hymns to be used if it assisted the faithful catechetically in the liturgy. However, this was interpreted rather loosely, which led to what was considered bad liturgical music by most theologians. Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy comment that, “Some of these were of high biblical and theological quality and skillfully composed, but others were banal and sentimental, with moralistic lyrics, often focused on celebrating the congregating community . . . Others, however, sounded like Broadway rejects—a poor combination of ‘spiritual’ words with the tune of contemporary musicals”.⁷¹ They acknowledge that not all the music was bad, but the bad music was still used during liturgy. This influenced the way people saw liturgy, because the music went from what is pleasing to God to what is pleasing to the congregation. This came out of trying to relate to the congregation by use of modern music.⁷²

Section 3.3.a.ii: Vernacular

The Church calls for the use of vernacular in the liturgy when necessary for the faithful and she calls for the use of the predominate language of the faithful. This however becomes

⁷¹ Cavadini, Healy, Weinandy, “The Implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.”

⁷² Two worship songs that especially demonstrate this are “Sing of the Lord’s Goodness” and “Remember your love”. Which both are respectively influenced by “Take Five” a Jazz song, and “Pure imagination” from *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory*.

problematic when the nation is multicultural. In a multicultural nation, with the *Novus Ordo* there is more freedom to be able to have a bilingual liturgy. The purpose of a bilingual liturgy is to assist faithful who speak two different languages, but is not often used to this end. Bilingual liturgies are commonly used for pandering in the Church. Those who do this, usually progressivists, attempt to show that the Church is diverse and is for everyone. While the Church is meant for everyone and is diverse, the intention behind emphasizing diversity in the Church is meant to serve man and not God. This is because the emphasis of diversity fails to recognize that during liturgy union with God is most important. As St. Paul writes, “there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus”.⁷³ This shows that the highest good of man is not highlighting what makes him different from others, but who he is in the eyes of God.

The use of the vernacular, specifically bilingual liturgies, misses the point of using vernacular in the first place. The use of the vernacular as intended by the LRM was to promote more participation by having the faithful understand what was going on during liturgy. However, when a liturgy oscillates between two different languages rapidly it can confuse the faithful. The use of two different vernaculars tends to make the faithful believe that liturgy is something that can be altered at the will of man, something with no fixity. In total, while the actual implementations desire to reach the faithful by attempting to interact with the modern world they seem fail in what they look to accomplish. The actual implementations give man what he wants to hear instead of what he needs to hear. What man needs to hear then is who He is, who God is and their relationship by understanding the Sacrifice and resurrection of Christ.

⁷³ Gal. 3:28

Section 3.3.a.iii: Orientation

The orientation of the priest was also instrumental to the actual implementation, because the primary orientation of the priest changed from *ad orientem* to *versus populum*. However, *versus populum* was not a common posture at the time. Prior to the Council, the only one in the LRM who had been recorded using *versus populum* was Guardini.⁷⁴ During the Council though there was one time when *versus populum* was used by Paul VI. However, Paul VI was actually *ad orientem* but seemingly *versus populum* due to the geography of St. Peter's Basilica where facing east is facing toward the nave not the apse.⁷⁵ Although Paul VI was celebrating liturgy *ad orientem*, those who thought he was celebrating liturgy *versus populum* saw it as license to begin to change their orientation when celebrating liturgy. Even though *versus populum* was not spoken about in the reforms, it seems that the lack of its acknowledgement implies that liturgy is to be celebrated *ad orientem*.

Furthermore, after the Council *versus populum* began to be used as a means for the priest to entertain his congregation instead of lead them in prayer. As Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy write, "The entertaining celebrant became the focus of the Eucharistic assembly, leading to a new form of clericalism. Instead of speaking and acting *in persona Christi*, the priest was in effect speaking and acting in his own person. Some celebrants even improvised their own Eucharistic canons".⁷⁶ This shows that *versus populum* can lead the laity to treating liturgy like a performance meant for them, instead of a sacrifice for God. The priest too can misconstrue liturgy because he becomes the focus of the congregation of him acting in *persona Christi*.

⁷⁴ Reid, *Organic Development of the Liturgy*, 83.

⁷⁵ Conroy, Fr. Sean, Fr. John Nepil, Fr. Eric Gilbaugh, "The Liturgical Ideal of the Church," *Catholic Stuff You should know*, 1:12:47.

⁷⁶ Cavadini, Healy, Weinandy, "The Implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly."

Versus populum at its worst leads the faithful to believe that the priest is an entertainer on the altar. This can take away from the purpose of the liturgy, which is to experience Christ through prayer. When the laity see the priest as an entertainer and they go to a parish where the priest acts with reverence, the laity then desire to change the liturgy to their liking. The focus on the priest then becomes the jokes he tells during liturgy or the prayers he ad-libs on the altar. This takes away from the priest as acting *in persona Christi* and instead highlights the priest and his characteristics, not who he is in Christ.

Section 3.3.a.iv: Implications

Each of these influence catechesis, because each reveals how God is at the center of one's life. Liturgical music assists with disposing one's self to God in a way that is receptive to him. The use of the vernacular allows the person to receive God through his intellect, by meditating on the words being said, which allow him to see how God works directly in his life. However, this is changed when the focus of liturgy is man's desires. When music is changed to match the culture man is more likely to have a superficial meditation during liturgy. This means, man tends to focus on the Church staying relevant with each age of music instead of focusing on everlasting truths.

Section 3.3.b: Intentional Implementation

Those who have a progressivist view argue that the intention of Vatican II was the actual implementations. This however is not the case. Not only is it obvious that the reforms intended for a participation in liturgy that was in continuity with tradition, but also did not promote the actual implementations. This is clear in a homily Paul VI gave in 1972, seven years after Vatican II. He claims, "through some fissure the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God . . . It was believed that after the Council a sunny day would come for the history of the Church. Instead, a

day of clouds, of storm, of darkness, of research, of uncertainty has come”.⁷⁷ It is clear then that Vatican II had expected for the reforms to be followed and was hopeful that they would be. However, they were not, which caused confusion in the faithful who wondered what the Church was trying to do with the reforms.

Section 3.3.b.i: Liturgical Music

The intentional implementation of Vatican II regarding liturgical music seems to be almost exactly the opposite of what actually occurred after the Council. The General Instruction of the Roman Missal (GIRM) is a document by the USCCB which outlines what was intended in the liturgical reforms. Regarding liturgical music, the GIRM states, “all things being equal, to Gregorian chant, as being proper to the Roman Liturgy. Other kinds of sacred music, in particular polyphony, are in no way excluded, provided that they correspond to the spirit of the liturgical action and that they foster the participation of all the faithful”.⁷⁸ It seems, then that what the Church has in mind regarding liturgical music does not entail bringing in music that does not have some kind of solemnity to it. When music is solemn it orders the mind toward God. When one hears music that is commonly heard outside of liturgy, the mind is less likely to make a distinction between what is solemn versus what is secular. Therefore, the intention of the Council seems to be that the kind of music that is to be used during liturgy is solemn and promotes participation.

⁷⁷ “a qualche fessura sia entrato il fumo di Satana nel tempio di Dio...Si credeva che dopo il Concilio sarebbe venuta una giornata di sole per la storia della Chiesa. È venuta invece una giornata di nuvole, di tempesta, di buio, di ricerca, di incertezza”. Paul VI, Homily at the Holy Mass for the Solemnity of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul (Rome, 29 June 1972) trans. Br. Daniele Cagliioni A.A.

⁷⁸ *The General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, 41.

Section 3.3.b.ii: Vernacular

Vernacular in the liturgy is also promoted by the reforms as outlined in *Sacrosanctum concilium*.⁷⁹ However no mention of bilingual liturgies is made during Vatican II.⁸⁰ The Church, though, began to notice that North America was no longer becoming predominately English-speaking. Therefore, the CDW promulgated *Liturgiam authenticam*, which addressed the use of multiple vernaculars in the liturgy. It claims,

Only the more commonly spoken languages should be employed in the Liturgy, avoiding the introduction of too many languages for liturgical use, which could prove divisive by fragmenting a people into small groups. A number of factors should be kept in mind when choosing a language for liturgical use, such as the number of priests, deacons and lay collaborators at ease in a given tongue.⁸¹

It is evident that the CDW recognizes that the use of multiple vernaculars can be harmful to the faithful. This is because it can divide the faithful by making them cling to their ethnic groups instead of understanding that they are all one in Christ. Furthermore, the reform outlines that a bilingual liturgy should only be done if there a substantial number of people who speak a different language in the congregation. Therefore, the use of a bilingual liturgy is meant to minister to faithful who cannot speak the other language being used, and for both groups in the congregation to understand how they are one in Christ.

Section 3.3.b.iii: Orientation

Even though orientation was not outlined in *Sacrosanctum concilium*, the use of *ad orientem* seemed to have been implied. Since the use of *versus populum* became widespread and was abused the Church attempted to regulate it. As Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy write, “in 1964 the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued an Instruction on the Proper Implementation of the

⁷⁹ See chapter 3.1.

⁸⁰ This is probably because at least America at the time was still a predominantly English speaking nation.

⁸¹ *Liturgiam authenticam*

Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. It stressed that only competent ecclesial authority could regulate and implement the liturgical reform”.⁸² The document however was largely ignored and abuse of *versus populum* continued. Though after the reforms some began to push for *ad orientem* again. In Ratzinger’s *Spirit of the Liturgy* he outlines the point of *ad orientem*: he argues, “praying toward the east is a tradition that goes back to the beginning . . . we should pray toward the central place of revelation, to the God who revealed himself”.⁸³ Ratzinger clarifies that the purpose of *ad orientem* is that it allows the congregation to understand that there is an intentionality in the posture the priest takes. The priest does not face away from the congregation because he does not want to be involved with them, but because he desires to bring his faithful to something higher than him.

Section 3.3.b.iv: Implications

What the use of vernacular, liturgical music, and orientation mean in context of the reforms properly understood and catechetically is that the faithful have to participate individually in the liturgy, and understand they are one Christ. Liturgical music used as prescribed can catechize the faithful well. This is because it elevates the souls of the faithful because the solemnity allows the faithful to understand that God is the highest being and loves man personally. The proper use of vernacular can also assist the faithful in catechesis, because man can come to understand that God speaks to him too, because he comes to understand God in the language he speaks. This makes God more personal, because it means that God became man so that he could be understood by man particularly. Orientation helps the faithful understand that the priest is the vessel that brings them closer to Christ, because he faces God. Overall the

⁸² Cavadini, Healy, Weinandy, “The Implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.”

⁸³ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2000), 75.

reforms as intended show that the reformers at Vatican II were not attempting to destroy the liturgy, but sought to make God more understandable for modern man while holding on to eternal truths.

Conclusion

Examining the beginning of the liturgical reforms, it is clear that the Church needed reform. Since the laity did not understand its role in the Church, the goal was to make clear how they are involved in the body of Christ, specifically, how God calls them to be with Him most intimately through receiving Him in liturgy. Therefore, the goal of the active participation in the liturgy was to edify the faithful better by showing them how God desires pierce the human heart. Vatican II sought to speak to modern man while also holding steadfast to the tradition of the Church.

Tracing the liturgical reforms from before the Council to after the Council shows what the reforms were intended in the beginning and how they were perverted after Vatican II. Particularly both hermeneutics of rupture miss the mark in terms of liturgical reform. The intentions of those at the Council seemed to desire to give more freedom in the liturgy to the priest and bishop. This is because those who are in a certain diocese can understand the needs their faithful have. Therefore, the Council seemed to have thought that liturgy would be implemented reverently at the episcopal and parochial level. However, the common practice in America and other regions was the abuse of the loose guidelines that are given in the new Roman Missal. This abuse came out in poor liturgical music and inappropriate uses of the vernacular. Since the vagueness of the rubrics did not intend for this, bishops and priests now are attempting to follow the reforms as intended.

The fruit then of interpreting the rubrics in a progressive manner does not seem to speak to modern man as some thought it would. It actually seems to draw the modern man away from the Gospel. If the Gospel looks like what the world has to offer, then man sees no reason to change his behavior. However, interpreting the rubrics as the Council intended seems to entice

modern man. Not only because the Church is speaking his language, quite literally through the vernacular, man can begin to understand why he needs God. When man seems to see the Church as different from the world, but willing to adapt somethings to assist him, he is more likely to see how the Church desires him and why he should be part of the Church.

Bibliography

Benedict XVI, “To the Roman Curia Offering them his Christmas Greetings” (Vatican City, 22 December 2005) https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/december/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051222_roman-curia.html.

Bouyer, Louis. *The Memoirs of Louis Bouyer: From Youth and Conversion to Vatican II, the Liturgical Reform, and After*. Translated by Anne Englund Nash. Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2015.

Cavadini, John, Mary Healy, Thomas Weinandy, “The Implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly,” Church Life Journal, October 26 2022, <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-liturgy-prior-to-vatican-ii-and-the-councils-reforms/>.

Cavadini, John, Mary Healy, Thomas Weinandy. “The Liturgy Prior to Vatican II and The Council’s Reforms,” Church Life Journal, October 26 2022, <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-liturgy-prior-to-vatican-ii-and-the-councils-reforms/>.

Chiron, Yves. *Annibale Bugnini: Reformer of the Liturgy*. Tranlate by John Pepino. Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2018.

Congregation for Divine Worship. *Liturgiam authenticam*. March 20, 2001. https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_20010507_comunicato-stampa_en.html.

Conroy, Fr. Sean, Fr. John Nepil, Fr. Eric Gilbaugh, “The Liturgical Ideal of the Church,”

Catholic Stuff You should know, December 12, 2022,

<https://catholicstuffpodcast.com/podcast/2022/11/17/the-liturgical-ideal-of-the-church.html>.

Crouan, Denis *The liturgy Betrayed*. Translated by Marc Sebanc. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000.

Driscoll, Michael S. Review of *Un pionnier, dom Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960): Liturgie et*

Unité des chrétiens. *The Catholic Historical Review* 94, no. 4 (2008): 841-

842. [doi:10.1353/cat.0.0178](https://doi.org/10.1353/cat.0.0178).

General Instruction of the Roman Missal. Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of

Catholic Bishops, 2011.

Gonzales, Philip. “The Trajectory of Twentieth-Century Catholic,” *Church Life Journal*,

February 29, 2023, <https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/the-trajectory-of-twentieth-century-catholic-thought/>.

Grabowski, John. *Sex and Virtue: An Introduction to Sexual Ethics*, Washington D.C.: Catholic

University of America Press, 2003.

Guardini, Romano. *The Spirit of the Liturgy*. Translated by Ada Lane. New York: Crossroad

Publications, 1998.

Horan, Michael. “Liturgical Pioneers, Pastoral Musicians, and Liturgists,” *liturgical leaders*

Blogspot, January 24, 2023, <https://liturgicalleaders.blogspot.com/2008/09/josef-jungmann.html>.

John XXIII, “Solemne Apertura del Concilio Vaticano II” .Vatican City, 11 October 1963.

https://www.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/es/speeches/1962/documents/hf_j-xxiii_spe_19621011_opening-council.html

John Paul II. *Vicesimus quinus annus*. Apostolic Letter. Vatican December 4, 1988.

https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/1988/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_19881204_vicesimus-quintus-annus.pdf

Jungmann, Josef A. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origin and Development*. Translated by

Rev. Francis A. Brunner. Indiana: Ave Maria, 2012.

Krieg, Rober. *Romano Guardini: Proclaiming the sacred to the modern world*. Chicago: Liturgy

Training Publications, 1995.

Lefebvre, Marcel *Open letter to Confused Catholics*. Translated by Fr. M. Crowdy. Kansas City:

Angelus Press, 1985.

Madiran, Jean “Conférence de Mgr Lefebvre à ses séminaristes” *Itinearies*, no. 208: 142.

Translated by Rachel M. Coleman.

Newman, John Henry “An Essay on development of Christian Doctrine”.

O'Malley, John W. *What Happened at Vatican II*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard

University Press, 2010.

Paul VI. “Consilium ad ad exsequendam constitutionem de sacra Liturgia”. Vatican City, 13

October 1966. Translated by Fr. Donato Infante III. https://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/speeches/1966/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19661013_sacra-liturgia.html.

Paul VI. Homily at the Holy Mass for the Solemnity of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul Rome, 29 June 1972. Translated by Br. Daniele Caglioni A.A.

https://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/homilies/1972/documents/hf_p-vi_hom_19720629.html

Paul VI. *Sacrosanctum concilium*. Constitution. Vatican. December 4, 1963.

https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html.

Prosperi, Paolo “The Birth of *Sources Chrétiennes* and the Return to the Fathers.” *Communio: International Catholic Review* 39 (Winter 2012).

Pius X. *Tra le sollecitudini*. Motu Proprio. Vatican. November 22, 1903.

https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-x/es/motu_proprio/documents/hf_p-x_motu-proprio_19031122_sollecitudini.html

Pius XI. *Divini Cultus*. Papal Bull. Vatican. December 20, 1928.

https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/it/bulls/documents/hf_p-xi_bulls_19281220_divini-cultus.html

Pius XII. *Maxima redemptionis*. General Decree. Vatican. November 16, 1955.

https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccdds/documents/rc_con_ccdds_doc_19551116_maxima-redemptionis_la.html.

Pius XII. *Mediator Dei*. Encyclical Letter. Vatican. November 19, 1947.

https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_20111947_mediator-dei.html.

Ratzinger, Cardinal Joseph. "Communio: A Program," *Communio: International Catholic Review* 19 (Fall 1992).

Ratzinger, Joseph. *The Spirit of the Liturgy*. Translated by John Saward .San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000.

Ratzinger, Joseph. *Theological Highlights of Vatican II*. Translated by Henry Traub, SJ. Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2009

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

Seewald, Peter. *Benedict XVI: A Life*. Translated by Dinah Livingstone. London: Bloomsbury Continuum, 2020.

Von Balthasar, Hans Urs. *A Short Primer for Unsettled Laymen*. Translated by Michael Waldstein. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989.