

MISSA TRIDENTINA



THE REFORM OF THE ROMAN
MASS LITURGY IN THE SIXTEENTH
CENTURY

ANTHONY CHADWICK

This work is dedicated to the faithful remnant of Bishops and Priests who have confessed the Catholic Faith in the face of heresy and who have suffered moral persecution for the Mass of their Ordination.



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
I. THE STATE OF THE LITURGY IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES	7
THE CONFUSION IN THE THEOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE MASS WHICH GAVE RISE TO ERRORS AND PRACTICAL ABUSES	7
<i>The allegorical understanding of Mass ceremonies</i>	8
<i>Gothic churches and liturgical ornaments</i>	9
<i>The contribution of scholastic theology: Thomism and Nominalism</i>	10
<i>The reaction from medieval heresies in eucharistic piety</i>	13
<i>The medieval doctrine of the eucharistic Sacrifice as a factor of the decadence of the celebration of Mass</i>	15
THE PRACTICAL DECADENCE OF THE ROMAN EUCHARISTIC LITURGY	16
<i>The system of Votive Masses</i>	16
<i>The Low Mass as the normative Mass</i>	17
<i>Abuses arising from an exaggerated devotion to the Sacrament of the Eucharist</i>	18
THE PROTESTANT RESPONSE	19
<i>The main Protestant objections to the Catholic liturgical abuses</i>	20
<i>The protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone: the rejection of the Catholic liturgy as a good work</i>	22
<i>A criticism of the protestant principles of liturgical reform</i>	22
CONCLUSION	24
II. REFORMS OF THE LATIN LITURGY BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF TRENT	26
THE FIRST MASS BOOKS AND CODES OF RUBRICS FROM THE THIRTEENTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURIES	26
<i>The significance of the Missale plenum</i>	27
<i>The Missal of the Papal Court in the thirteenth century</i>	28
<i>The Missal of the Roman Curia of 1474</i>	30
<i>The Medieval Uses or variants of the Roman Mass liturgy</i>	30
THE BACKGROUND OF THE MISSAL OF PIUS V	34
<i>The Ordo Missæ of John Burchard and the Pontifical of Patrizi</i>	34
<i>Aspects relevant to the Mass liturgy of the work of Paul IV and the Theatines on the Roman Breviary</i>	36
CONCLUSION	38
III. PRINCIPLES OF LITURGICAL REFORM RESULTING FROM THE COUNCIL OF TRENT	39
THE TRIDENTINE UNDERSTANDING OF THE THEOLOGICAL MEANING OF LITURGY IN GENERAL	39
<i>The work of apologists and theologians concerning the Mass liturgy</i>	39
<i>The deliberation of the Tridentine Fathers during the first two Periods of the Council</i>	44
<i>Deliberations of the Conciliar Fathers in 1562, during the third Period, concerning Mass ceremonies and the definitive Decrees and Canons</i>	48
THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT DEALING WITH PARTICULAR ASPECTS OF THE MASS LITURGY	53
<i>The question of the Roman Canon</i>	53
<i>The secret voice in the celebration of Mass</i>	59
<i>The language of the liturgy.</i>	60

THE PROBLEM OF LITURGICAL ANARCHY AND ABUSES	64
<i>The establishment of a special Commission to report on liturgical abuses.</i>	64
<i>Liturgical abuses in particular</i>	64
<i>Deliberations of the Fathers concerning remedies</i>	67
<i>The need for a codified Roman Missal</i>	70
CONCLUSION	71
IV. THE POST-TRIDENTINE REFORM OF THE ROMAN MISSAL	73
THE POST-CONCILIAR COMMISSION OF PIUS IV	73
<i>Available sources and documents</i>	74
<i>The working methods of the Commission</i>	75
THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE COMMISSION'S WORK	78
<i>Restoration and codification of the Roman Rite</i>	78
<i>The resolution of liturgical anarchy and the abolition of abuses</i>	80
THE ROMAN MISSAL OF 1570 IN DETAIL	81
<i>The Order of Mass</i>	81
<i>The liturgical year in general</i>	85
<i>The reform of the Calendar in detail</i>	86
<i>The Common of Saints</i>	89
<i>Votive Masses</i>	90
<i>The rubrics</i>	91
<i>The Lectionary</i>	93
SOME CANONICAL ASPECTS OF LITURGICAL CODIFICATION	94
<i>The Bull of Saint Pius V</i>	95
<i>The unification of liturgical custom and Canon Law</i>	97
CONCLUSION	97
V. THE EFFECTS OF LITURGICAL REFORM	99
THE CODIFICATION OF LITURGICAL TRADITION	99
THE REFORM OR RADICAL RECASTING OF LITURGICAL RITES	102
<i>Archæologism</i>	102
<i>The radical recasting of a liturgical rite or substitution of rites</i>	103
CRITICISM OF IMMOBILISM AND EVOLUTIONISM	104
<i>Immobilism</i>	105
<i>Evolutionism or the dissolution of liturgical form</i>	106
PRINCIPLES OF LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT	108
<i>The Principles of liturgical development in Sacrosanctum Concilium</i>	108
CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF THE ROMAN RITE OF THE MASS	110
BIBLIOGRAPHY	113

INTRODUCTION

Why study the history of the Tridentine reform of the Roman liturgy? In view of the state of the liturgy in the post-Vatican II Church, and the claim of Paul VI in the Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* of 1969 that he was doing nothing other than his predecessor Saint Pius V, such a study seems to us of fundamental importance. We cannot, in all honesty, claim impartiality in this question, for our work has its origin in the “traditionalist” reaction following the imposition of the Pauline rites of the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. We begin with the thesis of the radical opposition between the reforms of 1570 and 1969. The former was the codification of the existing traditional Roman rite, and the latter was the creation of a totally new concoction using a few vestiges of the traditional liturgy and a few ancient sources fallen into desuetude. However, we endeavour to present our thesis in as scientific and objective way as possible. Our method is historical, and it is only in the last chapter that an attempt of interpretation and speculation is made

It ought to note that medieval and post-Tridentine scholars were familiar with the theological, allegorical and canonical approaches to the liturgy, but had little conception or knowledge of the history of the liturgy. We find it fitting to study this period of the development of the liturgy from an historical point of view. The essentially pragmatic mentality of a Renaissance rubricist or a Tridentine theologian can be of great help to us in the understanding of many difficulties that beset the liturgy to-day. The study of liturgical history can enable us to grasp this realism and profound sense of tradition of our forefathers in the Church.

Were we to consider the problem in a different way, let us consider the discussions of thirty years ago, when there was the issue of implementing the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* of Vatican II. A considerable amount of paper was blackened. In our own time, there is talk of *further* reform, a *missa simplex* or a *liturgy for 2000*, an express Mass for people in a hurry to get their duty of divine worship over with as quickly as possible. So, what is liturgical reform, and why does the Church reform her liturgy? What should be the *criteria* for such reforms?

The period we are dealing with, that is to say the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, is one where the theme of the preservation of the integrity of the Catholic liturgy is uppermost. It is also a period of decadence in the understanding and practice of the Church’s worship, against which liturgists fought to preserve the tradition hence the extreme conservatism and tendency towards rubricism. The concept of *reforming* the liturgy, in the sense of radical change, was unknown to the Church before Protestantism. The liturgy was never before reformed in this way; it grew from the life of the Church over centuries. The Tridentine reform of the liturgy is to be seen in the context of the reform of ecclesiastical *discipline* in general. It was seen as an urgent measure to curb excesses and disciplinary *abuses* in the liturgical celebration.

The reform or *codification* of the Roman Missal by Saint Pius V, by authority of the Council of Trent, was a watershed in the history of liturgy, for this was the first act of its kind by the central Authority of the Catholic Church. It was diametrically opposed to the principles of the protestant reformers, who attempted to engage in a pseudo-historical reconstruction of a *primitive liturgy*, conveniently conformed to their new anti-ecclesiastical and anti-clerical doctrines. The work of Saint Pius V was far from perfect, but it lasted for four centuries; the fact that the liturgy fell again into decadence in baroque times is proof of this imperfection. Its durability, however, is sure evidence of the prudent conservatism and pragmatism of the Tridentine Fathers and Popes, and also that of the liturgists and theologians who had worked for the codification of the Roman Rite. Perhaps, the experience of our own times is evidence that reforms of the liturgy, imposed by authority, are dangerous endeavours. This can be seen in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church, the reform of Peter the Great and Patriarch Nikon in the seventeenth century, provoking the schism of the *Old Believers*. This schism is unhealed to this day.

However, it is certain is that without this work of reform and purification, the coherence of the Roman liturgy might have been forever broken, not only by Protestantism, but also by Jansenism and the Enlightenment movement of the eighteenth century. It certainly would not have withstood the vicissitudes of the late twentieth, had medieval and Tridentine scholars been animated by that lack of sound liturgical sense which was characteristic of the liberalism or modernism of later times. It is a two-edged sword.

We are certainly aware that the work of Trent or Saint Pius V did not in every way solve the profound crisis in the Church's liturgical life. It was, however, a step in the right direction, paving the way for such scholars as Mabillon and Dom Martène of the Order of St Benedict, Le Brun, Pope Benedict XIV and some of the more inspired spirits of modern times like Dom Guéranger and Dom Odo Casel.

Our method of procedure is that of exposing the history of the liturgical situation of both saintliness and decadence in the middle ages, and the Protestant revolt that resulted (chapter 1). We then trace the history of the codification or fixation of the Roman Mass liturgy from the origins of the *missale plenum* (chapter 2). Thus, the two opposing tendencies compared and contrasted, we examine what the Council of Trent sought to remedy the situation, by achieving the work of codification as a means of disciplinary *reform* in matters of liturgy (chapters 3 and 4). The last chapter is an attempt to discern *criteria* for good liturgical reforms that respect the integrity of traditional rites, all in preserving them from that decadence which is due to a distorted understanding of ecclesiology and the Church's sacred liturgy.

I. THE STATE OF THE LITURGY IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

In most parts of Europe, by the end of the middle ages, the Roman liturgy, with its many derivatives, was in a state of advanced decadence, but bore testimony to western liturgical worship as it had been in the most creative centuries of its development. We shall in this first chapter investigate the theological causes of the crisis, examine the resulting abuses and study some of the remedies proposed by medieval heretical movements and the Protestant Reformers.

It must be said, at this point, that decadence in the liturgy was by no means universal in every part of Latin Christendom. It must also be mentioned that *decadence*, like beauty, is frequently in the eye of the beholder. Since beginning this work, we have discovered conflicting opinions concerning the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. For example, much of the following chapter was influenced by Anglican authors such as Dom Gregory Dix, obviously justifying the *raison d'être* of Anglicanism. English Catholic authors tend to defend the beauty of *Our Lady's Dowry*, before wicked heretics treaded upon the ancient faith. A perfect and objective balance is difficult to find.

It is certain that the liturgical life of a typical English parish of the fourteenth century was healthier, more manly, and holier, than its counterpart in the nineteenth or early twentieth. Parish life was more easy-going than in post Tridentine Catholicism, close in spirit to what is still to be seen, for example, in the Greek Church of Cyprus. The choir Office was still very much a part of parish life at that time, and deacons, subdeacons and other ministers were to be found alongside the priest.

However, where liturgical life and ecclesiastical discipline had gone beyond the limits of wisdom, there *were* serious abuses, well attested by serious historical sources.

THE CONFUSION IN THE THEOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE MASS WHICH GAVE RISE TO ERRORS AND PRACTICAL ABUSES

The causes of this late medieval decadence were highly complex. This liturgical crisis is certainly due to the multiplicity of conflicting eucharistic and sacramental theologies, both orthodox and heretical, for the rule of faith determines the law of liturgical prayer: one prays as one believes, and one believes as one prays. At the same time, the liturgy was a victim of all too

human weaknesses, such as formalism, avarice and laziness. The theological causes of the crisis are those we should investigate.

The allegorical understanding of Mass ceremonies

The development of the Low Mass as the normative form of celebration was one of the factors that led to the decline of the liturgical spirit in the late middle ages. With the increase in the complexity of the ceremonies, these began to be interpreted in an allegorical manner; they led to theological speculation on the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the sacrificial nature of the Mass. The signs of the cross and kissings of the altar, especially during the Canon, were increased in number. The stretching out of the celebrant's hands, bowing the head and striking the breast at certain parts of the Mass served to dramatise the words. These usages, fascinating the curious eyes of the faithful, began to take on an allegorical meaning¹.

Allegorical interpretations of liturgical ceremonies were nothing new in the Latin middle ages. There was no lack of symbolic and allegorical explanations of the Mass from the Mystagogical Catecheses of Saint Cyril of Alexandria and of Maximus the Confessor. We find allegorical teaching in the work of Nicholas Cabasilas (†1350) on the Byzantine Liturgy². These early allegorical treatises are constructed around the fundamental symbolic notion that the liturgy is in some way heaven on earth and the central point of a cosmic vision; the offering of the Holy Gifts has the effect of transfiguring the whole universe by the action of the Holy Spirit³.

The Latin and medieval notion of allegory was altogether different. It falsified the meaning of the words and actions of the Mass. Medieval allegorism was not content with the essential sacramental symbolism of the Mass. It gave new meanings to actions that had a utilitarian origin, for example, climbing the steps to the altar⁴. From the ninth century, a new literary form sprang up, that of the *Expositiones Missæ*⁵. These were books of meditation and a kind of theological and moral catechesis on the mysteries being celebrated in the

¹ J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite (Missarum Sollemnia)*, Westminster (Maryland) 1986, vol I, pp 107-108.

² Nicholas Cabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, ed. J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty, London 1960.

³ A.G. Martimort, *L'Eglise en Prière (L'Eucharistie)*, Paris 1983, p 165.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p 157.

⁵ Cf. A. Wilmart, *Primum in ordine*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, 50 (1936), pp 133-139; Simmons, *The Lay Folk's Mass book*, London 1879; Langford's *Meditations on the Mass* (ed. J. Wickham Legge, *Tracts on the Mass*, 1904, pp 19 sqq.). Until the invention of the printing press, these works were confined to manuscript copies. They, however, formed popular preaching.

Mass. One of the initiators of this new method was Amalar of Metz (775-852)⁶. This allegorical literature was much in fashion for several centuries⁷.

In the Gothic era, a principle which governed the multiplication of Mass ceremonies was that of repetition, for example the kissing of the altar each time the priest turned away from the altar to greet the congregation, or the signs of the cross over the oblations. If this action was accomplished five times, as it is on some occasions during the Canon, this was interpreted as representing the five Wounds of Christ; three times meant the Trinity. The extension of the arms at the *Unde et memores* imitated the outstretched arms of the Crucified⁸. Numbers of times an action was repeated had a meaning, as did numbers allegorical biblical exegesis. These interpretations centred more and more on the Passion of Christ as time went by.

Newly developed ceremonies had to have their allegorical meaning. With the development of the Low Mass, the Missal was kept on the altar and moved from the Epistle side to the Gospel side. The Book would be angled so that the Gospel would be read partially facing the north, for it is proclaimed in that direction by the deacon at High Mass. The allegorical interpretation for this was Jesus preaching to the Jews, the north being associated with evil and faithlessness⁹.

Gothic churches and liturgical ornaments

The allegorical interpretation had its influence on the architecture of churches and the design of their furnishings. The dramatisation of the Low Mass led to the increased length of the altar, in some cases to more than three metres¹⁰. The distance, in the medieval mind, from Ciaphas' palace to the Prætorium was appreciable. This trend changed not only the shape of the altar, but added richly decorated retables, frequently of considerable artistic merit, but which led to changes in the architecture of churches.

⁶ Amalar's allegorical interpretations are mainly of the texts of the Mass: the Introit represents the Prophets announcing the Messiah, the Kyrie evokes the Old Testament, the Gloria introduces the New Testament with the singing of the Angels of Bethlehem. He also comments some of the actions of the Mass: when the priest goes to the altar, it is Christ who climbs to Calvary; and when the from one side to the other, it is Jesus who goes from his trial before Ciaphas to Pilate. Martimort, op. cit., p 158, 38.

⁷ Martimort, op. cit., pp 157-158.

⁸ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 107.

⁹ Ibid., pp 109-110; cf. Ivo of Chartres, *De conven. Vet. et Novi Test.*, PL, CLXII, p 550 A. The north sides of medieval churches were frequently adorned with grotesques and figures of demons.

¹⁰ H. C. King, *The Chancel and the altar*, London 1911, p 91. Altars of this length could be found at Tewkesbury Abbey and at Arundel Castle. The latter is still intact.

The priest's liturgical vestments also took on such meanings. The humeral veil was held to represent the hiding of Christ's divinity by his humanity; the alb, of purity; the stole, of Jesus' obedience unto death; the maniple, of service; the chasuble, of the seamless garment of Christ which is the Catholic Church¹¹. Liturgical colours came to be codified on this basis, but which symbolised what was not standard until 1570. The Gothic chasuble came to be adorned with a Y-shaped cross. The original pillar-orphrey had for its only function the covering of the seam¹². This new type of orphrey became an allegorical representation of the Cross. The chasuble was increasingly ornamented, and the required stiffness of the cloth led to the degradation of its shape¹³.

The contribution of scholastic theology: Thomism and Nominalism

Such an allegorical method of explaining and contemplating the liturgy led to a crisis in the thirteenth century. This was the century of the peak of scholastic theological speculation. Allegory as a method was called into question and with it the basis of liturgy, for it is founded on a conception of the world that understands sensible phenomena as symbols of a higher reality. This was a logical development of Plato's theory of knowledge. But, neo-platonistic philosophy was being rapidly replaced by that of Aristotle and theology was systematised. The new basis of epistemology was to be that the origin of knowledge is in the senses¹⁴.

The most obvious problem in the situating of medieval sacramental theology is the sheer multiplicity of the Schools, frequently associated with the distinctive spiritualities of the various religious Orders. Our scope is too short to go into anything but broad generalisations. Nevertheless, we shall briefly examine the two main divisions of scholastic theology in what concerns the Mass: the Augustinian tradition, and that of the Franciscans.

Albertus Magnus (c. 1200-1280) was the pioneer in the scholastic movement away from the allegorical understanding of the Mass; he presented a theologically grounded explanation of the Mass, for the most part derived from the *Ordo Missæ* - the actual texts of the liturgy¹⁵. He carried a severe judgement on the medieval system of allegory. There were many examples of what he found to depart from the true spirit of the Mass were. Two examples is these were notions that silence during the Canon of the Mass represented

¹¹ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 111-112; cf. Rupert de Deutz, *De divinis officiis*, PL, CLXX, col 11-332.

¹² E. A. Roulin, *Vestments and Vesture*, London 1931, p 60.

¹³ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 112.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p 113.

¹⁵ Albertus Magnus, *De sacrificio missæ* in: *Opera omnia*, ed. Borgnet, vol. 38, pp 1-189.

the silence of Jesus during his trial and that the kissing of the altar at the *Supplices te rogamus* signified the traitorous kiss of Judas Iscariot¹⁶.

He divided the Mass into three parts: the *introitus* (from the beginning of the Mass to the Collects); *instructio* (to the Credo); and *oblatio*. As the Mass was viewed chiefly from the aspect of oblation and consecration, Albert considered the Canon as beginning with the words *Te igitur*; the Preface was therefore thought to be a part of the Offertory¹⁷.

Like his pupil, Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), Albert's doctrine was based on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. From these he developed his teaching on eucharistic sacrifice¹⁸. He defined sacrifice as *an oblation that is made sacred in the offering, unless impeded by (the priest's) irreverence or sin*¹⁹.

Saint Thomas systematised the doctrine of the Mass, copiously quoting from the Fathers, his master Saint Albert and from Peter Lombard. What Lombard began in the making of a system of eucharistic theology, Aquinas brought to fruition, especially in the *Summa Theologica*. Much as he developed the doctrines of the Real Presence and of the eucharistic Sacrifice, we are not primarily concerned about these, but about what he said of the meaning of the rite of Mass. The *Summa Theologica*, unlike the work of Albert, made concessions to allegory²⁰. He says concerning the ritual washing of the celebrant's hands at the Offertory: "*We are not accustomed to handle any precious things save with clean hands; so it seems indecent that one should approach so great a Sacrament with hands soiled*"²¹. This is a far cry from the notion of Pilate washing his hands of the blood of Christ. Saint Thomas clearly saw the primary purpose, the *res et sacramentum*, of the Eucharist: the unity of the Church²². His approach was more practical and utilitarian than that of pre-scholastic commentators.

Apart from his theological work in the *Summa*, Saint Thomas eloquently expressed his eucharistic teaching in the liturgical texts he very likely wrote

¹⁶ Jungmann, op. cit., I, pp 113-114.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp 114-115.

¹⁸ F. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, Oxford 1967, p 407.

¹⁹ Clark, op. cit., p 445; cf. Albertus Magnus, *Summa Alexandri*, III pars, ch. 119.

²⁰ Saint Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III, 83, 5. This section is not the work of Aquinas (Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 114 note 61).

²¹ *Summa Theol.* III, 83, 5 ad 1.

²² Ibid., IIIa, 82, 2; cf. In IV sent. dist. 13, qu 1, a.

for the Feast of Corpus Christi²³. This Office was subsequently adopted in the Roman Missal and Breviary.

Some other scholastic theologians shared a similar attitude to that of Albertus Magnus and Aquinas, notably Alexander of Hales (†1245), Henry of Hesse (†1397), and the Dominicans Bernard de Parentinis (†1340) and Hugh of Saint Cher (†1263). Hugh of Saint Cher takes the Augustinian interpretation of the New Testament terms of oblation, communion, prayer, thanksgiving, etc. and applies them to the Mass. In doing this, he divides the Mass into four parts: all that comes before the *Sanctus*, the Canon, the communion rite beginning with the *Pater noster*, and the postcommunion²⁴. The Augustinian tradition achieved little in the way of the interpretation of the Mass and its ceremonies. It did however form the basis of the dogmatic teaching of the Council of Trent on the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Many of the schoolmen, in their philosophical subtleties, had lost sight of the wholeness, the complete synthesis of Catholic doctrine. Nominalists such as Ockham, from the very nature of their philosophy, were incapable of any balanced view of theological questions, for each aspect was treated in isolation from others. Nominalism²⁵ came very much into fashion in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and was most represented by theologians of the Franciscan Order. The theological consequences of nominalist philosophy did not affect the whole of Catholic theology; the metaphysics of Saint Thomas, based on the moderate realism of Aristotle, was radically different. It can be generally said that nominalism, to a large extent was responsible for the philosophy behind protestantism. It is of little wonder that many aspects of eucharistic doctrine would be exaggerated or isolated from

²³ A. Fortescue, *The Mass: a study of the Roman liturgy*, London 1917, p 277; cf. P.M. Gy, *La Liturgie dans l'histoire*, Paris 1990, pp 223-245.

²⁴ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 114.

²⁵ Nominalism was a philosophical system chiefly expounded by William of Ockham (†1349). It was one of the main contributory factors to the breaking up of western Christianity. Strictly speaking, the nominalists considered that universal concepts hold no objective reality in the structure of the universe, which is made up only of individual existent beings. Therefore it would be said that universals (class names) are nothing but logical entities, for the convenience of thought. Thus, the nominalists were so called because they made of universals mere names, *nomina*. This introduced a dialectical opposition between conceptual knowledge and objective reality. Every individual reality thus becomes a sealed island of being and cannot participate in the existence of another reality. This is the radical affirmation of the individual, who, in the case of a human soul, cannot participate in the being of God. This has disastrous consequences on the theology of the redemption and the efficacy of prayer. Theologians, following the philosophical doctrine of Ockham, attributed the logos or ultimate reason for the *quiddity* of each thing, or for God's dealings with man, to a series of divine decrees, depending on the absolute freedom of God's will. This dimension became known as voluntarism, which created an opposition between faith and theology. This was later to have profound consequences on Catholic and Protestant spirituality and moral theology

their relation with others. To some extent, nominalist theologians reacted from the seeming rationalism of the thomists²⁶.

The reaction from medieval heresies in eucharistic piety

The old allegorical interpretations returned with a vengeance in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Christian people in the parishes, being unversed in philosophy would easily misunderstand much of what they were taught, understanding what was meant to be metaphorical, poetical or symbolic in a literal sense. This would bear dramatic results on popular devotion. The allegories were even more centred on Christ's Passion and neglected the fullness of the Paschal Mystery. The Mass came to be considered nearly exclusively as an action of God, an epiphany. No longer was it the corporate action of the priest, his assistants and the people. The eucharistic celebration had become an advent of God who appears among men and dispenses graces²⁷. The emphasis had shifted from doing the Mass to seeing and hearing it.

The trend of considering the Sacrament of the Eucharist as something to be contemplatively adored was reinforced by a reaction from the medieval heresies of the Cathars²⁸ and of Berengarius of Tours (999-1089)²⁹. The latter caused controversy among theologians whilst the former had a considerable impact on the people. This reaction was the development of eucharistic devotion to the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

²⁶ Cf. Clark, op. cit., pp 296-322.

²⁷ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 117.

²⁸ The Cathars were a neo-Manichæan sect in the twelfth century. Their doctrine was dualistic, believing in two Gods: the good God who created only spiritual things, and the evil God who was responsible for material creation. In accordance with its fundamental dualism, this heresy denied the hierarchy and the Sacraments, save only one, the *Consolamentum* which was the initiation ceremony of the *perfecti* who had to practice an extreme asceticism. Suicide was a recommended practice. This heresy originated in some of the pagan religions of Persia and the Middle East, and was brought to Europe by cloth merchants. Catharism or Albigensianism found firm ground in the south of France, attracting considerable numbers of Catholics by its apparent ideal of a poor Church in its primitive simplicity. It was repressed and finally eliminated by the Dominican Friars and the medieval Inquisition.

²⁹ Berengarius was a pupil of Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres. Denying the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist in the light of Aristotelian logic, he considered that the only truth was demonstrated by the conclusions of his dialectic. Therefore, for Berengarius, no accident could exist in separation from its proper substance. If the Eucharist continued to subsist under the accidents of bread and wine after the consecration, that which subsisted had also to be bread and wine. If Jesus Christ was present, it was in the bread and wine. P. Hughes, *A History of the Church*, vol II, London 1952, p 267. This teaching was condemned, and Berengarius was made to recant in 1087 (DS 700).

It was from this development of eucharistic piety that the practice of elevating the Host at the consecration developed. The first time this was made obligatory was in 1210 by the Bishop of Paris³⁰. Where it was not enforced by church law, the people called for it³¹. The medieval Grail-legend to some extent found its expression in the Mass. The desire to see the Sacred Host³² became such an obsession that people ran from church to church or from altar to altar if several masses were being celebrated simultaneously in one church to see the elevated Host as often as possible. It was thus imagined that the resulting graces would be arithmetically multiplied. The most extreme result of this tendency was that people would enter the church hearing the bell at the *Hanc igitur* and leave as soon as the elevation was finished³³. Eucharistic piety became protest against heresy, and the celebration was centred on the consecration as effecting both the Sacrifice and the Real Presence. A development of this trend was the Mass celebrated *Coram Sanctissimo*³⁴, while the Sacrament was exposed in a monstrance above the altar.

Many of the late medieval theologians were influenced by the development of eucharistic piety. They were, however, mainly concerned with the refuting of heretical doctrine. Definitions became increasingly subtle and the clarity of mind of a Saint Thomas was largely obscured. Theology had become decadent though it remained orthodox. The theology of consecration revolved around two *poles* of eucharistic doctrine: the Mass considered as a propitiatory sacrifice offered for the living and the dead, and the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ by way of transubstantiation. These theologians had a number of Church definitions to go on, such as those provoked by the opinions of Berengarius. Reams of hair-splitting distinctions were produced. Some historians maintain that there was simply total confusion in theology at the time³⁵. This general decadence in theological learning was correlative with the abuses motivated by avarice,

³⁰ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 120.

³¹ Fortescue, op. cit., pp 341-342. An English protestant at the time of the Reformation reported that the faithful of the parishes complained that the Host was not elevated high enough: *The rude people of the countrey in diverse partes of England will crye out to the priest: houlde up Sir John, houlde up. Heave it a little higher.*

³² E. Dumoutet, *Le désir de voir l'hostie*, Paris 1926, pp18-25.

³³ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 121.

³⁴ This practice was abolished during the Pontificate of Pius XII. There are, however, theological and liturgical arguments *in favour* of this rite. For example, the presence of the *Sanctissimum* shows the unity between all celebrations of Mass, as its presence in the tabernacle.

³⁵ Clark, op. cit., Ibid., pp 54 and 73; cf. E. Maskell, *The Recovery of Unity*, London 1955; E. Maskell, Letter to the *Church Times*, 28th October 1955, p 11. This leading Anglican theologian observed that *by the end of middle ages the whole conception of sacrifice had got distorted.*

loss of interest in the liturgy and superstition on the part of the uninstructed parochial clergy and their faithful³⁶.

The medieval doctrine of the eucharistic Sacrifice as a factor of the decadence of the celebration of Mass

The medieval concept of the Mass, as a propitiatory sacrifice to glorify God and to obtain the forgiveness of the sins of the living and the dead, was wrapped up in confusion and error³⁷, and these led to abusive practices in the applying of the Sacrifice to particular intentions. The consequences of these misconceptions were devastating on popular devotion. These abuses had necessarily to be based on popular belief, which is formed by catechesis in Christian doctrine. Our purpose here is to examine briefly some of the variations of this doctrine that made the abuses possible.

In reaction to the heresies, the doctrine of the Real Presence had undergone a considerable development at the hands of the Schoolmen. This was not so with the doctrine of the Mass as a Sacrifice. The reason for this is, until the onset of the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, that no significant controversies had arisen³⁸. Both the scholastic theologians and those from the late middle ages merely echoed the doctrine of the Fathers and of their predecessors that the Mass was a true Sacrifice. Even when commenting the Sentences of Peter Lombard, all they did was to repeat what he said³⁹. There was no exaggerated development of the doctrine of eucharistic Sacrifice in pre-Reformation times: it was a period of apathetic conservatism. From the viewpoint of Catholics, the question was not whether the Mass is a Sacrifice, but how, and to whom it is applied.

The Sacrifice of the Mass, in the eyes of most people, was the means whereby their sins and the temporal faults of their loved ones were remitted. Together with the development of the Low Mass, celebrated with Votive formulæ, this belief led to a need to have Mass celebrated for particular intentions. This practice originated in the eighth century, and stipends were paid for these celebrations⁴⁰. This established practice combined itself with certain erroneous conceptions about the *fruits* of the Mass, and with the mentality of the time, to

³⁶ Clark, op. cit., Chapter III *Survey of current Catholic teaching*, pp 73-98. A more detailed study of the corruptions in late medieval theology is the subject of the second part of this book (pp 209-523).

³⁷ The most prevailing popular notion of the Sacrifice of the Mass was that it was distinct from that of the Cross. Such a doctrine has never been officially taught in the Church.

³⁸ Clark, op. cit., pp 78-79.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p 79.

⁴⁰ Fortescue, op. cit., p 187.

produce a system of abuse that was later to be denounced by the Council of Trent. Lists of *fruits of the devout hearing of Mass* were published from the thirteenth century onwards. The Fathers were copiously quoted to support claims that the Sacrifice had a beneficial effect on man's temporal estate⁴¹.

THE PRACTICAL DECADENCE OF THE ROMAN EUCHARISTIC LITURGY

It now remains to outline the effect of these theological trends and tendencies of popular devotion on the liturgy of the Mass. Christian worship suffered a profound decline, obviously manifested in the loss of a deep understanding of worship. This decline of a sense of liturgical mystery showed itself in the form of abuses and theological errors.

The system of Votive Masses

The most blatant of these abuses was trafficking in Mass stipends, the money offered to a priest in asking him to celebrate the Mass on a given day for a particular intention. This legitimate practice⁴², in such a period of spiritual decline as the late fifteenth century, was the occasion of abuse by covetous men. There were many unworthy priests at this time who, for want of honest employment, trafficked in Mass-stipends.

Votive Masses had been celebrated since early times. The Gelasian Sacramentary contained a number of Votive Masses⁴³. But, it was only since the thirteenth century that these celebrations multiplied to an excessive extent⁴⁴. A number of Votive formulæ appeared⁴⁵. With this trend came the ordination of priests whose only role was to celebrate these votive masses, especially for the dead⁴⁶. These clerics made considerable profits from the

⁴¹ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 129. Saint Augustine is quoted as having said that during the time one hears Mass one does not grow older. The various *fruits of hearing Mass* quoted by Jungmann are all of this grossly materialistic order, owing to a misunderstanding of the theology of eucharistic sacrifice.

⁴² The modern Code of Canon Law still recognizes this practice: CIC (1983), Can. 945-958 and Can. 1385 (penalty for abuse).

⁴³ Fortescue, op. cit., p 120.

⁴⁴ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 129.

⁴⁵ Ferreres, *Historia del Misal Romano*, Barcelona 1929, pp 350-376. Some of these Votive Masses included formulæ against various sicknesses, against dangers to property and against attacks from an enemy.

⁴⁶ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 130. In England, Henry VIII abolished 2,374 chantries and Mass foundations which employed full-time massing priests.

excessive multiplication of Votive Masses. Invariably, these *massing priests* had no theological training. The effect of all this on the simple faithful was to instil in them a feeling of false security. If such fruits of the Mass were so automatic, no personal responsibility in the moral life was necessary. It could thus be believed that salvation was possible without faith or personal conversion. It was on this point that the Protestants would react, some by completely abolishing the Mass, others by modifying the theology and the rite of celebration.

Erroneous medieval theological interpretations of the doctrine of Purgatory gave rise to many superstitions concerning the number of masses that were necessary for the souls of deceased relatives and friends. Legends that were intended for the pious edification of souls led to abuses. Some of these legends were so often ludicrous and unthinkable for the twentieth century western mentality, but went uncriticised by the medieval mind. A special value was attached to the precise number of these masses, and by this means, greedy priests could calculate how much money they would make. Votive Masses and Masses for the Dead had almost entirely replaced the Temporal and Sanctoral Cycles in some places.

In the popular mythology of the time, not only would the Mass shorten one's punishment in Purgatory, it could also obtain many temporal benefits: one could avoid going blind, prosper in worldly affairs, reap a good harvest. The Mass, so it had been said, would improve a pious man's digestion⁴⁷. The gullible mentality of those who believed in such superstitions could be cheated out of considerable sums of money.

The Low Mass as the normative Mass

The development of the Votive Mass most contributed to the shift of emphasis from the Solemn High Mass to the Low Mass assisted by only a single server. The *blessed mutter of the Mass*⁴⁸, that is to say, the Low Mass said nearly entirely *submissa voce*, became an occasion for the people to find inspiration in their devotions⁴⁹. There was no longer a corporate action, as at High Mass, of singing and *doing*. The layman's role was hitherto reduced to seeing, and above all, to *hearing Mass*⁵⁰. The Low Mass became the *normative*

⁴⁷ Clark, op. cit., pp 60-61; cf. T. F. Simmons, *The Lay Folk's Mass Book*, London 1879, pp 366-371.

⁴⁸ The expression is of G. K. Chesterton.

⁴⁹ Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London 1945, p 599. Many medieval lay people preferred the Low Mass to the Solemn Mass on account of its brevity and silence. Not distracted by exuberant ceremonies and music, they were freer to practice their pious exercises.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p 599.

Mass, in such wise that the High Mass with deacon and subdeacon came to be considered as something *special*, the roles of the assistants being considered as optional extras. The Mass came to be regarded as an occasion of private and subjective devotion: such an attitude would lead inevitably to the protestant conception of the Eucharist. The logical development would have been to remove the external action, leaving the individual to his devotions⁵¹.

This development of the Low Mass as a norm led to the increasing isolation of the celebrating priest in the Mass, and the infrequency of communion by the faithful. This was a contributing factor in this loss of the sense of the liturgy, as a corporate action of the whole Church. Frequent communion was not encouraged in the medieval mystical tradition. We know that the Mass came to be considered as an epiphany of God Incarnate, and that the contemplative aspect nearly eclipsed the active dimension: the liturgical action of the whole worshipping community. The Low Mass radically separated the celebrant from all his people, including the ministers assisting him at High Mass. The Tridentine reform missed this fundamental point.

Abuses arising from an exaggerated devotion to the Sacrament of the Eucharist

The doctrine of transubstantiation led to the change in policy concerning the handling of the Blessed Sacrament. Because of the extreme degree of veneration made to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, no lay person was allowed to touch the Host under any circumstances. The corporal was shown such veneration that amounted almost to superstition⁵². In some of the medieval rites, there was the curious custom at the ablutions of leaving the chalice on its side, the upper part or cup on the paten, so that there would be no risk of spilling the smallest drop of the Precious Blood. Many chalices of the period were specially made, so that in this position they would not roll⁵³. The rubrics *de defectibus* in many Missals were multiplied, prescribing stern punishments for careless priests who allowed hosts to fall to the floor or the chalice to be spilled.

Most of the abuses were not evidence of doctrinal errors, but were signs of an urgent need for pastoral reform. Though the people did not directly participate in the liturgy, they frequently had old and new allegorical

⁵¹ Ibid., p 603. The effect of the Low Mass on protestant liturgy is evident from the following quotation of the English puritan divines: “*The minister is appointed for the people in all publick services appertaining unto God, and the Holy Scriptures both of the Old and New Testaments intimating the people’s part in publick prayer to be only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto*”.

⁵² Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 128.

⁵³ King, *Liturgies of the Past*, p 324.

explanations of the Mysteries⁵⁴ which enabled simple people (if literate) to assist at Mass devoutly. Though devotion to the Blessed Sacrament became a solid tradition in the Latin Church, the abuse of this was to reduce the liturgy to a mere occasion for private devotions.

Priests and laity alike were appallingly ignorant about many of the basics of the faith, and were frequently motivated by self-interest. Thus we can see a dichotomy between the teaching of the theologians, which was orthodox, and the lamentable liturgical and pastoral situation of the late medieval Church. Other than the practical abuses of parish priests and their ignorant congregations, some of the official texts themselves were elaborated with highly questionable texts, legends wholly lacking in authenticity. All this was like dry tinder that needed only one spark to set it aflame. This spark was Protestantism, which threatened to destroy the branch and root of the Catholic edifice. There was an urgent need of a Catholic reform of the Mass liturgy, to affirm definitively the doctrine of the Eucharist and to guarantee the integrity of the liturgy, all in waging war against the abusive praxis⁵⁵.

THE PROTESTANT RESPONSE

The general situation of decadence in the Latin Church, occasioned by the liturgy, in the life of western Christianity brought on a bitter controversy. The Protestants posed the question, as did medieval heresiarchs, if it would not be better to abolish the liturgy, as something quite unnecessary for an authentic Christian life in the spirit of the Gospel, or to adapt it to their theology.

Dom Guéranger speaks, in his *Institutions liturgiques*, of an *anti-liturgical heresy*⁵⁶. By this, he means a movement of liturgical reform culminating in the work of the Protestant Reformers and the neo-Gallican liturgies he knew in his own time. We might, or we might not, agree with Guéranger's opinion that the *hérésie anti-liturgique* was a co-ordinated movement which spanned throughout the history of the Church. It is certain, however, that the various movements opposed to Catholic orthodoxy were based on similar philosophical principles, such as dualism or Manichaeism, or simple anticlericalism.

Much of the later medieval theological confusion came about from combating heresies that questioned the reality of the Incarnation, therefore of the liturgy and Sacraments. We have already mentioned Berengarius and the Cathars, against whom was developed the doctrine of the Real Presence of the

⁵⁴ Simmons, op. cit., pp 2-60. These pages contain, in four parallel versions, a commentary of the Mass in Middle English. This is probably the best known of this type of literature.

⁵⁵ Jungmann, op. cit., I, pp 132-133.

⁵⁶ Dom Prosper Guéranger, *Institutions liturgiques*, Paris 1878, pp 388-407.

Incarnate Christ in the Sacred Species. However, there were reactions from the scholastic developments in eucharistic theology and the resulting liturgical trends.

The Waldenses continued some aspects of Catharism, in refusing the Incarnation and its consequences. It was above all an anti-clerical movement against scholastic theology. They were against any kind of liturgy. The other most well known pre-Reformation heresiarchs are Wycliffe and John Hus. Neither of these produced any kind of reformed liturgy as did the Reformers, properly so-called.

The main Protestant objections to the Catholic liturgical abuses

The most characteristic objections of the Reformers to Catholic liturgical praxis were to the abusive practices in the celebration of Mass: the lists of *fruits of the Mass*, the multiplication of votive masses, even all private celebrations where the priest celebrated without a congregation, the commerce in stipends⁵⁷. They wanted to see the Sacrament of the Eucharist reestablished as food for the spiritual nourishment of the faithful, and the emphasis removed from a disproportionate adoration arising from the Corpus Christi procession and the innumerable eucharistic devotions then in use. Some of the Reformers wanted to bring about what might be anachronistically termed a liturgical movement⁵⁸.

The liturgical message of the Reformers was appealing: they wanted a simple service close in spirit to that of Christ and the Apostles. They believed that in removing what they saw as medieval accretions, such as the Canon of the Mass, they would restore the primitive simplicity of the early Church. They wanted to go back to biblical values, to be rid once and for all of trafficking in Mass stipends, to be free from the tyranny of the Rome of the Popes. The basis of the Protestant message was that of freedom, to worship God without the intermediary of a crushingly oppressive clerical system. What could be more attractive than a simple service held in a language everyone could understand, and in which all could take an active part, gratuitously?

For Martin Luther, the Mass was to be stripped of its sacrificial character, to become a bequest given by God, independently of any human "merit". Thus the offertory had to disappear, and the *abomination of the low Mass called the Canon*⁵⁹ had to be severely modified. The English reformers were more

⁵⁷ Dix., op. cit., p 627.

⁵⁸ G. J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, London 1969, pp 34-48.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p 132; cf. Martin Luthers Werke (1524): *Von dem Greuel der Stillmesse so man Canon nennet*. Some of Luther's language against the Mass was of an extreme violence, for example: "Yea, I declare that all the brothels (though God has reprov'd these severely) all

influenced by the Swiss reformers, Zwingli and Calvin⁶⁰. So bad was the situation of Catholic theology and liturgy it was inevitable that, psychologically, the reaction had to be fierce. It was all like a wound-up spring ready to give all its energy at a touch. It took the Anglican Church some fifty years to recover a more patristic sense of theology and the liturgical celebration under the light of the Caroline Divines⁶¹.

These legitimate complaints about a system that was thoroughly rotten made a great impression on the ignorant public and lower clergy, and threatened not only to trim away the accretions, but to attack the very root of the tree. The liturgy was despised, where as before, it had become neglected. This over-reaction was inevitable given the ignorance of both reformers and counter-reformers in questions of liturgical history. In attacking the abuses, the Protestants were attacking the liturgy itself.

In the case of some of the reformers, especially Luther and Cranmer, so deep was rooted the liturgical instinct, that they could not bring themselves completely to abolish liturgical worship. If they wanted to, it would have been a most unwise step, because there would have been nothing to fill the void. They created new liturgies⁶² in an attempt to correct the theological abuses, but above all, with an intention to restore the most primitive style of worship. This they largely failed to do, because they lacked many elements of historical and theological knowledge in comparison with twentieth century scholars. Cranmer had created an eucharistic liturgy that perfectly reflected his nearly docetistic theology, but on the other hand, he devised services of morning and evening prayer of outstanding genius, as may be witnessed to this day in most of the English Cathedrals and parish churches of the Anglican Church. The Office, though considerably reformed, thus became a popular act of worship⁶³.

manslaughters, murders, thefts and adulteries have wrought less evil than the abomination of the popish mass" (Dix, op. cit., p 634).

⁶⁰ G. Dix, op. cit., p 659.

⁶¹ The Caroline Divines were seventeenth century Anglican theologians, frequently bishops, and were so-called because they lived and worked during the reign of King Charles I (1600-1649, King since 1625). Generally speaking, they sought to find a new theological and spiritual balance in opposition to the excesses of puritanism. Their conception of the Anglican Church was that of a *via media* between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism.

⁶² E. Lodi, *Enchiridion Euchologium Fontium Liturgicorum*, Rome 1979, pp 1724-1752. This book reproduces the primitive versions of the rites for the Lord's Supper of Luther, Calvin and Cranmer (1549); cf. Cuming, op. cit., pp 318-367.

⁶³ Dix., op. cit., pp 656-674.

The protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone: the rejection of the Catholic liturgy as a good work

In the Thirty Nine Articles of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, a heavy emphasis is placed on the relation between grace, free will, faith and good works. These are all Augustinian terms, written in the context of the controversy against the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians, who had maintained that it was possible for a Christian to merit salvation by his own energies, to be justified by good works. Was the author of these Articles accusing the pre-reformation Church of semi-Pelagianism? If so, this tendency would have been one of the underlying causes of the medieval degradation of liturgy and sacramental theology, causing the abuses above mentioned.

One fact that can help us to answer this question is the fundamental tenet of the Reformers: salvation by faith alone. It follows that the Catholic Mass is considered in this perspective as a good work that is in no way conducive to salvation. This doctrine, expounded by Luther but adopted by the other Reformers, was based on an interpretation of Saint Augustine's doctrine of grace and free will⁶⁴. Though it is out of our scope to go into detail on this subject, there is no doubt that this protestant tenet struck at the heart of the Catholic sacramental system, and in particular the Mass⁶⁵. Even if the Protestants retained the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, motivated by compelling scriptural evidence, to be *justified through faith* meant the abolition of an objectively operating sacramental system rooted in the doctrine of the Incarnation⁶⁶.

In the logic of justification by faith alone, the two main pillars of scholastic speculation were attacked in order to destroy the theological basis of the abuses⁶⁷. They wanted to reestablish the role of faith and personal conversion in the Christian life. They attacked the Sacrifice of the Mass and the doctrine of the Real Presence, the basis of medieval eucharistic devotion. The dogmatic basis of the Sacraments was the main business of the Council of Trent, and is beyond our subject matter.

A criticism of the protestant principles of liturgical reform

In considering the reasons for a revolt against the traditional Catholic liturgies, there is another element: the loss of a sense of the place of liturgy in

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp 629-631.

⁶⁵ Clark., op. cit., p 364; cf. H. B. Meyer, *Luther und die Messe. Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Verhältnis Luthers zum Messwesen des späßen Mittelalters*, Paderborn 1965.

⁶⁶ K. B. Ritter, *Zur Lehre vom opus operatum*, in: *Una Sancta*, May 1959, pp 34-39; cf. Dix, op. cit., p 632.

⁶⁷ Cuming, op. cit., p 32. It is on account of their theological system that the Protestants wished to set aside the Roman Canon, regardless of its known antiquity.

the Christian life. Historically, we can remark that the many perversions of theology and spirituality we have already discussed are due to a lack of the liturgical sense. But, we may argue that this is the fault, not of the Protestants, but of the medieval decadence in the Catholic Church. This is true. Sound liturgical thinking had disintegrated over several centuries. The sense of the plenitude of the Paschal Mystery in the liturgy had been nearly lost, eclipsed by eucharistic devotion and an allegorical understanding of the ceremonies⁶⁸. Soon, there was no interest at all in the meaning of these, to the point that the liturgy became a mechanical function or duty to perform. Naturally, a spiritual life was sought in other forms of prayer and devotion. There was an urgent need to rediscover the value and meaning of the liturgy, and the proper authorities of the Catholic Church were too slow in acting. It was the Protestants, or shall we say, groups of “avant-garde” Catholics, who committed themselves to the sixteenth century equivalent of a liturgical movement. They wanted prayer and liturgy to be one and the same thing. This was a highly cogent reason for the Protestants’ reforming zeal.

What is unfortunate with the protestant reform was that it based on the wrong principles. The most striking is their archæologism, an idealised and mechanical reproduction of the *primitive Church* and its worship in so far as they could be ascertained by the very imperfect scholarship of the time⁶⁹. The Reformation foundered, not on account of its revolutionary forwardness of view, but because it was insufficiently critical of its own assumptions concerning the liturgy of the primitive Church. The reformers believed that a return to the *purity of the Gospel* meant taking as the liturgical norm the Low Mass and to suppress the *medieval accretions* such as the Offertory and the Canon, except the words of Institution. They emphasised the penitential features⁷⁰ of the Low Mass, reducing everything to the dimensions of a Eucharistic meal and the memory of the Passion⁷¹.

⁶⁸ Dix, op. cit., pp 625-626.

⁶⁹ L. Bouyer, *Life and Liturgy*, London 1956, p 41.

⁷⁰ Cf. Book of Common Prayer (1662), Oxford 1934, pp 270-271. Such a typical feature is the following confession of sins from the Anglican Eucharist of 1662: “*Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men; we acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time, most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against thy Divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, and are heartily sorry for these our misdoings; the remembrance of the is grievous unto us; the burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, forgive us all that is past; and grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life, to the honour and glory of thy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen*”.

⁷¹ Bouyer, op. cit., p 42; Book of Common Prayer, op. cit., pp 276-277. Equally in the Anglican rite of 1662, the anamnesis of the Eucharistic prayer (*Prayer of Oblation* which follows the communion) is reduced to this: “*O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness (...); most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion...*”. Cf. Dix, op. cit., p 625.

In fact, all the Protestants succeeded in doing was to reinforce the worst aspects of medieval Catholicism. The reformers failed to discover that the primitive form was the High Mass celebrated by the Bishop. They ignored the dimension of the anamnesis of the whole of the Paschal Mystery, which would thus restore the balance of the Eucharistic Action. They had taken their penitential prayers, not from patristic sources, but from the various apocryphal rites of Holy Communion outside Mass, which originated after the end of the thirteenth century. Their devotion of the suffering Humanity of Christ originated in the *Expositiones Missæ*. The sacramental element of the liturgy had given way to a sentimental and allegorical remembrance of the past actions of Christ⁷². Largely, the reformers had kept the medieval accretions and had thrown away the most authentic aspects of the liturgy of the early Church⁷³. The most salient characteristic of protestant worship is its synthetic nature; it had not developed from centuries of tradition, as did the ancient eastern and western liturgies. In this way, the protestant principle of liturgical reform was directly opposed to that of Pius V and his Commission in 1570.

In aiming for a purer and higher type of worship, the reformers were victims of their own idealisation of the past. They had not the critical view of history we have to-day. However, it would be unjust to dismiss the reformers as ignorant men. It would be equally incorrect to accuse the Protestants alone of an anti-liturgical heresy, for they inherited a long legacy of neglect of the liturgy. It is surprising to discover the reformers' erudition in patristic and biblical studies⁷⁴. The men of the renaissance could frequently write poetry in Latin, Greek or Hebrew.

CONCLUSION

We have attempted to trace the causes of the medieval liturgical situation, examining its history, and have evaluated some of the proposed solutions. The foundation of a liturgical norm on the rite of the Low Mass is one of the most profound roots of the medieval decline in the sense of liturgical worship. Our observation is founded on the experience of church history since the thirteenth century, maybe even traceable to the schism between Rome and Constantinople. The liturgical norm founded on the Low Mass was

⁷² Bouyer, op. cit., p 42.

⁷³ Dix, op. cit., p 600. Dix describes the most orthodox protestant worship as a collection of medieval lay devotions without the external eucharistic action of the Mass. However, few Protestants have been to such a point, and have nearly always kept some exterior aspects of the eucharistic liturgy.

⁷⁴ Cf. G. Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*, Zurich 1975.

so taken for granted in medieval and renaissance times that protestant worship was based on it.

The focusing of the celebration onto the priest, who has become known as the *celebrant*, is a direct consequence of the Low Mass as a liturgical norm. This increasing isolation of the celebrant proportionately led to an exaggeration of the contemplative dimension on the part of the faithful. From being concelebrants, the role of the faithful was reduced to near total passivity. From then onwards, it was the priest who alone celebrated for the people, and even for the clergy assisting him at the altar⁷⁵.

It is due to this duality, not between clergy and laity, but between the celebrant and everyone else in church that the spirit of liturgical worship was lost. No longer was the Mass a corporate action, but it became an occasion for individual devotion, for want of occupation. Combined with the age-old tradition of celebrating Mass for particular intentions, the Mass became an occasion of superstition and filthy lucre on the part of unscrupulous priests.

It is in this context that we can understand the multiplication of dubious rites which could not be allowed to continue. Those who composed them had forgotten what the liturgy was, and hence allowed spurious legends to creep into the texts. However, many of the local rites were genuinely traditional, and Saint Pius V made provision for them. By the sixteenth century the liturgy of the Mass was desperately in need of reform, for it was part of a culture of a sterile and ritualistic conservatism, decadent to the point of a certain materialistic sacramentalism. It was not necessary for heretics to plot against the liturgy; it was already a tangled jungle, rotten at the roots. Errors in the understanding of the liturgy had led to purely intellectual systems of theology without foundation in reality, and such theologies had led to formalism in the liturgy. The movement of reform was a failure; the only positive movement in the early sixteenth century was an effort to codify and preserve the liturgical tradition from further decay.

⁷⁵ This is particularly apparent in the modern rite of Mass celebrated facing the people: the priest is doing something *for*, not *with* the people.

II. REFORMS OF THE LATIN LITURGY BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

Parallel with the medieval liturgical crisis was a movement within the Catholic Church to preserve existing tradition by codification of the text and rubrics of the rites. It was certainly felt that the ecclesial spirit which had brought about the former free development of the Roman liturgy had been lost. In an environment of decadence and crisis, the need was felt to shift the emphasis from spontaneity and development to preservation of the integrity of the liturgy. The first written books of liturgical rites, the *Ordines Romani*, marked the beginning of codification: the Popes did not write how the liturgy was to be celebrated, but how it already was celebrated.

What do we mean by codification? We mean by this word the expression of a pre-existing tradition in terms of newly worded rules or rubrics, as in the field of canon law. Reform can imply a more radical change, so we think that in this historical context, codification is a more apt term to use. If we speak of reform, it is a looser use of the term, synonymous with codification. Such a way of thought is certainly in the line of liturgists and rubricists of the late middle ages and time of the Counter Reformation.

The development of precise codes of rubrics for priests came to a head from the thirteenth century. An event which marks this point is the invention of the *Missale plenum*, where the book used for the celebration of Mass becomes a single volume, all the texts, including the Bible readings and the sung parts, being said by the priest at the altar. This marks the beginning of the Low Mass as a defined form of the eucharistic celebration. Many liturgical historians consider this event as a turning point in the development of the Roman liturgy⁷⁶.

THE FIRST MASS BOOKS AND CODES OF RUBRICS FROM THE THIRTEENTH TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

The process of codification of the Roman rite of Mass from the thirteenth century is a complex question owing to the multiplicity of its regional variations. In the Latin west, the Gallican rite having fallen into desuetude,

⁷⁶ J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman rite (Missarum Sollemnia)*, Westminster (Maryland) 1986, vol I, pp 103-104; A. Fortescue, *The Mass: a study of the Roman liturgy*, London 1917, p 184; F. Cabrol, *Missel Romain*, in: DACL, vol XI, col 1483; G. Duret, *Les livres liturgiques*, in: *Liturgia*, Paris 1930, p 412; A. G. Martimort, *L'Eglise en prière*, vol II (L'Eucharistie), Paris 1983, p 154.

the parent rite of nearly all the local diocesan usages is that of the Roman Church⁷⁷. During this period, we find two tendencies: that of the spread of a uniform Roman rite; and the diversification of local variations of this rite, more or less mixed with Gallican remnants, frequently leading to untraditional developments.

The significance of the Missale plenum

Until the appearance of the *Missale plenum* in the thirteenth century⁷⁸, Mass was celebrated from three types of books. These were the Sacramentary containing the texts for the priest to read at the altar; the lectionaries with the Old Testament Lessons, Epistles and Gospels for the deacon, subdeacon and lectors; and books of chant for the *schola cantorum*⁷⁹. The development by which these several books were reduced to one was parallel with that of the reduction of books required for the Liturgy of the Hours to form the Breviary⁸⁰. In the late middle ages, there were developed two types of such a complete Missal: those which contained parts of the liturgical year and Votive Masses, particularly favoured by itinerant monks, and those which contained the full texts of the Sacramentary, Lectionary and chant books. This latter became known as the *Missale plenum* or *plenarium*⁸¹. These early missals were frequently volumes in which the sacramentary, lectionary and chant books were bound together⁸². Not everything had to be found in this book, because most priests knew the Psalter by heart.

The reason for this development is not so much the predominance of the private Mass, which had long been celebrated, but, in some measure, of its extended use⁸³. The private Mass was, to a point, a consequence of the evolution of the *Missale plenum*⁸⁴. When a private Mass had been said using

⁷⁷ Fortescue, op. cit., pp 199-205.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p 190.

⁷⁹ S. J. P. van Dijk, *The origins of the modern Roman liturgy*, London 1960, pp 57-58.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p 58. This parallel development of the Missal and Breviary is only coincidental. What became the Missal could have been known as a *Breviarium Missæ* or something of the sort, if the two were more closely related.

⁸¹ Ibid., p 59.

⁸² Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 105. Such a book was far cruder than the fully developed Missal, where all the variable elements were grouped together in Propers, containing the biblical readings and the sung parts as well as the prayers.

⁸³ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 107; cf. Van Dijk, op. cit., 61.

⁸⁴ Van Dijk, op. cit., p 61. Fortescue (op. cit. p 189) affirms the contrary, that the Low Mass was the *raison d'être* of the *Missale plenum*. Van Dijk produces arguments from modern scholars to state which caused what.

only the Sacramentary, the Bible readings and sung parts were simply left out⁸⁵, unless some of these were included in the priest's sacramentary, or if a lectionary was available and placed elsewhere on the altar⁸⁶.

The *Missale plenum* was a purely clerical book, like the Breviary, and was intended for celebration at the altar. It was particularly useful for priests who had constantly to travel and for small parishes⁸⁷. It is thus in the thirteenth century that the *Missale plenum* replaced the Sacramentary⁸⁸. From this moment, we find the priest reading all the texts of the Mass, including the reader's part. This became a rule, even at High Mass where readers, subdeacon, deacon and singers were available⁸⁹. We will find this tendency, of conceiving the rite of Mass as a Low celebration with the choir and ministers as mere additional functions, codified in the Missal of Pius V⁹⁰.

From now on, the normative form of the Mass, whether solemn or private, was to be the Low Mass. Previously, the roles of ministers, servers, readers and singers were an integral part of the Mass, for the priest did not have these parts to read, now, they become a kind of *optional extra*. This is the origin of the unliturgical custom of the celebrant reading in a low voice those parts of the Mass which were read or sung by others. The Low Mass, the two being juxtaposed, markedly influenced the Solemn Mass⁹¹. We can be sure that this tendency of basing the whole concept of the celebration of the Mass on its Low form was the origin of the medieval decadence, and of the protestant liturgies.

The Missal of the Papal Court in the thirteenth century

The origin of the Missal that was to become the primary source for the reform of Pius V (1566-1572) was the liturgy of the Papal Court from the first half of the thirteenth century⁹². Innocent III (1198-1216) initiated a liturgical reform that was to have increasing influence in the whole of the Latin Church. His

⁸⁵ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 105.

⁸⁶ Van Dijk, op. cit., p 62.

⁸⁷ Ibid., pp 64-65.

⁸⁸ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 104.

⁸⁹ Ibid. , p 106.

⁹⁰ Cf. R. Winch, *The Canonical Mass of the English Orthodox*, Oxford 1988, p 47: "The Tridentine book (...) maintains the notion that a 'low' celebration is somehow the most primitive".

⁹¹ Fortescue, op. cit., p 190; cf. Martimort, op. cit., p 155.

⁹² Martimort, op. cit., p 187; cf. M. Andrieu, *L'ordinaire de la chapelle papale et le cardinal Jacques G etani Stefaneschi*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgic e* 49 (1935), pp230-260.

successors began to dream of spreading this liturgy in the whole western world; this wish was finally realised by Pius V in 1570. The Bishop of Assisi, Guido II, adopted the liturgy of the Roman Court in his cathedral. He and Saint Francis of Assisi (c 1181-1226) were on intimate terms, and this liturgy was adopted by the Franciscan Order⁹³.

The Franciscans, who, like the Dominicans, were mendicant preachers and missionaries, adopted this rite of the Roman Curia and spread it far and wide in the Catholic world. One of their number, Hymo of Faversham (c 1239-1244)⁹⁴, wrote out the first complete *Ordo* of the Roman Mass in its private form for the use of Franciscan itinerant priests⁹⁵. It began with the words *Indutus planeta*⁹⁶. This *Ordo* was an early attempt at a codification of the priest's ceremonies at Mass. Such attempts had already been made in large monasteries, such as Mainz and St Gallen⁹⁷.

Hymo presented the *Indutus planeta* to the Chapter in Bologna in 1243. Its purpose was to describe the ceremonies according to the custom of the Roman Church, but only those of the celebrant priest⁹⁸. It was not concerned with the roles of the assistants, the choir or the people. The source for the *Indutus planeta* was the Court Ceremonial for Mass quoted in the Pontifical of Innocent III⁹⁹. As the Franciscans thus spread the use of the Roman liturgy wherever they went, the *Indutus* became the only complete ceremonial for the private Mass¹⁰⁰. After the Pontificate of Innocent IV (1243-1254), more

⁹³ Van Dijk, op. cit., pp 398-399.

⁹⁴ Hymo of Faversham was the fourth minister general of the Franciscan Order. He joined the Order as a priest and a man of erudition in 1224. In 1230 he developed the Franciscan Rule and took part in a delegation to have it approved by the Pope. He had considerable influence in his Order and in the academic world. He found the Order's liturgy to be in a lamentable state, and thus wrote the *Indutus planeta*.

⁹⁵ Martimort, op. cit., p 160; cf. Van Dijk, op. cit., pp 292-301.

⁹⁶ The text of *Indutus planeta* is reproduced in: J. Wickham Legg, *Tracts on the Mass*, London 1904, pp 179-189.

⁹⁷ Theodor Klauser, *A short history of the western liturgy*, Oxford 1979, pp 104-105. This short work of Prof. Klauser is definitely situated in the context of the pre Vatican II liturgical movement. He divides the history of the liturgy into four sections: *creative beginnings* (Ascension of Jesus to Gregory I), *Franco-German leadership* (Gregory I to Gregory VII), *dissolution, reinterpretation, and misinterpretation* (Gregory VII to the Council of Trent), and *rigid unification in the liturgy and rubricism* (Council of Trent to Vatican II). We are more inclined to consider the tendency of rubrical unification as from the later Roman Ordines to about 1920.

⁹⁸ Van Dijk, op. cit., pp 292-293.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p 294; cf. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical romain au moyen age*, in: *Studi e testi*, vol 87, Vatican City 1940.

¹⁰⁰ Van Dijk, op. cit., p 297; cf. Jungmann, op. cit., I, pp 412, 441 and 455, II, 292, 349, 351 and 443.

religious Orders adopted the use of the Roman liturgy. By 1295, the papal library possessed three Franciscan ordinals, and their codified ceremonials were adopted in the Papal Court¹⁰¹. Thus was born the uniform tendency of the western liturgy, paving the way for the reform of Pius V in 1570¹⁰².

The Missal of the Roman Curia of 1474

This Franciscan-Roman liturgy formed the basis for the first printed Roman Missal (*Ordo Missalis secundum consuetudinem Romanæ Curiaë*) which was published at Milan in 1474¹⁰³. The invention of the printing press revolutionized the development of the Roman liturgy, for the problem of copyists' errors was solved at a stroke. The text therefore became more or less fixed, but there were more than 320 editions between 1474 and 1570, mainly from Italian and French publishers¹⁰⁴.

These editions of the Missal of the Roman Curia were by no means standard and entirely uniform; only Pius V achieved this by his legislation of 1570. The point that varies the most is the final blessing¹⁰⁵. The Master of Ceremonies of Alexander VI (1492-1503) codified the rubrics into a new Ordo in the late fifteenth century.

The Medieval Uses or variants of the Roman Mass liturgy

There were developed in Europe many variants of the Roman rite. Many of them contained rich remnants of the ancient Franco-German liturgies, a kaleidoscope of local customs and cultures. Lest we should go far out of our scope, it is necessary to restrict ourselves to very wide generalizations.

In the middle of the sixteenth century the Anglican reformers thus described the pre-Reformation situation:

*“And whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in churches within this realm; some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln; now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use”*¹⁰⁶.

¹⁰¹ Van Dijk, op. cit., p 411.

¹⁰² Jungmann, op. cit., I, pp 101-102.

¹⁰³ An edition of this Missal can be found in volume XVII of the Henry Bradshaw Society: R. Lippe (ed.) *Missale Romanum Mediolani 1474*, vol I, London 1899.

¹⁰⁴ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 102; cf. R. Menthe, *Ein Missale Romanum von 1481*, in: *Franziskan. Studien*, 20 (1933), pp 89-129.

¹⁰⁵ Jungmann, op. cit., II, pp 446-447.

¹⁰⁶ Book of Common Prayer 1662, Preface: *Concerning the Service of the Church*, written by Cranmer in 1549 under the influence of the Breviary of Quiñones.

It is evident that this diversity of liturgical rites was considered more a disadvantage than a wealth, but the above is a contemporary witness to the situation. However, before the first Anglican reform of the Mass in 1548, there was a tendency towards uniformity, which became much more severe than that imposed by Pius V in 1570¹⁰⁷. The Convocation in Canterbury in 1542 decided to make the Sarum Use the unique liturgy of the Church of England, already separated from Rome in 1534, but this decision was never put into execution, that is until the First Prayer Book of 1549 entirely replaced the old service books¹⁰⁸.

It is notable that these medieval liturgies were not called *rites*, but *uses*, because they all belonged to the same family; they were all variants of the Roman rite with greater or lesser proportions of relics from the long-forgotten Gallican and Celtic rites. This distinction of *rite* and *use* is simply the distinction between genus and specific difference¹⁰⁹. This is true not only of England but also in most of the Latin Catholic world.

By the eve of the Reformation, the rubrics of many of these rites had become highly complicated and difficult to observe. For example, in the English Use of Sarum, the rubrics of the *Pie*¹¹⁰ became a jungle of highly complex rubrics, which in its turn would be attacked by the reformers. The Sarum rubricists were reputed as the finest of the land and the Use of this diocese became a model for many other Churches, even outside England¹¹¹. The cathedral Chapter became a kind of congregation of rites to which were referred any problems of liturgy or ceremonial. On the other hand, the Use of Sarum had such prestige that Bishop Giles of Bridgeport was able to boast already in 1256 that:

¹⁰⁷ Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London 1945, pp 658-659. Dix illustrates the rigour of liturgical uniformity in sixteenth century England, saying: *The clergy, unconvinced of the merits of the Book by the hanging of priests for non-compliance, were deliberately misinterpreting it and making it as much of a mass as they dared.*

¹⁰⁸ G. J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, London 1969, pp 53-54.

¹⁰⁹ Fortescue, op. cit., pp 199-205.

¹¹⁰ The *Pie* was the name given to the Sarum Ordinal or book of rubrics, a French term for the Latin *Pica* (*Quod usitato vocabulo Pica, sive directorium sacerdotum*), a magpie, owing to the confused appearance of the rules which were printed in old Black-Letter type on white paper, resembling the colours of this commonly found European bird.

¹¹¹ Archdale A. King, *Liturgies of the Past*, London 1959, p 284.

*“Among the churches of the whole world, the church of Sarum hath shone resplendent, like the sun in his full orb, in respect of its divine service, and its ministers”*¹¹².

Such a claim may seem to us somewhat exaggerated, but people were proud of their liturgies. At the occasion of the promulgation of the first Anglican Prayer Book of 1549, there was a fierce reaction from many of the faithful of the south west of England. Their slogan was *“We will have the Mass”*¹¹³, for they were attached to the liturgy they had always known.

In the other English medieval variants of the Roman rite, there was much variation from the Use of Sarum. All these uses were largely based on the Roman Sacramentaries, though they contained Gallican elements. Generally in Europe, the local diocesan usages had grown out of divers historical situations: privileges, jealousies between bishops and cathedral chapters, invasions and wars, above all the instinct of fidelity to tradition. The variety was rich and steeped in the various cultures of peoples and those who invaded their countries¹¹⁴.

Despite the general trend of uniformity in liturgical matters, particularly as a result of the reform of Gregory VII (1073-1085), nearly every diocese and religious Order had its own Missal and Breviary¹¹⁵. Many of these rites came into being during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and Pius V (1566-1572) allowed some of them to continue. The most famous of these liturgies were those of the Dominicans, Cistercians, Canons Regular of Prémontré, Carmelites and the dioceses of Lyons, Milan and Toledo¹¹⁶.

There were three parts of the Mass where were developed numerous private devotions for the celebrant and his assisting ministers: at the preparation or so-called “prayers at the foot of the altar”, at the offertory, and between the

¹¹² *Stat. Eccles. Cath. Sarum* (edited 1883), p 54. The title page of some editions of the Sarum Missal bears the legend *Missale ad usum insignis et præclaræ Ecclesiæ Sarum*.

¹¹³ A. Fletcher, *Tudor Rebellions*, London 1973, p 35. The protesting lay people had said: *We will have the masse in Latten, as before (...) We will not receyve the newe servye because it is like a Christmas game*; cf. Dix, op. cit., p 658: *The English laity (...) rose in rebellions over half the countryside, which were suppressed with considerable slaughter by the use of foreign mercenaries*. Some 5,000 people were executed for taking part in these uprisings in 1549 alone.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Archdale King, op. cit., pp 276-374.

¹¹⁵ The use of the word *Breviary* here is anachronistic, for the books for the Office were not unified into a Breviary in all places. Such a book, containing everything needed for the recitation of the Office, like that for the Mass, was an invention of the Mendicant Orders for the convenience of itinerant clerics. Cf. section 2.1.1. of this present work.

¹¹⁶ Denis Crouan, *Histoire du Missel Romain*, Paris 1988, P 41. These liturgies had to have a custom of more than two hundred years.

Agnus Dei and the Communion¹¹⁷. To these moments were added prayers for the incensing of the altar and *oblata*, at the kissing of the altar before the Introit, before the Gospel, and at the ablutions.

These prayers were the most variable in the different Uses within the Roman rite. In the Sarum Missal, the prayers of preparation are very long, including many versicles and responses, whilst in the contemporary monastic rites, including that of the Dominicans, they were very brief or virtually non-existent¹¹⁸. In the majority of rites, the *Judica me* (Ps. 42) figured with its antiphon: *Introibo ad altare Dei: ad Deum qui lætificat iuventutem meam*. It was almost invariably followed by apologetic prayers¹¹⁹, which became a penitential rite with a form of public confession of sins and absolution. The offertory prayers in the late medieval rites were not standard in every missal, and the communion prayers were frequently longer than in the 1570 Roman Missal.

In these prayers, it is no longer *we* but *I* which predominates. They are private prayers for the edification of the priest. Most prayers were said aloud standing upright *manibus extensis*, but these were said *submissa voce* with hands crossed over the breast or joined, bowing over the altar¹²⁰. There was certainly no harm in such a type of prayer, though it tended to make of the Mass an individual devotion for the priests: it was a sign of an age of a healthy repentance of sin, when auricular confession was not yet generalised. Thus, these prayers were sharply reduced with the spread of private confession. In many medieval rites, the apologetic prayers were much more Gallican in flavour, and as we have already seen, the communion prayers in the Sarum Mass bear considerable resemblance with those of the Hispanic rites. Most of this was to be swept away by all the sixteenth century reforms: Catholic, protestant and Anglican.

¹¹⁷ Cuming, op. cit., p 18: “*In the priest’s prayers the predominant thought is that the communicant will be cleansed from all his sins by receiving the sacrament, a medieval departure from the primitive conception of the Eucharist as a thanksgiving for benefits already received*”.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Archdale King, *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*, London 1955, pp 325-395.

¹¹⁹ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 78-80. An Apologia is a private prayer said *submissa voce*, a personal avowal of guilt and unworthiness on the part of the celebrant, usually of considerable length. It is an acknowledgment of guilt in a spirit of regret. Such *apologiæ* are usually conjoined to a prayer begging the mercy of God. They appear in their earliest forms in the Franco-German liturgies, whilst the Roman liturgy is much more sober, and have their parallels in the oriental liturgies. The best examples of these in the Roman liturgy are the *Confiteor* and the *Oratio S. Ambrosii* in the *Præparatio Missæ*.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp 78-80. According to Jungmann: *This usage, with its symbolism of submissiveness, of the resignation of one’s own power to a higher one, is traced back to Teutonic culture. It is akin to the custom by which a vassel or liegeman vowed homage and fealty by placing his hand in that of his lord. This custom is expressed in the Roman rite of ordination, where the ordinand makes promise of obedience to his Bishop.*

THE BACKGROUND OF THE MISSAL OF PIUS V

After the imperfect attempts of the Franciscans to spread a relatively pure form of the Roman Mass liturgy (mixed with Nordic usages) throughout Christendom, the turn came for the liturgists of the Renaissance to pave the way for the work of the Council of Trent and the post-conciliar Commission.

The Ordo Missæ of John Burchard and the Pontifical of Patrizi

The most important pre-Tridentine stage in the development of liturgical codification was the work of John Burchard (c. 1450-1506). This was to be the most important single source for the elaboration of the Missal under Pius V. The rubrics¹²¹ were more in need of codification than the body of liturgical texts. John Burchard was born at Strasbourg towards 1450 and became Pontifical Master of Ceremonies in 1483. Having served Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII and Alexander VI in this function, he became Bishop of Città del Castello and Orta in 1503. Burchard played an important role in the elaboration of the Roman Pontifical of Augustine Patrizi, published in 1485¹²². Burchard participated also in the production of the *Cæremoniale Romanum* of Patrizi, published in 1516¹²³. In this work is found the *Ordo Missæ* which, in the context of the Pontifical and Ceremonial, formed the basis of the celebration of Low Mass¹²⁴. The *Ordo servandus per sacerdotem in celebratione Missæ sine cantu et sine ministris secundum ritum sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ*¹²⁵ appeared in 1498. Approved by Alexander VI in 1501, it was edited a number of times: in 1523 it appeared in the *Liber Sacerdotalis* of Castellani and was translated into Italian in 1534. From 1541, it is to be found in some editions of the Roman Missal¹²⁶.

¹²¹ Rubrics (printed in red, *ruber-rubris*) are the ceremonial directions to guide the priest and ministers in the practical aspects of the liturgy.

¹²² Dom Pierre de Puniet, OSB., *The Roman Pontifical*, London 1932, p 47; cf. *Pontificalis ordinis liber*, published in 1485; cf. Patrizi, *Cæremoniale Romanum*, original preface, appendix of the facsimile republication by Gregg Press, 1965: Patrizi declares: *Horum laborum socium mihi adiunxi Iohannem Burchardum*.

¹²³ *Sacrarum cæremoniarum sive Rituum ecclesiasticorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ libri tres*, composed by Burchard and Patrizi. This work was re-edited with a commentary by J. Catalani, Rome 1750.

¹²⁴ Pierre Jounel, *Les Rites de la Messe*, Tournsi 1963, p 9. In this work treating the rubrics of the 1962 edition of the Roman Missal, Jounel traces a general history of the *Ritus Servandus*.

¹²⁵ J. Wickham Legg, *Tracts on the Mass*, London 1904, pp 124-174. Legg is wrong in saying that Burchard's *Ordo Missæ* appeared in 1502, for a copy from 1498 is to be found in the Vatican Library (Incunables, IV, 528): cf. Jounel, op. cit., p 10.

¹²⁶ Jounel, op. cit., p 10.

In his preface, Burchard indicates the reason for his work, and this is very important for our understanding of the orientations of the post-Tridentine Commission. Having proposed the observance of these rules for all priests and bishops, including the Pope, in the celebration of private masses, he outlines his desire to remedy the abuses and situation of liturgical anarchy already rampant at the beginning of the sixteenth century. For Burchard, it was necessary for the Church to *offer to all priests a firm and universal rule*, especially for newly ordained presbyters¹²⁷. Burchard elaborated this code of rubrics from previous decrees of the Popes and Fathers. He did not make the rite himself, but sought to express the previous tradition in a new and canonical form.

In his presentation of the Pontifical and Ceremonial, of which the *Ritus Servandus* forms a part, Burchard reveals a marked sense of tradition, and a well-organised and clear manner of thinking. The *Ordo Missæ* being taken in the context of the full pontifical liturgy, the rules for the celebration of a private Mass are considered as a reduction of the full ceremonies, and not as the basis. On its own, the *Ordo* treats only the private Mass. The post-Burchard tendency of separating the private Mass from the full pontifical celebration was to lead to a repetition of the medieval error of considering the rites of Mass from the basis of Low Mass.

On examination of the text of Burchard's *Ordo*, it is easy to see the development of the *Ritus Servandus* of 1570. However, many elements of this *Ordo* are richer and directly inherited from a number of medieval diocesan missals. The Gloria is *farced* with Marian interpolations, as may be found in the northern French Uses and at Sarum¹²⁸. A feature of particular interest in Burchard's *Ordo* is the offertory procession, abolished in the 1570 Missal. When the gifts are brought to the altar, the celebrant is directed to go to the Epistle corner, to take off his maniple and to accept the offerings. Each faithful kissed the priest's hand and made his offering. The celebrant would say: *Acceptabile sit sacrificium tuum omnipotenti Deo* or *Centuplum accipias: et vitam wternam possideas*¹²⁹. Having accepted the oblations, the priest put on his maniple and went to the middle of the altar. He then proceeded with the offering of the host. The rest of this offertory rite was exactly reproduced in the 1570 Missal. For the Canon, all the ritual directions are as in the Tridentine Missal, though differently worded. Already, genuflexions, before and after the elevation of each Species, are prescribed¹³⁰.

¹²⁷ Legg, op. cit., p 126.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p 249.

¹²⁹ Ibid., p 149.

¹³⁰ Ibid., pp 156-157.

Another curious aspect of the old Ordo is the usage of the *Missæ Sicca*¹³¹. Whilst a priest may say Mass once a day, if there is a second feast on a particular day, he could say a second Mass proper with some prayers of the *Ordo Missæ*, but without the consecration, for his personal devotion. Having said Mass, the priest was directed to put off his chasuble, but keeping his other vestments, he went to the Epistle corner of the altar. He said the Introit, and if the Gloria was not said at Mass, he then said it. He then read the Collect, the Epistle, Gradual and Tract or *Alleluia*, the Gospel, Offertory, Communion and Postcommunion. There is no mention of communion from the presanctified and reserved Sacrament. Directions are given for *missæ sicca* to be celebrated at sea and in the homes of the sick¹³². Since it is mentioned in the rubrics of the *missæ sicca* for the sick that the Sacrament is not to be shown, it can be assumed that in these circumstances, there is a communion, like at the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday. The *Ordo* of Burchard is clearly a capital stage in the codification of the liturgy.

Burchard's successor as Papal master of ceremonies was Paris of Grassi (†1528). Paris was opposed to the reform attempts of the humanist tendency, and collaborated with Patrizi in his work on the pontifical ceremonial¹³³. Paris left a manuscript of the last *Ordo Romanus*, which served as a Roman ceremonial¹³⁴.

The characteristic of these liturgical canonists is that they in no way attempted to change the practice of the liturgy. They largely succeeded in expressing the liturgical tradition in terms of canon law, but this process of codification was only to be completed by the edition of the Missal of 1570, and by centuries of work of the Congregation of Rites.

Aspects relevant to the Mass liturgy of the work of Paul IV and the Theatines on the Roman Breviary

Gianpietro Caraffa, as Pope Paul IV (1555-1559)¹³⁵, is a capital figure in the history of the codification of the Roman liturgy. He did little in the way of

¹³¹ Ibid., p 173.

¹³² Ibid., pp 173-174.

¹³³ Guéranger, *Inst. lit.*, I, pp 372-373.

¹³⁴ Ibid., p 374.

¹³⁵ Jean Mathieu-Rosay, *Chronologie des Papes*, Bruxelles 1988, pp 380-381. Gianpietro Caraffa was born in Naples the 28th June 1476, and was 80 years old when he was elected Pope the 23rd May 1555 under the name of Paul IV. In all the posts he had occupied, Bishop of Chieti, Nuncio in England, Archbishop of Brindisi, vice-Grand Chaplain to the Spanish Court, he thought only of reforming the Church. In 1524, he entered the Order of Theatines having disposed of all his benefices. He was created Cardinal in 1536, and from 1542, he presided over the new commission of the Inquisition, which became with him of an extreme rigour. Having been elected Pope, under the name of Paul IV, the four years of his Pontificate were

work on the Missal, but was mainly interested in the Breviary. Mention of the Divine Office can be made here, since many of the rules governing the liturgy of the Hours apply also to the Mass, particularly concerning the Calendar.

As a priest of the Theatine Order, Caraffa was charged by Clement VII to compete with Quiñones in the effort of reforming the Roman Breviary. The work of the former was preferred on account of its brevity, but Caraffa, on becoming Pope, forbade the use of the new Breviary, and proceeded to his own reform. Paul IV, as most of the Successors of Saint Peter, thought that the reform of the liturgy could be done only in Rome, for it was properly the work of the Roman Pontiff. Paul IV, as Pope, had but four years to work on his projects which, at the end of his life, were left incomplete. Generally, it could be said that Paul IV wanted a genuinely Roman liturgy that was true to the line of tradition. In establishing principles for the reform of the Breviary, the work of Paul IV gives us invaluable insight into what was being planned for the Missal.

The Theatines, as an Order, were interested in questions of liturgy, as their libraries show by their phenomenal collections of liturgical sources. Caraffa asked from his superior, Saint Gætan of Theatino, permission to correct the Breviary¹³⁶. Permission to try a new Breviary in the Theatine Order was granted by dispensation of Clement VII. Caraffa provided clearer rubrics and recast the system of readings at Matins.

The two Theatine historians Tufo and Silos¹³⁷ record Caraffa's method of work. Some material was ruthlessly scrapped, but what is more significant is that he was interested in clarifying the rubrics. He rearranged what was clumsy or impractical, in order to restore a sense of harmony to the Office. Having become Pope (Paul IV) in 1555, Caraffa enlisted the help of Cardinal Bernardine Schotto, and William Sirleto, both of whom worked on the post-Tridentine Commission¹³⁸. There was thus a continuity between the pre-Tridentine work and that following the Council. Much of Caraffa's work was, in fact, adopted in the Roman Breviary of 1568.

marked by his nepotism, an extreme hatred of anything to do with Spain, from the Emperor downwards and his fanaticism in his reforming actions. He was known to include Books of the Bible and a number of works of the Fathers on the Index of forbidden books. Having recognized the failure of his Pontificate, Paul IV died in 1559, after which the people demolished his statue and razed the buildings of the Inquisition to the ground. Guéranger, *op. cit.*, pp 408-410, speaks only of his liturgical work, and in a positive light.

¹³⁶ Guéranger, *op. cit.*, pp 408-410.

¹³⁷ S. Bäumer, *Histoire du Bréviaire*, vol II, Freiburg 1967, p 154; cf. J. Tufo, *Historia della rreligione dei Padri Cherici regolari*, Rome 1609-1616, t II, C. XCVI, 8-13.

¹³⁸ Bäumer, *op. cit.*, p 155.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that there was in the late middle ages and the period of the Renaissance a serious movement of preserving the liturgical tradition. This was necessary against erosion by decadence and attacks from reformers. Catholic liturgists were aware of the liturgical crisis, and sought means to remedy the situation.

It can be supposed that the principles that guided liturgists such as Burchard or Caraffa were fidelity to tradition instead of adaption to literary trends, reform work to be based on competent authority. Aspects of the liturgy were to be restored, if defectuous, but not abolished. The length of the celebration was not considered as a fault by such as Burchard. The guiding principle was the continuation of tradition, and not adaptation to new norms or fashions of theology and culture. This movement of reform, in the sense of correction and codification, had a tremendous influence on the Fathers of the Council of Trent, who were to define the theological basis of liturgy.

III. PRINCIPLES OF LITURGICAL REFORM RESULTING FROM THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

Having studied the medieval situation of the liturgy and its theological causes and effects, and having discovered the existence of a movement to correct and codify the liturgy, we now turn to the Council of Trent. For the Tridentine Fathers, the problem of the liturgy was to be considered as part of a wider movement of reform in the Catholic Church. The Council had first to determine what was the liturgy, how to defend the Catholic understanding of Christian worship, to set certain principles based on practical necessity, and to make recommendations for reform.

THE TRIDENTINE UNDERSTANDING OF THE THEOLOGICAL MEANING OF LITURGY IN GENERAL

The Council of Trent undertook no systematic treatment of the liturgy as such, but mentioned it only in function of its dogmatic treatment of the Sacraments and the disciplinary reform of the Church. In defining the dogmas of the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Council made an attempt to defend the liturgy from Protestant attacks, by attempting to prove the biblical and apostolic origin of the liturgy. The Fathers proceeded by giving a positive teaching on the theological and pastoral meaning of the liturgy. It is on this that we focus our interest.

The work of apologists and theologians concerning the Mass liturgy

As in nearly all the Ecumenical Councils in the Church's history, the Council of Trent used a particular method in its working¹³⁹. The matter of discussion

¹³⁹ In all three of its periods, the Council of Trent (1545-1563) dealt with the problem of the liturgy of the Mass. During the first (1545-1547), the theologians' discussions about this matter were less official than tentative. Decrees concerning the Mass were prepared, though not yet promulgated during the second period (1551-1552), and in the third (1562-1563), a solemn decree was promulgated concerning the liturgy of the Mass (17th September 1562). During the first period, the Council's working procedure underwent an evolution. Originally, there were only two kinds of congregations: general gatherings where the Fathers discussed questions proposed to them, and the solemn sessions. But, during the first period, in 1546, the Fathers were divided into three sections, called classes. Each class was presided over by one of the three papal legates and presidents of the Council: Cardinals Gian Maria Del Monte, Marcello Cervini and Reginald Pole. Each class simultaneously discussed the same matter, then the three classes collated their discussions at the general assembly and took a vote. A month later, theologians were brought in to examine the matter in the Fathers' presence, and this became standard procedure throughout the Council (Reinold Theisen, *Mass liturgy and the Council of Trent*, Collegetville 1965, p 29; cf. H. Lennerz, *De congregationibus in Concilio Tridentino*, in:

was prepared, discussed and promulgated. In the wider context of the definition of matters of faith, the Council's theologians and Fathers sought to define the liturgy from an apologetic point of view.

In March 1547, during the first Period (1545-1547), the Fathers began to discuss the Sacrament of the Eucharist, but it was decided that they should not consider the problem of abuses until they had formulated the doctrine of all the seven Sacraments¹⁴⁰. It was in August 1547, while the Council was in session in Bologna and considering Extreme Unction and the Sacrament of Order, that the theologians examined seven articles on the Sacrifice of the Mass¹⁴¹. These were for the most part taken from protestant writings or paraphrased from them¹⁴². The first article concerned the denial of the Mass as a sacrifice with all the doctrinal consequences of this denial¹⁴³. The other articles are the logical consequences of the first. There were to be no Masses for the dead or for particular intentions, the Mass was not instituted by Christ, no private celebrations or more than one celebration in a church on any given day, no Mass if only the priest is to communicate, rejection of the canon of the Mass, and no water to be mingled with the wine.

None of these articles explicitly treated of the ceremonies of Mass, but more particularly of the evangelical origin of the Mass. To this end, it was necessary to distinguish between accidental and essential parts: the essence had been

Gregorianum, 26 [1945], pp 7-21). In May 1546, the system of classes was abolished, because it slowed down the proceedings. The new system was as follows:

- a) the theologians discussed matters proposed to them in the presence of the Fathers;
- b) the Fathers examined and voted the matter in the form of articles and in that of trial decrees drawn up by a commission of Fathers;
- a) the decrees were promulgated in a solemn session.

Finally the proceedings of the Council were recorded in the *Acta*, the protocol written by the Council's secretary. This protocol is the most important source of what the Council said about the liturgy, or any matter that it discussed (Theisen, op. cit., pp 29-30; cf. *Concilium Tridentinum; Diarorum, Actorum, Epistolarum, Tractatum nova collectio*, Edidit Societas Goerresiana promovendis inter Germanos catholicos litterarum studiis, 16 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau 1901-1980. The method of referring to this work is the following: the tome is indicated in Roman numerals, the volume (if any) is marked, in brackets, in Arabic numerals, followed by the page number, then by the line number (or note, if stated), eg: CT VII (1), 322, 10-15 and note 6. Cf. H. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, Bd II: *Erste Trienter Tagungsperiode (1545-1547)*, Freiburg 1957.

¹⁴⁰ CT I, 623, 21-25; V, 1010, 17-22.

¹⁴¹ GT VI (1), 321, 20-25.

¹⁴² Theisen, op. cit., pp 30-31; cf. CT VI (1), 322, note a; 321, note 2.

¹⁴³ Theisen, op. cit., p 30. The basic protestant teaching in article 1 was that the Mass was not a sacrifice, thus it cannot be offered as an oblation for sins. It is only a commemoration of the sacrifice offered once and for all upon the cross. To offer the Mass cannot be a good and meritorious work. All these articles are based on the work of Luther, but compared with other protestant reformers.

instituted by Christ, whilst the Church had supplied the accidental or ceremonial parts¹⁴⁴. The apologists, theologians and Fathers, in attempting to define the origin of liturgical ceremonies, revealed their lack of historical knowledge of the development of liturgy¹⁴⁵.

In an attempt to establish the theological principles of the necessity of the liturgy, the theologians treated an article stating that in the celebration of Mass all ceremonies, vestments and external signs were provocations to impiety rather than duties of piety. It went on to say that the ceremony was proportionately more Christian as it was more simple and close to the Lord's Supper¹⁴⁶. This article incited the theologians to determine why the Church was to continue to worship according to fixed liturgical ceremonies. They had to examine the problem of the rites in themselves. The first part of this article condemns ceremonies as provocations to impiety. The Church is here reproached for having added external signs and external forms to an essentially simple eucharistic service. The article is based on Luther's *De captivitate babilonica*¹⁴⁷. However Luther does not condemn ceremonies as such, for if they are accompanied by faith, they can be useful for instilling piety. The condemnation of ceremonies out of hand is more characteristic of the thought of the more radical reformers; Luther is quoted out of context.

The second part of the article, quoted from the same work of Luther repeats the idea that the more closely the Mass approached and resembled the first of all Masses, which Christ celebrated at the Last Supper, the more Christian it was¹⁴⁸. Luther idealised the simplicity of the Last Supper, but he does not here condemn ceremonies. The two parts of the article 10 are artificially joined

¹⁴⁴ CT VI (1), 357, 7-10.

¹⁴⁵ For references concerning the Tridentine understanding of the origin of the eucharistic liturgy, cf: CT VI (1), 327, 30-33; Theisen, Op. Cit., p 32; CT VI (1), 336, 11-13; Theisen, op. cit., p 32 and notes on p 130; CT VI (1), 351, 7-10; 362, 17-19; CT VI (1), 362, note 12; Theisen, op. cit., p 36; CT V, 835 note 3; I, 677 note 2; CT VII (1), 377, 2-3; CT VII (1), 437, 24-28; Theisen, op. cit., p 37: *Missam non esse ex evangelio neque a Christo institutam, sed inventam ab hominibus; neque eam esse opus bonum aut meritorium; imo in ea committi manifestam et multiplicem idololatriam.*

¹⁴⁶ Theisen, op. cit., p 40; cf. CT VII (1), 377, 9-12: *In celebratione missarum omnes ceremonias, vestes et externa signa irritabula impietatis esse magis quam officia pietatis. Et sicut missa Christi simplicissima fuit, ita quanto missa illi primæ omnium missæ vicinior et similior sit, tanto magis esse christianam.*

¹⁴⁷ CT VII (1), 377, 9-13: *In celebratione missarum omnes ceremonias, vestes et externa signa irritabula impietatis esse magis quam officia pietatis. Et sicut missa Christi simplicissima fuit, ita quanto missa illi primæ omnium missæ vicinior et similior sit, tanto magis esse christianam. Lutherus de captiv. Babilonica.*

¹⁴⁸ Theisen, op. cit., p 41: *Iam Missa, quanto vicinior et similior primæ omnium Missæ, quam Christus in cæna fecit, tanto Christianior; cf. Luther, Ein Sermon von dem N.T.: Jhe neher nu unssere messe der ersten mess Christi sein, jhe besser sie on zweyffell sein, und jhe weytter davon, jhe ferlicher.*

together in the attempt of exposing what was most typical of protestant teaching.

The few theologians who remarked on this article were primarily concerned with proving that ceremonies were used by Christ himself and by the Apostles, the implication being that the protestant idea of the simplicity of the Mass was unfounded on Scripture. Other theologians more realistically affirmed the usefulness of ceremonies without attempting to find direct biblical references, which was ridiculed by the Protestants¹⁴⁹. These more realistic men outlined the didactic character, especially of the liturgy of the word, but also the use of vestments, incense and so forth, but they also brought out the allegorical dimension¹⁵⁰. It is plain from this that such a kind of interpretation of vestments and ceremonies was still in vogue¹⁵¹.

In 1562, during the third Period (1562-1563), fresh discussions of the Council theologians were held on the legitimacy of liturgical ceremonies. Thirteen new articles were proposed to the theologians, but these did not in any way correspond with those discussed during the first or second sessions, neither the articles nor the proposed canons. However, the new articles were inspired by the original ones, some phrases being quoted. The first four and the last two concern the Sacrifice of the Mass, its institution and application. The others treat of liturgical matters of interest to our work¹⁵². The discussions were restrained by the lack of available time: one group of theologians was to examine the first seven articles, and another, the last six. Representatives of these two groups were then permitted to present their views to the Fathers¹⁵³.

These discussions went on from the 21st July 1562 to the 4th August of the same year. Some twenty six theologians were allowed to express their views. The apologetic arguments in favour of liturgical ceremonies were not very different to those already advanced by the apologists and theologians at the first period of the Council. What is most significant is that the Church, being of divine institution, is considered of first importance. Christ, having had the authority and mission to found the Church, gave to her that same mission and authority¹⁵⁴. As before, other theologians advanced an historical argument: that eucharistic liturgies were known to the Apostles and Fathers of the early

¹⁴⁹ Theisen, op. cit., p 42.

¹⁵⁰ CT VII (1), 395, 10-12 : *Articulus 10 etiam hæreticus est. Vestes enim et ceremoniæ in missa passionem Christi repræsentant et sunt (ut Gregorius Nazianzenus ait) fidei christianæ pedagogia.*

¹⁵¹ Theisen, op. cit., p 43.

¹⁵² CT VIII, 719.

¹⁵³ Theisen, op. cit., p 53. The rules of procedure are recorded in CT VIII, 720.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. CT VIII, 744, 36-39.

Church. Others affirmed a distinction between the *essential* parts of the Mass, directly instituted by Christ and recorded in the New Testament, and the *non essential* parts which were instituted by the authorities of the Church.

We now come to article 11 which concerns the ceremonies of the Mass, in which the following question is posed: *whether or not the ceremonies, vestments and external signs which the Church uses in the celebration of Masses must be abolished*¹⁵⁵. The theologians first went to the scriptural sources which referred to the use of vestments and ceremonies in the Old Testament. Though the Law had been fulfilled by Christ, priests wore vestments in every law, so it is inferred that Christ did not intend to abolish the use of these. They sought in the New Testament for references to Christ having used ceremonies: he washed the feet of his disciples and performed certain actions having looked up to heaven. Though these are not explicitly connected with the Mass, it is implied that if Christ employed rites and sacred actions, the Church has the right to institute them for the celebration of Mass.

The theologians returned to the anthropological argument, based on the necessity of ceremonies imposed by human nature. Saint James is quoted as proof of this: “*Show me your faith from works*” (2,18), which is perplexing, for he actually says: “*Show me your faith without works, and I from my works will show you my faith*”¹⁵⁶. The argument goes that an interior worship which is not expressed outwardly is hypocrisy¹⁵⁷. The ability of ceremonies to stir up devotion is mentioned; they are a help to the Christian people. Therefore, it is argued, it would be a sin against charity to abolish them¹⁵⁸.

There is from this period of discussion a significant document, a treatise on the Sacrifice of the Mass, written in 1562 by Christopher of Padua, the general of the Augustinians and a Council Father¹⁵⁹. What is worthy of note here is that his contribution is the most historical. Commenting on article 11, he maintained that liturgical ceremonies, signs and vestments should not be laid aside, because they had their origin in apostolic times. He refers to Pseudo-Dionysius, whom he believed to be a disciple of Saint Paul, for the former would have been a witness of the liturgy of the Apostles themselves. He

¹⁵⁵ Theisen, op. cit., p 54; cf. CT VIII, 742,18 - 743,5: *An cæremoniæ, vestes et signa externa, quibus ecclesia in celebratione missarum utitur, sint tollendæ.*

¹⁵⁶ CT VIII, 742, 18-20.

¹⁵⁷ Theisen, op. cit., p 56; cf. CT VIII, 744, 11-14: *Ad 11. articulum respondit, cæremonias retinendas esse, id est cultum exteriorem, qui ab interiori procedit; alias esset hypocrisis. Et alii illis excitantur, quare essent contra caritatem illas adimere.*

¹⁵⁸ CT VIII, 744, 13.

¹⁵⁹ CT XIII, 708-714: *Rev. P. Generalis Augustinensium Mag. Christophori Patavini super prædictis articulis [de missæ sacrificio] explicatio et decisio. Anno 1662 mense Augusto, dum hæc materia in Concilio Tridentino tractaretur, ab eo edita.*

refers also to Saint Clement (which one is not clear)¹⁶⁰ and to Saint Jerome in support of ceremonies. Having quoted his historical witnesses, Christopher goes on to the anthropological argument, similar to those we have already seen, and to say that it was characteristic of heretics to oppose the rites of the Church. For this last, he gives the example of the Ebionites¹⁶¹. Though Christopher's arguments are much the same as that of other theologians, he does introduce some new references. His weakness is that, in quoting Pseudo-Dionysius¹⁶², he believed, not only that liturgical rites existed in apostolic times, but that they were already well developed.

We find that the work of the Council theologians reveals a very limited knowledge of liturgical history. However, we see the effect of a strong influence of medieval allegorism, a pronounced objective and ecclesial sense, and a realistic and scholastic understanding of human psychology.

The deliberation of the Tridentine Fathers during the first two Periods of the Council

Concerning article 10, very few Fathers speak of it, other than condemning it as impious. But, one bishop, Francis Manrique of Orense, whilst condemning the articles, did not condemn the last part of article 10¹⁶³, namely, that the more the Mass resembles the first of all Masses, the more Christian it is. It is not known why he made this judgement, whether because he was favourable to liturgical reform, for he was not opposed to the use of the vernacular language. However, he is more likely to have wished not to condemn a proposition which desired to bring the *essentials* of the Mass into conformity with that of Christ¹⁶⁴. A condemnation of this article would involve a rejection of the opinion that added rites and ceremonies were contrary to the Christian spirit or to the institution of Christ. The other Fathers unanimously condemned the proposition¹⁶⁵.

¹⁶⁰ It is possible that Christopher is referring to Pope Clement I; cf. The edition of F. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderborn 1905, vol I, p 475.

¹⁶¹ Theisen, op. cit., pp 56-57. The Ebionites were a second century Judeo-Christian sect, who denied the reality of Christ's incarnation. Christopher erroneously refers to Epiphanius' *Adversus hæreses*, where he should have referred to *Panarium hæres.*, 30, c.16 (PG 41,431).

¹⁶² Pseudo-Dionysius, *De eccl. hier.*, chapter 7, no 2 (PG 3, 555); Ps. Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus*, 3,2 (PG 3, 681).

¹⁶³ CT VII (1),450,15: *In 10 quanto missa similior est missæ Christi etc. non videntur damnanda.*

¹⁶⁴ CT VII (1), 450 note k.

¹⁶⁵ Theisen, op. cit., p 45.

Like the previously mentioned theologian John Arze, two bishops favoured the allegorical interpretation of liturgical ceremonies¹⁶⁶. It was maintained that every ceremony and vestment had its meaning: it represented a particular mystery of the life of Christ.

A general assembly was held in January 1552, in which a number of Fathers were selected to arrange the articles in the form of canons¹⁶⁷, and to prepare doctrinal statements¹⁶⁸. A few days later, the canons and doctrinal statements were ready to be submitted to the Fathers. This doctrinal exposition was presented in four lengthy chapters, of which the fourth treats of the rites and ceremonies used in the celebration of Mass¹⁶⁹.

The argument used in this document is purely at the didactical or anthropological level. The beginning of this chapter reads:

*“It is only with difficulty that man’s unrefined nature (which does not apprehend anything without previous sense perception) can be held to its duty, instructed in religion and roused to piety and devotion without perceptible ceremonies and other external helps. For this reason God did not wish the Christian religion to be devoid of this exceedingly great aid. Therefore, the Holy Synod declares that the Eucharistic ceremonies are not wanting in scriptural witnesses nor regard for the mysteries. It affirms that, though not every individual rite and ceremony employed in the celebration of Mass is expressly found in the Scriptures, not one has been introduced in the Church or observed so continually and religiously for so many centuries without the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Just how necessary these ceremonies are for holding the people to their duty, the enemies of the Church themselves proclaim; for after they have set aside the ancient and approved ceremonies, they find it necessary to devise and introduce new ones. Thus, there must be no complete abrogation or change of such rites...”*¹⁷⁰

At this point follows a discussion of the problem of liturgical language and of the canon. The chapter goes on:

¹⁶⁶ Nausea of Vienne and Michæl Pugijs of Elne in France. CT VII (1), 443, 32-34: *10 falsus et impius est; omnes enim ceremoniæ suam significationem habent passionis, mortis et resurrectionis Christi*. Nausea, to his credit, evokes the whole of the Paschal Mystery. CT VII (1), 452, 1.

¹⁶⁷ A canon, in this context, is a statement of a condemned doctrine with an anathema threatened to anyone who should hold it. It has been a long tradition in Ecumenical Councils to present doctrinal definitions in their negative form, eg: “If anyone should maintain that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God, let him be anathema”.

¹⁶⁸ CT VII (1), 459. This reference gives the names of the Fathers appointed to this Commission.

¹⁶⁹ Theisen, op. cit., p 46; cf. CT VII (1), 475-483.

¹⁷⁰ CT VII (1), 481, 16-27. The translation of the text is of Theisen.

“But everyone knows how much vestments, lights and the other external things which are used in the Mass rite (...) habitually excite people to turn their minds from commonplace thoughts and to reflect reverently upon the sacred and godly reality which is taking place. For in all these things there is present an extremely useful and holy symbolism. Those who understand this symbolism are forcibly moved to adore the Father in true spirit and to imitate (as far as it is possible) that purity and soaring of mind which our Redeemer possesses in the Mass of his Last Supper. This Mass was altogether simple and devoid of these external symbols and decorations, for the reason that he did not need to be spurred on by any external aids and that the time or place did not require their use. Therefore, the same Spirit which incited Christ to sacrifice in that manner has instructed the Church to append becoming and religious ceremonies in due consideration of the times”¹⁷¹.

What is presupposed in this chapter is the scholastic philosophical principle *non habet in intellectu quod non est prius in sensu*. For the Fathers of Trent, rites and ceremonies help the people to persist in their religious duties, moving them to devotion and piety. These ceremonies are said to be helps to attain this aim, for without ceremonies, man can persist in his religious duties, but only with difficulty. Man has a need to exteriorise his worship of God, so ceremonies supply an anthropological need. The didactical element is emphasised to a great extent.

The Fathers willed that nothing of the ceremonies of the Catholic liturgy should be abolished or changed. This was partly as a reaction against the protestant desire to change the liturgy at will. Bishop Nausea gave his reasons:

“Such rites [those commended by the authority of the Church and its tradition] must not be abolished altogether or changed; there is no reason for it. The changes can ever be dangerous and cannot be put into effect without great commotion and the serious disturbance of many. Those especially are affected who, through ignorance or perversity, immediately suspect that the Church had laboured under a certain error and had had thrown off the faith of the ancients”¹⁷².

The chapter continues, as above quoted, by speaking of objects used in the celebration of Mass such as vestments, candles, incense and other external things. The justification of these is the same as for all ceremonies which are considered to be *non essential*. They have an useful and holy meaning.

¹⁷¹ Theisen, op. cit., pp 46-47; cf. CT VII (1), 482, 20-31.

¹⁷² Theisen, op. cit., p 49; cf. CT VII (1), 481 note q.

The section ends, referring once more to the role of the Church assisted by the Holy Ghost. The Fathers admitted that the Church instituted liturgical ceremonies, but they did not reveal when¹⁷³.

The former ten articles based on typical¹⁷⁴ protestant doctrine, already discussed above, were arranged into thirteen canons. The three additional ones were the result of dividing articles 1, 3 and 10.

Article 2 became canon 3, and was considerably modified:

*If anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass is not from the Gospel, or that it [the sacrifice] was not instituted by Christ but was thought up (inventum) by men, or that it is not a good and meritorious work to offer it, but that an evident and multiple idolatry is committed in it [the sacrifice], let him be anathema*¹⁷⁵.

Here the shift of emphasis is from the Mass in general to the sacrifice thereof. Now the canon concerns purely the dogmatic teaching on the Sacrifice of the Mass, and no longer directly concerns our subject.

Article 10 became canons 12 and 13. Canon 12 reads as follows:

*If anyone says that the ceremonies, vestments and external signs which the Catholic Church uses in the celebration of Masses are provocations to impiety rather than exercises of piety, let him be anathema*¹⁷⁶.

This canon differs from article 10 in that the latter had condemned all ceremonies, whereas the canon condemns those who attack the ceremonies of the Catholic Church. Strictly, it would be permissible, in reading this text, to reproduce the celebration of Christ so long as one did not condemn the Catholic liturgy. Canon 13 reads as follows:

*“If anyone says that the Mass is less Christian because it is celebrated with more ceremonies than it was celebrated by Christ, let him be anathema”*¹⁷⁷.

¹⁷³ Theisen, op. cit., p 49.

¹⁷⁴ Typical, according to the Fathers' synthesis of the writings and sayings of the various Protestant heresiarchs.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., p 50; cf. CT VII (1), 460, 15-17: *Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium non esse ex evangelio nec a Christo institutum, sed inventum ab hominibus, neque illud offerre esse opus bonum aut meritorium, imo in eo committi manifestam et multiplicem idololatriam: anathema sit.*

¹⁷⁶ Theisen, op. cit., p 50; cf. CT VII (1), 460, 41-43: *Si quis dixerit, ceremonias, vestes et externa signa, quibus in celebratione missarum ecclesia catholica utitur, irritabula impietatis esse magis quam officia pietatis: anathema sit.*

¹⁷⁷ Theisen, op. cit., p 51; cf. CT VII (1), 460, 44: *Si quis dixerit, missam minus christianam esse, quia cum pluribus ceremoniis celebratur, quam fuerit a Christo celebrata: anathema sit.*

The original article 10 had been quoted from Luther's *De captivitate babilonica*, but this article no longer exactly reproduces the thought of Luther. The canon does not include the idea of gradation (ie: the more ceremonies are added, the less Christian the Mass, and the more the Last Supper is copied, the more Christian it is), but there remains the comparison with Christ's Mass. The wording was changed because not everyone was convinced that the original article (second part) was heretical. It was necessary to render the canon in a form that was manifestly heretical, that anyone who maintained this doctrine would incur the anathema of the Church.

These chapters and canons were intended to be promulgated at the solemn session of the 25th January 1552. This was not possible on account of the suspension of the Council. The Fathers had intended to delay publication of the decrees until the solemn session of March 1552. But war broke out between the Lutheran princes and the Emperor, and the former were gaining territory in southern Germany. The Council had to adjourn and flee for safety. Though the Fathers intended to continue in two years time, ten years passed before the Council could reconvene¹⁷⁸.

***Deliberations of the Conciliar Fathers in 1562, during the third Period,
concerning Mass ceremonies and the definitive Decrees and Canons***

Having considered the pastoral problems of communion under both kinds and communion given to children in 1562, the Council turned its full attention to the Mass in July of that year¹⁷⁹. The original intention had been to continue discussion from the point it had reached during the second period in 1552, to propose the doctrinal chapters and the canons to the Fathers. But, due to the presence of more Fathers (180 compared with only 70 in 1552), the second President of the Council, Cardinal Seripando, decided on a fresh examination of the question by theologians¹⁸⁰.

Nine Fathers were appointed to draw up the decrees and canons concerning the doctrine of the Mass¹⁸¹. For this purpose, they could consult any theologian or make reference to the old material from 1552, amending them as necessary¹⁸². What happened is that they made a very concise form of the

¹⁷⁸ Theisen, op. cit., pp 51-52. It is also known that Paul IV was not favourable to the Council, and it was not re-convoked until after the accession of Pius IV in 1559.

¹⁷⁹ The Fathers in the second period, in 1552, had considered the Mass conjointly with the Sacrament of Order. This time they concentrated their attention purely on the Mass before proceeding to other Sacraments.

¹⁸⁰ Theisen, op. cit., p 52; cf. CT VIII, 722, 1-12.

¹⁸¹ The names of these nine Fathers are found in: CT VIII, 721.

¹⁸² Cf. CT VIII, 722, 8.

doctrinal chapters already studied¹⁸³. The Fathers did not attempt to define the origins of liturgical ceremonies, whether divine, apostolic or ecclesiastical. They advanced above all the anthropological argument:

*“The rites and ceremonies which the Church employs in the celebration of Masses have been instituted in order that by these visible signs and indications of religious piety men’s minds may be moved [to contemplate] those heavenly and invisible mysteries which are contained in the sacrifice itself”*¹⁸⁴.

It seems that the Fathers, in omitting to define the origin of ceremonies either did in realising that they were on very uncertain ground, or that they were aware that very few ceremonies are explicitly witnessed in the Scriptures. The remark that nothing should be changed no longer figures, and this indicates a different attitude. In 1562, a much more self-critical attitude was adopted: a commission was appointed to make a list of abuses and suggestions for reforms¹⁸⁵.

The chapter continues with a discussion of the Roman Canon and the use of the Latin language. After this, it continues on the subject of ceremonies:

*“But everyone knows how much the vestments, lights and the other external things (which are consecrated by a blessing and used in the cult of Mass) move men and turn their minds from commonplace thoughts to [the contemplation of] that divine sacrifice which is being performed. There is indeed an extremely useful and holy symbolism in all these things; whoever understands it knows that they were aptly instituted. The Spirit that induced Christ to institute the sacrifice at the Last Supper taught and instructed the Church to use becoming and religious ceremonies that were well adapted to the times”*¹⁸⁶.

This new version follows the same thought as that of 1552, but it is better and more concisely expressed. Anything that was unsure, or capable of an ambiguous interpretation, was omitted. The Fathers in 1562 also omitted any

¹⁸³ CT VIII, 751-755.

¹⁸⁴ Theisen, op. cit., p 58; cf. CT VIII, 793, 26-29: *Ritus vero illi ac cæremoniæ, quibus ecclesia utitur in celebratione missarum, ea ratione institutæ sunt, ut mentes hominum per hæc visibilia religionis ac pietatis signa et argumenta ad superna illa et invisibilia, quæ in ipso sacrificio exercentur, mysteria magis excitentur.*

¹⁸⁵ Theisen, op. cit., p 59; cf. CT VIII, 916-921.

¹⁸⁶ Theisen, op. cit., p 59; cf. CT VIII, 753,45-754,2: *Quantum vero et vestibus et luminaribus et aliis externis rebus, quæ et benedictione consecrantur et ad missæ cultum adhibentur, moveantur homines et animos convertant a rerum profanarum cogitatione ad divinum illud sacrificium, quod agitur: nemo est, qui nesciat, et est quidem utilissima et sanctissima rerum earum omnium significatio, quam qui percipiunt, recte eas institutas fuisse cognoscunt. Atque idem Spiritus, quo ad sacrificium instituendum in cæna Christus adductus est, ecclesiam docuit atque instruxit, ut congruas ac pias pro temporis ratione cæremonias adhiberet.*

reference to the simplicity of the Last Supper, lest it should be asked (as the Reformers did) why the Church had developed the rites, or if she had the authority to do so¹⁸⁷.

Turning to the canons, the twelve proposed to the Fathers in 1562 strongly resemble the thirteen of 1552, more so than to the thirteen articles proposed to the theologians in 1562. The canon 13 of 1552, condemning the proposition that the Mass was proportionately less Christian in so far that more ceremonies are added to what Christ instituted, was entirely dropped. Again, the Fathers did not wish to speculate on the comparison between the Last Supper and the Medieval Latin Mass¹⁸⁸.

Canon 12 of those proposed to the Fathers in August 1562, is the only one that generally defends liturgical ceremonies. It almost exactly corresponds with the canon 12 of 1552¹⁸⁹. Generally in their discussions, the Fathers made little reference to the rites and ceremonies, for they were much more interested in defending the dogmatic teaching of the Church, particularly on the Sacrifice of the Mass.

Four Fathers only make any criticisms of the part of chapter 4 that treat of liturgical ceremonies. It was felt that the reference to “*the same Spirit that led Christ*” did not adequately express the dignity of Christ, and should be reworded¹⁹⁰. Archbishop Peter Anthony of Capua suggested the following:

*“And as Christ instituted this sacrifice in the Supper, so also through his Holy Spirit he taught and instructed the Church to use becoming and appropriate ceremonies for the celebration of the same sacrifice”*¹⁹¹.

This amendment, although it refers to the institution of the Mass, seems more to express an interest in the relation between the Son and the Holy Spirit. Another Father, John Carol Bovius, Bishop of Ostuni in Apulia, wished to see a reason appended for the use of ceremonies, etc. He proposed a mention of some fundamental principles to justify their use¹⁹². It is not clear whether he

¹⁸⁷ Theisen, op. cit., pp 59-60.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p 60.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p 60: *Si quis dixerit, cæremonias, vestes et externa signa, quibus in missarum celebratione ecclesia catholica utitur, irritabula impietatis esse magis quam officia pietatis: anathema sit.*

¹⁹⁰ CT VIII, 761, 22.

¹⁹¹ Theisen, op. cit., p 61; cf. CT VIII, 756, 21-25: *In ultimo [4] cap. atque idem Spiritus etc. non videtur dictum ex dignitate; posset dici atque ut Christus sacrificium hoc in cæna instituit, sic ecclesiam per Spiritum suum Sanctum docuit atque instruxit, ut congruas atque idoneas ad idem sacrificium celebrandum cæremonias adhiberet.*

¹⁹² CT VIII, 756, 21-25.

had in mind scriptural or patristic witnesses, or the anthropological argument based on the needs of human nature¹⁹³.

Little is said, likewise, about canon 12. Apart from various suggestions made regarding the precise wording of the canon, one Father, the Patriarch of Jerusalem Anthony Helius, suggested a new version of the canon: “*If anyone says, it is contrary to the exercise of piety that the Catholic Church uses ceremonies, special vestments and other signs in the celebration of Masses, let him be anathema*”¹⁹⁴.

Since very little essential change was introduced into chapter 4 or into canon 12, it can be concluded that the majority of the Fathers agreed with the matter therein expressed. Their thought was not unlike that of the theologians concerning the historical origin of ceremonies and reasons for their use.

From the August to September of 1562, the Fathers were occupied with the problem of communion under both Kinds for the laity. During this time, the commission worked on a revised draft of the chapters and canons¹⁹⁵. It was decided to make the chapters much more concise¹⁹⁶, and the four lengthy chapters of August 1562 were discarded in favour of a preface and nine short chapters, corresponding more closely with the matters treated in the canons. The first two chapters treat of the sacrifice and its fruits. Chapters 3 to 8 are brief explanations of Masses in honour of the Saints, the Roman Canon, ceremonies and vestments, private Masses, prayers said in the secret voice, the use of Latin or vernacular languages and the mingling of water with the wine at Mass. Chapter 9 gives an introduction to the canons. The canons are reduced to nine, but their content remains nearly the same. The content of the chapters and canons are as in the definitive decree, so we shall hence proceed immediately¹⁹⁷.

Chapter 5 is a new composition, though it borrows much from previous drafts:

Since human nature is such that without exterior aids it cannot easily be elevated to the contemplation of divine realities, loving mother Church has established certain usages, for instance, that in the Mass some parts are recited in a low voice and others in a louder voice. Likewise, from apostolic teaching and tradition she has employed ceremonies, such as mystical blessings, lights,

¹⁹³ Theisen, op. cit., p 61.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., p 61; cf. CT VIII, 755, 23-25.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. H. Jedin, *Girolamo Seripendo. Sein Leben und Denken im Geisteskampf des 16. Jahrhunderts*, vol II, Würzburg 1937, pp 535-540.

¹⁹⁶ CT VIII, 909-912.

¹⁹⁷ Theisen, op. cit., pp 62-63.

*incense, vestments, and many other things of this kind which have the purpose of enhancing the majesty of so great a sacrifice and of moving the minds of the faithful by these visible signs of religion and piety to the contemplation of sublime truths which lie hidden in this sacrifice*¹⁹⁸.

Not one Father proposed any amendment, so it can be said to have been unanimously approved. Again, the argument is based on the philosophical principle of human nature's need of sense experience, to lead the soul to divine realities. This chapter does not affirm an absolute need of ceremonies, but that they are extremely useful, especially to those less advanced in the spiritual life. Many aspects of ceremonial are singled out for special mention, for they were likewise criticised by the Protestants. The list is not intended to be exhaustive, but includes implicitly any ceremony or sign used in the Catholic liturgy¹⁹⁹.

The new definitive canon 7 is the exact combination of the old proposed canons 12 and 7 of August and September 1562:

*“If anyone says that the ceremonies, vestments and outward signs which the Catholic Church uses in the celebration of Masses are provocations to impiety rather than exercises of piety, let him be anathema”*²⁰⁰.

The text is reproduced almost verbatim from that of 1552, and embodies a general defence of all liturgical ceremonies and signs. However, the condemned expression of Luther is taken out of context. What the reformer actually wanted to say is that such ceremonies are provocations to impiety if they are performed without a corresponding interior faith. On the other hand, Luther, as Calvin and Zwingli, ridiculed the ceremonies of the Mass in many contexts, claiming that they led to irreverence, avarice and superstition, and the canon condemns their general thought²⁰¹.

The question of whether these Canons are definitions of revealed truth is pertinent, considering that they carry anathemas. Some recent scholars consider that the decrees of the Council of Trent do not always define

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., p 63; cf. GT VIII, 910 and 961; DS 1746: *Cumque natura hominum ea sit, ut non facile queat sine adminiculis exterioribus ad rerum divinarum meditationem sustolli, propterea pia mater ecclesia ritus quosdam, ut scil. quædam submissa voce, alia vero elatiore in missa pronunciarentur, instituit; cæremonias item adhibuit, ut mysticas benedictiones, lumina, thymiamata, vestes aliaque id genus multa ex apostolica disciplinæ et traditione, quo et maiestas tanti sacrificii commendaretur, et mentes fidelium per hæc visibilia religionis ac pietatis signa ad rerum altissimarum, quæ in hoc sacrificio latent, contemplationem excitarentur.*

¹⁹⁹ Theisen, op. cit., pp 63-64.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., pp 67; cf. CT VIII, 912 and 913; DS 1757: *Si quis dixerit, cæremonias, vestes et externa signa, uibus in missarum celebratione ecclesia catholica utitur, irritabula impietatis esse quam officia pietatis: anathema sit.*

²⁰¹ Theisen, op. cit., p 68.

revealed truth²⁰². The anathema is joined to some propositions that are not intended to define revealed truth, but the anathema is lanced against heretics who affirm what is condemned. The Fathers' concept of heresy was evidently wider and more inclusive: a heretic is not only one who denies the doctrine of the Catholic faith, but one who obstinately disobeys ecclesiastical authority and who separates himself from Catholic unity²⁰³.

THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT DEALING WITH PARTICULAR ASPECTS OF THE MASS LITURGY

Having seen that the Council of Trent felt the need to justify the continuation of any kind of liturgical ceremony, for pastoral reasons, and to preserve the expression of Catholic doctrine, the Fathers had need to give precisions on certain aspects of the Mass liturgy. The aspects most attacked by the Protestants were the Canon of the Mass and the use of the Latin language. The aspect most in need of reform was the practical celebration of Mass: to bring about a remedy for the nearly universal situation of liturgical anarchy.

Here, we have been careful to distinguish all Conciliar deliberations concerning liturgical *ceremonies* from purely dogmatic aspects of the Sacrament of the Eucharist or the Mass as Christ's Sacrifice.

The question of the Roman Canon

In our historical survey of the discussion of the eucharistic liturgy in general at the Council of Trent, we have hinted at the question of the Roman Canon when discussing the drafting of the chapters on the ceremonies of Mass. We shall now discuss this in detail.

Nothing was more bitterly attacked by the Protestants than was the Roman Canon²⁰⁴. They sharply criticised the dogmatic content of this eucharistic prayer because it contradicted their theological systems. The objection made

²⁰² Cf. P. Fransen, *Réflexions sur l'anathème au Concile de Trente* (Bologne 10-14 Sept. 1547), in: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 29 (1953), pp 657-672; A. Lang, *Der Bedeutungswandel der Begriffe fides und hæresis und die dogmatische Wertung der Konzilsentscheidungen von Vienne und Trient*, in: *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 4 (1953), pp 133-146; H. Lennerz, *Notulæ Tridentinæ*, in: *Gregorianum* 27 (1946), pp 136-142.

²⁰³ The Code of Canon Law of 1983 (Can. 751) makes a sharper distinction between heresy (sin against Faith) and schism (sin against Charity and the unity of the Church).

²⁰⁴ Cf. M. Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, Dickinson 1976, p 32: *Moreover man needs to blind himself with these words, high mass, low mass. In the high mass are the selfsame abominations which are in the lowest. In both of them is the institution and ordinance of Christ perverted; in both of them is he worshipped in the bread; in both are idols served; in both, specially in the service of the saints, is help asked of creatures; in both of them is the wicked Canon, the greatest portion of the Mass. There is nothing in it of old antiquity, nothing of the apostolic simplicity* (*Two Epistles* of H. Bullinger, with consent of all the learned men of the church of Tyrgury, London 1548).

to the Canon was entirely doctrinal, because of its explicit sacrificial vocabulary. Luther at first applied his teaching on the Mass in his sermons, in which he condemned the whole concept of eucharistic oblation. This doctrine was most embodied in the Canon²⁰⁵. In composing his German Mass, he feared to keep any reference to sacrificial doctrine, and this led him to an extremely violent treatment of the Canon²⁰⁶. Because of its theological *errors*, the reformers decided that it was of recent origin, and therefore had to be abolished in favour of new eucharistic prayers of their own composition. We shall in no way attempt to discuss these theological problems, for they do not concern our subject.

The Council of Trent began its argumentation from the standpoint of the Protestants' objections. By this method we can more precisely locate their objections to the Canon, and not merely to Catholic sacrificial doctrine. We go back to the articles of protestant doctrine originally presented to the Council theologians on the 3rd December 1551²⁰⁷. One of these refers directly to the Canon of the Mass. The article in question, number 4, affirms that there are errors in the Canon and that it ought to be abrogated²⁰⁸. The protestants referred to are Melanchthon, Zwingli and Henry Bullinger. Melanchthon considered that the Canon should be laid aside on account of its open language concerning oblation and the application of the Sacrifice for others. He considered the invocation of saints in the Canon an idolatry²⁰⁹. Zwingli considered the Canon erroneous, superstitious and impious²¹⁰. Bullinger condemns it as absurd, erroneous and impious, and believed it to have been composed by the scholastic theologians²¹¹. This is the basis from which the Council set out to defend the Canon.

The Catholic apologists were mainly concerned with the defence of the doctrinal content of the Canon. The chief argument in favour of the Canon is

²⁰⁵ Cuming, op. cit., p 32.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., p 35.

²⁰⁷ CT VII (1), 375,7 - 377,13.

²⁰⁸ CT VII (1), 376, 8-11: *Canonem misse; erroribus et seductionibus scatere, abrogandum esse fugiendumque non secus ac pessimam abominationem. Habetur in apologia [Augustana] et apud Zvinglium et Bulingerium; Melanchthon in libro contra privatam missam.*

²⁰⁹ CT VII (1), 376 note 7: *Abiiciendus est Canon, quem vocant, in quo apertis verbis fit oblatio et applicatio pro aliis et additur idololatrica invocatio sanctorum.*

²¹⁰ CT VII (1), 376 note B: *En quid faciat error, quot putas doctos quoties etiam hanc precationem legisse et superstitione quadam nunquam verba expendere ausos? Hic est ille canon, quem attrahere non licet, inscita plenus, infantia, impietate.*

²¹¹ CT VII (1), 376 note 6: *De canone, qui multa absurda, erronea et impia habet, nihil certi, quando et a quibus compositus sit, ipsi etiam scholastici tradunt... Negligi enim ac contemni ceu inventum nuperum et ineptum.*

its antiquity, its supposed apostolic origin. However, most of the apologists were aware that subsequent Popes and Fathers added to this eucharistic prayer. Alphonsus de Contreras, a Franciscan theologian claimed that the Canon originated in apostolic times. He makes a comparison of this prayer with the Greek Anaphora, and affirms that it contains no error, but apostolic doctrine²¹².

The most important contemporary treatise on the subject of the Canon of the Mass in depth is a *Compendium* of sentences on the Sacrifice of the Mass, in response to the heretical articles, of two theologians, Claudio Iaio and the Jesuit Alphonsus Salmeron²¹³.

The two theologians begin by exposing the teaching of the Protestants, who were offended by the word *canon*, affirmed that it was composed by several authors, that it was new, that it had too many ceremonies and that it was ungrammatical²¹⁴. To the first, the theologians respond that the word *canon* means *rule*, affirming that it had been called *actio*, *secreta*, *sacrificium arcana*, *prex* and *oratio* by some of the Fathers of the Church²¹⁵. Concerning the several authors of the Canon, they compare the Canon to biblical texts which were written also by several authors²¹⁶. To the accusation that the Canon was of recent invention, they respond that it is of great antiquity, proving it by numerous patristic references²¹⁷. They answer the allegation that the Canon contained too many ceremonies by making reference to Jewish ceremonies in the Old Testament. They claim that Jesus, having instituted the Sacraments, would not have wished for them to be administered indecently. As did apologists in justifying ceremonies in general, these theologians claimed that Jesus performed certain actions with ceremonial²¹⁸. They challenged the Protestants to show them where ceremonies are against the law of the Gospel²¹⁹.

They go on to answer the affirmation of Zwingli that the Canon was ungrammatical. They wondered what kind of theologian Zwingli must be if

²¹² CT VII (2), 563, 14--17.

²¹³ The integral text of this work is found in: CT VI (3), 383-531. The part which interests our subject is Article 6, (pp 498-522).

²¹⁴ CT VI (3), 499, 26-27.

²¹⁵ CT VI (3), 499,28 - 500,12.

²¹⁶ CT VI (3), 500, 13-25.

²¹⁷ CT VI (3), 500,26 - 506,27.

²¹⁸ CT VI (3), 506,28 - 507,40.

²¹⁹ CT VI (3), 508, 15-17.

his most powerful argument against the Canon is its Latin composition. Those who hold such arguments are said to show themselves to be *stulti et maligni*²²⁰. They are held to sin by sophistry, and the theologians ask if the Protestants' new eucharistic prayers are better composed²²¹. The rest of the article treats of the different parts of the Canon in detail in view of refuting the Protestants' positions²²². Such arguments may seem to us crude, but this is how it was. The object was not to tackle the question historically, but to attempt to demonstrate the worthlessness of the opponent's argument. Such was the art of sixteenth century apologetics.

The Council Fathers took up many of the same arguments in their discussions in all three periods of the Council. They began, as for the question of ceremonies in general, from the heretical articles submitted to the theologians in 1547, that we have just seen in examining protestant opinion from the Council's point of view.

During the second period, the matter of the Roman Canon was very little discussed during the general congregations. However, two bishops presented ten articles on the Mass on the 7th January 1552; the fourth is pertinent to our theme²²³. They deny that the Canon should contain errors and seductions, and

²²⁰ CT VI (3), 508, 18-22.

²²¹ CT VI (3), 508, 22-28.

²²² CT VI (3), 508,30 - 522,9.

²²³ CT VII 7 (2), 591,40 - 592, 11: *Quartus articulus. Canonem missæ erroribus et seductionibus scaterè, abrogandum esse fugiendumque non secus ac pessimam abominationem.*

Sententia. Prima particula huius articuli quarti mendax est et falsissima referens canonem missæ erroribus et seductionibus scaterè. Cum enim canon ipse sanctissimus tanquam præcipua missæ pars usque ad communionem repræsentet omnem Iesu Christi passionem usque ad gloriosam eius sepulturam, id quod tam non est erroneum et seductorium, ut etiam Dominus Iesus serio præceperit, ut suum corpus et sanguinem sumserimus et offerremus in memoriam eius passionis et mortis dicens: Hoc facite, quotiescumque bibetis, in meam commemorationem. Quotiescumque enim manducabitis panem hunc et calicem bibetis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis, donec veniat, quod certe est scaterè erroribus et seductionibus.

Secunda particula huius articuli testator auctorem huius articuli in eo vere esse antichristianum et impiam pessimamque abominationem, quod velit canonem missæ adeoque ipsam missam missæque sacrificiam abrogandum et fugiendum esse. ouandoquidem hoc ipsum missæ sacrificium qui tollendum velit aut tollere conetur, oportet, ut tollat totum Christianismum adeoque totum Christum et eius memoriam. Sed hoc nemo facit nec facturus est præterquam Antichristus, quem Daniel ipse prophetizans de consummatione sæculi prædicit ablaturum esse iuge sacrificium, quod aliud non est præterquam sacrificium missæ, prout episcopus Viennensis secundo libro Miscellanearum abunde testatus est. Cui proinde canonem missæ, qui missæ sacrificium continet, quasi blasphemiam de medio tollere conatur, ipse vel Antichristus vel antichristianus, adeoque, adeoque crudelis illa abominatio, de qua Christus prædixit et admonuit inquit: Cum ergo videritis abominationem desolationis (per abominationem intelligens Antichristum), quæ dicta est a Daniele propheta, stantem in loco sancto, qui legit intelligat, quemadmodum fusius interpretatus est Nausea in libris de Antichristo.

that it should be abrogated as an abomination. They turn the argument against the Protestants, on the scriptural basis of the sacrificial character of the Canon, and affirm that the *abomination* consists in wishing to deny the Church the Sacrifice of Christ. We see that the argument in favour of the Roman Canon is entirely dogmatic, within the context of the general discussion on the Sacrifice of the Mass.

In the chapters proposed to the Fathers on the 20th January 1552, the fourth of these treated of the rites and ceremonies of Mass. In this chapter is a discussion on the Roman Canon²²⁴. For the theologians and Fathers of Trent, the Roman Canon was considered to be the most untouchable part of the Mass. It admits that some of its aspects are obscure and require explanation in the light of the Scriptures and Orthodox Fathers. The chapter therefore rejects any suggestion that the Canon should be abrogated on the pretext that it contained doctrinal errors. As we have seen before, the canons on the Mass proposed in 1552 were not definitive. We pass now to the third period.

It was proposed on the 20th July 1562 that the theologians should examine thirteen articles on the Sacrifice of the Mass; the seventh appertains to our subject, but it is considerably abridged. It simply poses the question if it contains errors and should be abrogated²²⁵. Four chapters were proposed to the Fathers on the 6th August 1562, of which the last speaks of the Roman Canon²²⁶. It affirms that it contains no errors or anything against true religion and piety. Admitted is the idea that some parts are obscure and need explanation in the light of Scripture and the Fathers. Twelve canons were proposed the same day, of which the eighth anathematizes anyone who says that the Canon contains errors and should be abrogated²²⁷. Nine reformed chapters and canons were proposed on the 5th September 1562 to be examined on the 7th. The fourth chapter²²⁸ and the sixth canon²²⁹ interest us.

²²⁴ 85. CT VII (1),481,26- 482,5: *Nihil igitur in ritibus huiusmodi vel abrogandum est omnio vel immutandum. Duare totum missæ canonem sacra synodus asserit sanctissime esse constitutum, nec quicquam continere, quod pietatem et religionem non spiret auod si quæ forte sint obscuriora loca et quæ explicationis lucem desiderant, qualia permulta in scripturis reperiuntur, consultis orthodoxis patribus, qui ea suis expositionis illustrunt, pie et catholice intelligi debent. Ideo nonnisi pernicioso ac pravo consilio abrogari quidam canonem missæ suadent vel tanquam erroribus, mendaciis et seductionibus scatentem impie traducunt.*

²²⁵ CT VIII, 719, 12: *An canon missæ errores contineat sitque abrogandus.*

²²⁶ CT VIII, 753, 29-36.

²²⁷ CT VIII, 754, 43-44: *Si quis dixerit, canonem missæ erroribus scatere abrogandumque esse: anathema sit.*

²²⁸ CT VIII,910,38-41: *Porro cum sancta sancte administrari conveniat, sitque hoc omnium sanctissimum sacrificium: ecclesia catholica, ut digne reverenterque offerretur ac perciperetur, sacrum canonem instituit, ita ab omni errore purum, ut nihil in eo contineatur, quod non maxime sanctitatem et pietatem quandam redolet mentemque offerentium in Deum erigat.*

²²⁹ CT VIII 912, 3-4 (see note 178)

The canon remains unchanged, but the chapter offers a reason for the institution of the Roman Canon, which is that of reverence for the Holy Mysteries and decency of the celebration. It affirms the Canon's doctrinal purity and suitability for true religion. The Council then turned its attention to the liturgical abuses we have already discussed. The definitive doctrine appeared on the 17th September of the same year.

The definitive decree does not determine which parts of the Canon proceed from the Apostles, as had been affirmed by the apologists. We find no evolution in what is said or known about its origin²³⁰. Nothing is mentioned about the literary structure of the Canon that Zwingli had criticised. The texts of the decree and canon are as follows:

“And since it is becoming that holy things be administered in a holy manner, and of all things this sacrifice is the most holy, the Catholic Church, to the end that it might be worthily and reverently offered and received, instituted many centuries ago the holy canon, which is so free from error that it contains nothing that does not in the highest degree savour of a certain holiness and piety and raise up to God the minds of those who offer. For it consists partly of the very words of the Lord, partly of the traditions of the Apostles, and also of pious regulations of holy Pontiffs”²³¹.

Canon 6 *“If anyone says that the Canon of the Mass contains errors and is therefore to be abrogated, let him be anathema”²³².*

It is noteworthy at this point to look at the one exception to the general desire to keep the Canon exactly as it was found in the 1474 Roman Missal. We had already remarked, while discussing abuses, that it was suggested by some that no signs of the cross should be made over the consecrated Species, but this would not have affected the text. Jungmann notes that one bishop proposed a change in the Canon²³³. Nausea of Vienna could no more know of the antiquity of the Canon than anyone else.

²³⁰ Theisen, op. cit., p 110.

²³¹ CT VIII, 960,43 - 961,3: cf. DS 1745.

²³² CT VIII, 962, 12-13: cf. DS 1756.

²³³ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 141; cf. CT XII, 420,39 - 421,1: *Friderici Nausea Blancicampani episcopi Viennensis, de tollendis circa apies christiane religionis abusibus et moderandis rebus absolute pietatis haud existentibus. Lib. VII, 4: Tollatur omnino diversitas et disparitas utriusque canonis, ac ipse paulo serius discutiatur, ne quid in eo sibi non satis pie mutuo cohereat, si quid superstitionis aut sordium irrepsit, vitetur, ipsaque missa habeatur sacrificium mysticum, et eius que facta est in cruce immolationis representativum, atque ideo sub Domini corporis elevatione populus humi iacens, prostratus erectisque in celum cordibus Christo gratias agat, quod eius morte sit ab eterna morte redemptus etc.*

We have seen that the attitude of the Catholic Church in general was radically different from that of the protestants. The strongest argument for the retention of the Canon was not only its doctrinal purity, but its antiquity and established place in tradition. A recent author²³⁴ expressed how grateful one can be that the Council of Trent kept the Canon in its integrity, for it had never been changed according to whims of theology or forms of piety.

The secret voice in the celebration of Mass

We shall, by way of a short excursus, briefly go into the question of certain prayers of the Mass being said *submissa voce*. This was a question that was vehemently contested by the Protestants, and the Council Fathers were not unanimous on this point.

It was during the Twenty-second Session that the Council declared:

*“And since the nature of men is such, that it cannot be easily lifted up to the meditation of divine things without external aids, for this reason has Holy Mother Church instituted certain rites, namely, that some things in the Mass be pronounced in a low voice (submissa voce), others in a louder voice (elatiore) ...”*²³⁵.

The Council also anathematized those who condemned the use of the secret voice for the Canon of the Mass: *“If anyone says that the rite of the Roman Church, whereby part of the Canon and the words of Consecration are said in a low voice should be condemned; (...) let him be anathema”*²³⁶.

We note that the Council employed the anthropological argument in favour of the use of *submissa voce*. The Fathers did not wish to teach its absolute necessity but its convenience from the pastoral point of view²³⁷. The canon does not condemn the loud recitation of the Canon, but those who consider such a practice sinful, as did Calvin²³⁸.

²³⁴ B. Botte, *L'Ordinaire de la Messe*, Paris 1953, p 27: *On se figure quelle salade nous aurions aujourd'hui s'il avait été permis à chaque génération de refaire le canon à la mesure des controverses théologiques ou des nouvelles formes de la piété. (...) Le canon n'était pas pour eux un champ d'exercice. C'était à leurs yeux l'expression d'une tradition vénérable, et ils sentaient qu'on ne pouvait pas y toucher sous peine d'ouvrir la porte à toute sorte d'abus”*.

²³⁵ CT VIII, 910, 38-41; cf. DS 1746.

²³⁶ CT VIII, 912, 10-13; cf. DS 1759.

²³⁷ Cf. C. A. Lewis, *The silent recitation of the Canon of the Mass*, Bay Saint Louis 1962, pp 84-85.

²³⁸ CT VII (1),377,5-8: *Ecclesiae Romanae ritum, quo secreto et submissa voce verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; missamque non nisi in lingua vulgari, quam omnes intelligant, celebrari debere, imposturamque esse certas missas certis sanctis attribuere. Asseritur a Calvino in lib. de caena Domini.*

The treatment of this question at the Council evolved very little; the definitive canon is composed in very nearly exactly the words of Calvin. However, what is of interest are the few isolated interventions which were no means unanimous. An argument that came up in 1551 was that the Canon appertained to God, and not to the people, therefore it was to be pronounced secretly²³⁹. This argument is made in the context of the use of Latin, which we shall treat separately. The two bishops, who likened the reformers to antichrists, compare the secret saying of the Canon to the *disciplina arcana*, that such holy things should not be read aloud to lewd men as they are not thrown to dogs, and that it should be therefore retained²⁴⁰. At a conference of theologians, two Spanish clerics, Franciscus Torres and Franciscus de Sanctio, believed the silent Canon to be of apostolic tradition²⁴¹. The fourth chapter of doctrine proposed to the Fathers on the 6th August 1562 refers also to the silent Canon²⁴². The motive is reverence for the Mysteries and the edification of piety. The Fathers were not all in agreement as to the continued practice of the silent canon, as opposed to the theological basis that the Council wished to teach. Some would not condemn those who prefer the loud voice²⁴³. It is thus that we can see that the doctrine finally agreed upon did not condemn the use of the loud voice per se, but was aimed against those who denied the doctrinal basis. This was that the Canon is not a simple narrative of the Last Supper but a real Sacrifice and Sacrament. According to the teaching of Trent, the Canon may be said aloud, but in the reform of Pius V, it was decided to continue its silent recitation.

The language of the liturgy.

The question as to whether the Mass was to continue to be celebrated in Latin or to be said in the vernacular was a burning issue in the controversies between Protestants and Catholics in the sixteenth century. It is a simple statement of fact that, by this time, most of the lay people in the parishes no longer understood Latin. Throughout the history of the Church, the Roman Mass has been celebrated in languages other than Latin: Greek, Slavonic, German, French, Turkish, Armenian, Georgian, Albanian, Persian, Arabic,

²³⁹ CT VII (2), 551, 26-28: Disputatio Martini Olavei Hispani, 12th December 1551: *In canone enim nihil agitur cum populo, sed cum Deo. Ibi nihil refert, qua lingua aut quam clara voce utaris. Deus enim intelligit gemitus et omnes linguas. Quare quod ad canonem attinet, potest et debet submissa voce latine proferri.*

²⁴⁰ CT VII (2), 593, 27-38.

²⁴¹ CT VIII, 726, 5-7.

²⁴² CT VIII, 753, 33-36: *Propterea religiose ac sapienter fit, ut verba consecrationis et maxima pars canonis submissa voce recitentur. Ita enim et huius ineffabilis mysterii maiestas rectius conservatur, et populus excitatur vehementius ad præclare de hoc sacrificio cogitandum.*

²⁴³ CT VIII, 756,27-28; 757,81-52; 768,25-26; 771,40-41.

Chinese and a number of traditional tribal languages²⁴⁴. It can therefore be seen that the language of the liturgy is not of absolute value, but relative and disciplinary. However, it has to be admitted that, at this time, Mass celebrated in a language other than Latin was much more the exception than the rule.

Long before the Reformers of the sixteenth century began to compose vernacular liturgies, there had been a steady trend towards demand for a vernacular liturgy. This appeared largely in the form of nationalist movements, such as the Hussites in the early fifteenth century who, at the Council of Basle (1415) demanded the use of their own language in the liturgy²⁴⁵. For the Waldensians, as for Luther and the later Reformers, the real reason for their demand for the vernacular was that of intelligibility.

If the most important aspect of the Christian life was the written and spoken Word, it was absolutely vital that it should be in a language understood of the people. For the Protestants, the worship of the Church had to bear a dominantly didactic character.

Though Luther advocated the use of the vernacular, he did not impose it as an absolute necessity. He was favourable to the possibility of its being celebrated in any language, ancient or modern²⁴⁶. On the other hand, Calvin was convinced that the Sacraments had no validity unless the people could understand the words of the rites²⁴⁷. We discover that this last is suggestive of a denial of the objective efficacy of the Sacraments. It was on this point that the Council of Trent was to associate the demand for the vernacular with the heretical reasons for this desire.

It is in studying the deliberations of the Council on this subject that we discover that some of the theologians and Fathers were favourable to the use of the vernacular in the liturgy. Thus, it can be said that the use of the vernacular in itself was not, by the Tridentine Fathers, considered reprehensible, in so far as the motivation of this desire was not heretical.

One powerful factor in the question of Latin versus vernacular was the question of the translation of the Bible. What sixteenth century Catholics were concerned about was the risk of a proliferation of inaccurate translations and

²⁴⁴ Archdale King, *Liturgy of the Roman Church*, pp 52-77; cf. C. Korolevskij, *Liturgie en langue vivante, Orient et Occident*, Paris 1955.

²⁴⁵ Angelus De Marco, *The Church of Rome and the Problem of the Vernacular versus the Liturgical Language*, Washington DC 1960, p 1.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p 5.

²⁴⁷ Cf. Calvin, *Petit Tracte de la Sainte Cène de Nostre Seigneur*, in : *Corpus Reformatorum* , 33 (Joannis Calvinii Opera V), Geneva 1591, pp 57-59.

consequent falsifying of the sacred texts²⁴⁸. Though the Latin *Vulgata* was considered the normative version of Holy Scripture, the Council was silent in her definitive teaching on the subject of vernacular translations of the Bible. Though this does not directly pertain to our subject, this point does shed light on the problem of the language of the liturgy. It is a background factor which certainly influenced the Fathers' decision in regard to the liturgy.

Discussions on the question of Latin versus vernacular began, as most other aspects of the eucharistic liturgy, from the ten articles of heretical doctrine drawn from the writings of the Reformers. The article in question, number IX, raises questions both of the use of the *submissa voce* and of Latin. It is taken from Calvin, who most radically opposed the use of Latin on doctrinal grounds²⁴⁹.

John Arze was the first to intervene on this question; he objected that the Oriental Churches used languages other than Latin in their liturgical celebrations²⁵⁰. Another theologian, Josse Ravesteyn, argued in favour of the vernacular²⁵¹. As did the Reformers, Ravesteyn, based his argument on the text of St Paul (I Cor 14), but made a distinction between those parts of the Mass intended to teach the faithful, and the sacrificial part. For the latter, which would remain in Latin, it would suffice for the people to be instructed in what the priest was doing. For Ravesteyn, St Paul did not intend to condemn the use of languages other than that of the people, but he did insist on explanations.

Coming to the main deliberations of the Fathers on the language of the liturgy, we find that most of these took place in 1562 during the third Period. The Emperor Ferdinand addressed a petition to the Legates asking for the use of the vernacular in the liturgy²⁵². The idea was not to celebrate the whole

²⁴⁸ 109. CT V, 22, 5-6: *Nihilominus tamen et utilius esset, quod non imprimeretur in vulgari, quia non omnibus datum est lectura et interpretatio sacri codicis. Forti incedebant in errores pessimos.* Some Fathers agreed with this suggestion, but others did not. There were clearly two points of view represented at the Council. Cf. B. Chedozeau, *La Bible et la liturgie en Français. L'Eglise tridentine et les traductions bibliques (1600-1789)*, Paris 1990.

²⁴⁹ CT I, 603: *Ecclesiae romanae ritum, quo secreto et submissa voce verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; rmissamque non nisi in lingua vulgari, quam omnes intelligant, celebrari debere; imposturamque esse, certas missas certis sanctis attribuere.* Cf. H. Schmidt, *Liturgie et langue vulgaire*, Rome 1950, p 99-100. The use of language points to the notion that the vernacular is essential to the very nature of the liturgy. As such the notion had to be condemned by the Council.

²⁵⁰ De Marco, op. cit., pp 9-10. We should not forget that most of the Oriental Churches use non-vernacular *archaic* languages like ancient Greek or Church Slavonic.

²⁵¹ Ibid. , p 10.

²⁵² Ibid., p 16.

Mass in the vernacular, but only the sung parts. The Legates were unwilling to concede this, but encouraged vernacular preaching and explanations of the liturgy²⁵³. Most of the Council Fathers did not consider the rendering of the liturgy into the vernacular as intrinsically evil in itself, but that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages. Some were against the vernacular, for it seemed to them a profanation of the sacred texts²⁵⁴. It was generally agreed among the Fathers that Latin was to be retained, that it was sufficient to preach in the vernacular to explain the liturgy to the people, and that the question of liturgical language was a disciplinary matter²⁵⁵.

What were the advantages of Latin in the eyes of the Fathers? The Tridentine Fathers were aware of the role of a sense of unction in the liturgy. It would be better for the people to know what the Mass is, than to understand intellectually the text being read. Latin was preferred on account of its fostering a sense of respect and mystery²⁵⁶.

They were also concerned with the risk of erroneous translations, especially in the polemical climate of the defence of the Catholic faith against the Reformers.

However, a number of bishops declared their opposition to an absolute condemnation of the use of vernacular languages. Some had noticed that the Oriental Churches were not using Latin. But, the Tridentine Fathers were on the whole concerned with the liturgy of the Roman Rite. The question of liturgical language and dogmatic integrity were not to be intrinsically associated. Finally, the Council condemned those who maintained that the Mass was to be celebrated only in the vernacular, thus excluding for doctrinal reasons the use of Latin²⁵⁷.

²⁵³ Ibid., p 16; cf. J. le Plat, *Monumentorum ad Historiam concilii Tridentini*, 4 (Louvain 1784), pp 357-359.

²⁵⁴ Two examples are Francis de Sanctio and Anthony Grossutus.

²⁵⁵ De Marco, op. cit., p 18.

²⁵⁶ CT VIII, 13, 713, 1-41 (Christopher of Padua): *Missæ non nisi lingua vulgari quam omnes intelligant, celebrari debeat, respondeo, quod non est dubium, quod dicta sit aliquando missa materna lingua, ubi non est nisi una lingua... Ex suo igitur genere non est malum. Sed magis congruit literali sermone dici quam vulgato, ubi duæ sunt linguæ, propter maiorem tanti mysterii dignitatem. Sed tu dices: Quomodo respondebit populus 'Amen' ut dicit Apostolus ... si non intelligit, quid dicat. Dicat, quod loquitur de prædicatione, non de divino officio... non est nunc hic mos immutandus; quod fieri non posset absque antiquæ ecclesiæ perturbatione, periretque devotio. Nam omnes missale emerent et legerent evangelium et missam totam ante; postea cum legeretur, non attenderent. Satis sit sacerdotem in personæ ecclesiæ offerre et celebrare, populum autem devotione et pure fide adesse... Deus magis animum spectat quam intelligentiam eorum.*

²⁵⁷ CT VIII, 912, 10-13: *Si quis dixerit, ecclesiæ Romanæ ritum... aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrare debere ... eo quod sit contra Christi institutionem: anathema sit.*

THE PROBLEM OF LITURGICAL ANARCHY AND ABUSES

We have already briefly examined some of the abuses in the eucharistic celebration during the period immediately preceding the protestant Reformation and the Council of Trent. This was from a historical viewpoint. A discussion of the proceedings of the Council of Trent on the liturgy of the Mass in general is left incomplete without an examination of the most important points in particular. The first of these is the question of liturgical abuses as observed by those commissioned by the Tridentine Fathers.

The establishment of a special Commission to report on liturgical abuses.

The Council had already brought up the question of the Missal in the first period (1546-1547)²⁵⁸. Before the beginning of the XXIInd Session, in 1562, the subject of the celebration of Mass was taken up in earnest. A general congregation of the 20th July 1562 appointed a Commission of seven prelates²⁵⁹ to look into the problem of abuses in the eucharistic celebration²⁶⁰. It met in six sessions²⁶¹, and on the 8th August 1562, presented to the Cardinal Legate Hercules of Gonzaga a long memoir that was later abridged in length²⁶².

The abuses they listed were in six categories: the Mass, the celebrant and ministers, the vestments and material requisites, the place of worship, the time of Mass, and connected with the lay assistance (*auditoribus*).

Liturgical abuses in particular

Concerning abuses in the Mass in itself, the Commission reported that many apocryphal texts: introits, prefaces²⁶³ and prayers, had crept into the Mass²⁶⁴. The prelates found confusion in the rubrics, and desired uniformity in the

²⁵⁸ Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, Westminster (Maryland) 1956, vol I, p 133.

²⁵⁹ CT VIII, 721, 16-22. The names, in Latin, of the members of the Commission were: Ludovicus Beccatellus, Iulius Pavesius, Urbanus de Ruere, Hercules Rettinger, Bernardus de Bene, Martinus de Corduba and Andreas Dutitius Sbardellatus.

²⁶⁰ J. Riviere, *La Messe durant la période de la Reforme et du Concile de Trente*, in: DTC, vol X (1929), col 1085-1142; col 1126; cf. CT VIII, 719-720: *Item quod deputentur aliqui patres ad colligendos abusos super dicto sacrificio missæ*.

²⁶¹ The dates of these meetings were: 24th, 25th, 26th and 31st July, and 5th and 8th August 1562.

²⁶² The text of this memoir is found in: CT VIII, 916-924, 9.

²⁶³ CT VIII, 917, 11-15 and note 3. Such prefaces were those of Saints Jerome, Augustine, Roch and Christopher.

²⁶⁴ CT VIII, 917, 6: ... *ut missalia omnia a superstitiosis et apocryphis orationibus repurgata*.

question of rites²⁶⁵. Significantly, they observed that, at the offertory, the non-consecrated bread and wine were respectively called *a holy and immaculate host* and the *chalice of salvation*²⁶⁶. They objected to the multiplied signs of the cross over the consecrated elements²⁶⁷, which are not in fact an abusive practice, but long established in liturgical tradition. The practice of farcing was considered an abuse²⁶⁸. They warned of the custom of deploying a specified numbers of candles for certain feasts²⁶⁹.

We now come to those abuses arising from avarice on the part of the clergy. Some priests took several stipends for one Mass²⁷⁰, or even worse, took the money and failed to celebrate the Mass. Parish priests were not celebrating Mass in their churches on Sundays and Feast Days, for they were celebrating Votive or Requiem Masses elsewhere²⁷¹. The prelates reported on the problem of *missæ siccæ* and Mass celebrated several times a day. The Commission disapproved of the practice of celebrating several successive Masses²⁷² or of celebrating private Masses while a Solemn Mass was being sung in the same church²⁷³. It was observed that bodies of the deceased in a state of advanced putrefaction, lying in chapels of repose under the church, were a disturbance to people at High Mass. All kinds of suggestions were made to abolish pecuniary abuses and to avoid offences against Christian modesty and decency, such as licentiousness and drunkenness at the occasions of processions and first Masses of newly ordained priests²⁷⁴.

²⁶⁵ CT VIII, 917, 9-10: *Ut certæ quædam cæremoniarum rubricæ præscribantur, quas celebrantes uniformiter servant, ne novis aut diversis ritibus populus offendatur et scandalizetur.*

²⁶⁶ CT VIII, 917, 16-18. These formulæ were not changed in the Missal of 1570.

²⁶⁷ CT VIII, 917, 19-20. This practice also continued in the Pianine Missal.

²⁶⁸ CT VIII, 917, 27-30. Farcing was the practice of introducing apocryphal texts into the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*. The Commission give the example of *gubernans Mariam, coronans*, etc which figured in the Roman Missal of 1474.

²⁶⁹ CT VIII, 917, 31-38; cf. A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1902, p 115. For example, the Mass of Saint Sophia required 7 candles, as did that of the Holy Spirit. That of the Twelve Apostles required 12 candles. The determining factor was allegory. The variation in the number of candles in the Tridentine Missal is governed by the solemnity of the Feast: two are used for Low Mass, and four, six or ten are used for High Mass.

²⁷⁰ CT VIII, 917, 39-42; cf. Franz, op. cit., p 84.

²⁷¹ CT VIII, 918, 1-5.

²⁷² CT VIII, 918, 6-7. This practice was continued in the Missal of 1570 at Christmas and All Souls.

²⁷³ CT VIII, 918, 7-8. This was not abolished in 1570.

²⁷⁴ CT VIII, 918, 16-40.

The seven prelates recommended that priests were to celebrate Mass with devotion and due preparation, in order that the Sacrifice is fruitful and that scandal is avoided, lest religion be brought into disrepute. Priests were also to respect the rubrics and liturgical uniformity²⁷⁵. They added their own improvised prayers to the official texts of the Mass and made ridiculous gesticulations. Priests bowed their heads when elevating the Host, and ran the risk of spilling the chalice when holding it over their heads as they genuflected or bowed. Liturgical gestures were grossly exaggerated and indecent, such as licking the paten after communion. The practice of elevating the host during the *Pater noster* was not unknown²⁷⁶, Some priests left the altar during Mass without just cause.

The Commission recommended that clerics, priests in particular, should be correctly dressed in a cassock and the prescribed vestments, and to shave their beards and tonsures. Only clerics were to assist the priest in the sanctuary, and were to wear the surplice. They were to learn Latin and pronounce it correctly. The mention of all this indicates that discipline was very slack in the late middle ages. All occasion of scandal was to be avoided, thus drunkards and public sinners were to be excluded from the church. The prelates noted every detail from their observations, to the point of remarking the bare feet and legs of Franciscan priests²⁷⁷.

The altar linen was frequently dirty, and vestments were ill maintained²⁷⁸. The Commission recommended that chalices should be made only of precious metal. Masses were being celebrated in profane places, and fetid and semi-putrid bodies of the dead were being brought to church for burial. Churches

²⁷⁵ CT VIII, 918,42 - 919,9.

²⁷⁶ At the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday, in the Pianine Missal, the Host is elevated with the right hand after the *Pater*. This is perhaps reminiscent of the *sancta sanctis* rite in the Byzantine Liturgy. In some Missals derived from the Roman rite, the paten was likewise elevated during the Embolism following the *Pater*. This rite evolved from the practice in *Ordo Romanus Primus* of bringing the paten to the altar with the *Sancta* upon it.

²⁷⁷ CT VIII, 919,39 - 920,27.

²⁷⁸ Cf. G. E. Aylmer and R. Cant, *A history of York Minster*, Oxford 1977, p 194: *A report made in 1519 by the vicars and chantry priests in response to an inquiry from the dean and chapter reveals the Minster in all its tarnished splendour. (...) Dust and cobwebs festooned the walls and pillars, and particularly the reredos, which they feared might fall to pieces unless it was cleaned and looked after better than it had been in the past. The ragged and torn coverings of the little altars, they thought, would have disgraced an upland village, let alone a great cathedral. The hangings of the choir lay neglected in the presbytery, fouled by dogs and the wax dripped from candles. (...) At the high mass the priests made no distinction between the nine lessons and the double feast days and allowed the children to come around the altar in dirty albs. (...) Many of the albs for the priests were torn, and so skimpy that they had a struggle to get them on. (...) Then, after Mass, there were difficulties in the vestry, as the sink was stopped up and the priests had to wash their mass vessels in a bucket, when all that needed doing was for the pulley to be mended and the sink unblocked".*

were turned to profane use and parodies of the Mass were performed on occasions²⁷⁹. Churches were becoming places of ridiculous spectacles.

It had been a long tradition in the Church that Mass was not to be celebrated before dawn or in the afternoon or evening. This prescription was not always observed. Priests were marrying couples at the wrong times of the year²⁸⁰.

The abuse, concerning the laity, against which the Commission spoke the most severely was the non-observance of silence at Mass; people talked among themselves and walked around the church²⁸¹ during the ceremonies. Vagrants begged in churches, and the prelates suggested that they should be made to remain outside the doors of the church. Some people came to church indecently dressed and allowed animals to wander into the sanctuary. The Commission wished to see the ancient discipline restored concerning the unbaptised and excommunicated. They should be allowed to assist only at the Mass of the Catechumens. They desired also that people should attend services in their own parish churches and cathedrals²⁸².

Deliberations of the Fathers concerning remedies

From this long list of abuses, the prelates drew up a *Compendium abusuum circa sacrificium missæ*²⁸³. The most salient point of this new document is the first paragraph that calls for a reform of the Roman Missal in order to assure the uniformity of the eucharistic celebration. All that was abusive was to be abolished. The rest was to be continued and propagated by all priests, regular and secular²⁸⁴. The rest of the *Compendium* draws up the previously

²⁷⁹ Cf. Lodi, *Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum*, Rome 1979, pp 1712-1717. These pages contain two parody-mass rites, in barbaric Latin: the *Missa contra Hussitas* and the *Missa potatorum et lusorum*. The collect of the latter reads: *Potemus. Deus qui tres quadratos decios sexaginta tribus oculis remunerasti presta quesumus ut omnes qui vestimentorum suorum pondere gravantur ipsorum deciorum iactatione denudentur. Per doleum nostrum avumque Bachum, qui tecum bibit et cartat per omnia pocula pocolorum. Stramen.*

²⁸⁰ CT VIII, 920,28 - 921,16.

²⁸¹ Cf. L. Bouyer, *Liturgy and architecture*, Notre Dame 1967, p 80. It can be pertinently asked if active participation in the Mass would not be facilitated by allowing people a certain freedom, as is found in Oriental churches. Even in the west, pews or seating arrangements for the faithful were not known until after the seventeenth century, as is still the case in some southern Italian churches.

²⁸² CT VIII, 921, 17-35.

²⁸³ CT VIII, 921,40 - 924,9.

²⁸⁴ CT VIII, 921, 40-46: *Ut sancta Dei ecclesia, quoad fieri potest, unius labii sit, utque uniformitas celebrandi missas inter eos servetur, qui instituto et ritu S.R.E. celebrant, abusque, qui hominum incuria et superstitione fortasse in venerandum missæ sacrificium irrepsere, tollantur: missalia secundum usum et veteram consuetudinem S.R.E. reformentur, omnibus iis, quæ clanculum irrepsere, repurgatis, ut omni ex parte eadem Pura, nitida et integra proponantur, quibus de cetero*

mentioned abuses in a more concise form, but no longer in the form of observations, but of proposals for reform.

On the 10th September 1562, nine canons on abuses in the Mass were submitted to the Fathers for examination²⁸⁵, The first one of these proposes to abolish *profani lucri et sordida cupiditas* and to root out fraudulent practices in regard to stipends²⁸⁶. The second calls for an end to *missæ sicca*²⁸⁷. Canon 3 desired that priests should celebrate no more than one Mass a day, unless pastoral need necessitated it, on pain of suspension²⁸⁸. The fourth called for a restricted use of Votive Masses, and that these were not to be celebrated on Sundays and Feast Days²⁸⁹. The fifth concerns the Mass of the Dead and the right occasions for its celebration²⁹⁰, Canon 6 expresses a desire, out of respect for the Holy Mysteries, to abolish the celebration of Mass anywhere but in a consecrated building. In cases of necessity, priests would have to consult their Ordinary²⁹¹, Canons 7 and 8 concern the care of liturgical material and the way of saying and singing the Mass²⁹², The final canon (9) recommends the exclusion from churches of the excommunicated and public sinners²⁹³.

The Fathers discussed these canons, and the drafts were shortened. The minutes of these discussions²⁹⁴ are lengthy and meticulous, and it is out of our

celebrantes omnes uti teneantur, tam regulares quam seculares, salvis tamen consuetudinibus legitimis et non abusivibus regnorum.

²⁸⁵ CT VIII, 926,25 - 928,5.

²⁸⁶ CT VIII, 926, 25-32.

²⁸⁷ CT VIII, 926, 33-39; cf. Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 385. The term *missa sicca* was originally derived from a form of rite customary for the Communion of the sick. The priest read the fore-mass in the sick-room and proceeded to the *Pater noster*, having skipped the Canon, and gave communion under the form of bread. Hence the *dry mass* was so-called, for it involved the use of no liquid. The nearest equivalent to this celebration allowed in the Tridentine Missal is the ancient Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday, when no Mass is celebrated, or the Blessing of Palms on Palm Sunday. The *missa sicca* was a commemorative rite, used in such places where a real Mass would not be prudent, for example on a ship at sea. However, the *dry mass* became a devotion whose use had become abusive, hence the need for its abolition.

²⁸⁸ CT VIII 926,40 - 927,3.

²⁸⁹ CT VIII 927, 4-8.

²⁹⁰ CT VIII 927, 9-14.

²⁹¹ CT VIII 927, 15-22.

²⁹² CT VIII 927, 23-46.

²⁹³ CT VIII 928, 1-5.

²⁹⁴ CT VIII 928,6 - 942,50.

scope to elaborate on them. The *Decretum de observandis et evitandis in celebratione missæ*²⁹⁵ was passed on the 17th September 1562. This was the final result of the Commission's work. Most of the text is merely a resume; it had to be in order that all the Council Fathers be in agreement.

The abuses that headed the list for condemnation was the question of Mass-stipends:

“The local ordinaries shall be zealously concerned and be bound to prohibit and abolish all those things which either covetousness, which is a serving of idols, or irreverence, which can scarcely be separated from ungodliness, or superstition, a false imitation of true piety, have introduced. They shall in the first place, as regards avarice, absolutely forbid conditions of compensations of whatever kind, bargains, and whatever is given for the celebration of new masses; also those importunate and unbecoming demands, rather than requests, for alms and other things of this kind which border on simoniacal taint or certainly savour of filthy lucre”.

The Fathers were unanimous in declaring:

“that irreverence may be avoided, each in his own diocese shall forbid that any wandering or unknown priest be permitted to celebrate mass. Furthermore, they shall permit no one who is publicly and notoriously wicked either to minister at the altar or to be present at the sacred services; nor suffer the holy sacrifice to be celebrated by any seculars and regulars whatsoever in private houses or entirely outside the church and the oratories dedicated solely to divine worship”.

The question of unsuitable music comes up, as does that of the conduct of those assisting at Mass:

“They shall also banish from the churches all such music which, whether by the organ or in the singing, contains things that are lascivious or impure; likewise all worldly conduct, vain and profane conversations, wandering around, noise and clamour, so that the house of God may be seen to be and may be truly called a house of prayer”.

The Fathers imposed discipline and condemned once and for all the use of unlawful “liturgical” texts and superstitious customs:

“Finally, that no room may be given to superstition, they shall by ordinance and prescribed penalties provide that priests do not celebrate at other than proper hours; or make use of rites and ceremonies and prayers in the celebration of masses other than those that have been approved by the Church and have been received through frequent and praiseworthy usage. They shall completely banish from the Church the practice of any fixed number of masses and candles, which has its origin in superstitious worship rather than in true religion; and they shall instruct the people”.

²⁹⁵ CT VIII, 962,23 - 963,31. This decree, concerning disciplinary matters, is not found in Denzinger-Schönmetzer.

Some Fathers wished for slight amendments on doctrinal grounds. One Father, Lavellinus, desired to abolish the use of portable altars²⁹⁶. Nevertheless, the decree was promulgated. It was certainly in the light of this that the Roman Missal was to be reformed.

The need for a codified Roman Missal

The Council observed the gravity of the liturgical crisis of the late middle ages, and largely solved this situation by defining the Faith of the Church concerning the Sacraments. However, a practical reform in liturgical discipline was sorely felt. This would be partly enforced by the Holy See and diocesan bishops, but a more radical solution was needed: the fixing of the Roman liturgical tradition in form of a codified Missal. This was, in fact, a particularly significant point of the Commission's discussions on abuses.

In many places, the missals used in the churches and cathedrals were interpolated with untraditional and apocryphal elements, inspired by unorthodox theological trends. These were integral parts of some Missals that were composed after the thirteenth century. The elements of these rites most criticised by the Commission were the introits, prefaces and prayers. As for the Canon and the Offertory, these were usually strictly Roman in form.

Medieval liturgists were not content with the poverty of prefaces they found in the Missal, especially for the saints' feasts. A number of prefaces were composed for singularly venerated saints: John the Baptist, Augustine, Jerome, Francis of Assisi, Roch, and Christopher²⁹⁷. Many of these contained legendary contents, and as such were to be rejected. The humanist culture of the members of the Commission reacted sharply to such texts.

The prayers and introits similarly contrasted with the sober simplicity of the Roman rite, and in the bishops' eyes, led to superstition. Such elements were liable to render a whole Missal suspect, and this is the reason that such were finally abolished in 1570, unless they had a custom of more than two hundred years. It was considered unlikely that missals composed before 1370 would be tainted with errors and superstitious texts. The Commission did not say precisely which missals should be discarded and which ones to be retained.

The Commission prescribed a reform, an unification of the Missal²⁹⁸. We know that the Missal was already under consideration, for material was

²⁹⁶ CT VIII, 964, 47-48.

²⁹⁷ Jungmann, op. cit., II, p 121; cf. A. Zak, *Über die Präfationen*, in: *Theol. prakt. Quartalschrift*, 58 (1905), pp 307-325.

²⁹⁸ CT VIII, 916-921.

brought from Rome to Trent²⁹⁹. Saint Charles Borromeo wrote again to the Legates the 20th October 1563, advising that a Gregorian Sacramentary had been brought from the Vatican library for the Tridentine Fathers to examine in view to work on the modern Roman Missal³⁰⁰.

The question of working on the liturgical books was discussed at the General Congregation of the 26th to 27th October 1563, as the Bishop of Salamanca, Pietro Gongales de Mendoga, records in his diary³⁰¹. This deliberation is recorded in a letter of the Bishop of Fænza, Giovanni Battista Sighiselli, to Sirleto, thanking the latter for his observations³⁰². It was, however, impossible to consider undertaking a reform of the Missal at the Council itself, for risk of an undue delay in bringing all the proceedings to a close. At the end of the twenty-fifth and ultimate session, held the 4th December 1563, the Fathers decided to refer the whole question to the Roman Pontiff³⁰³.

CONCLUSION

In general, the first concern of the Council of Trent was to defend the dogmatic teaching of the Church against protestant attacks, and to reform ecclesiastical discipline, thereby to bring about a solution of the late medieval crisis. It was thus primarily an apologetic approach, from which the pastoral dimension is exposed.

In this context, we see that liturgical accessories (*adiunctis*), for the Fathers of Trent, are therefore necessary because of the needs of human nature, and that long usage and tradition enshrine them. The principle of retaining any kind of

²⁹⁹ P. Frutaz, *Contributo alla storia della riforma del Messale promulgato da san Pio V nel 1570*, in: *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento*, Padova 1960, p 188. The 6th July 1563, Saint Charles Borromeo wrote to the Legates: *Mons. Rev.mo di Trani (card. Giov. Bernardino Scotti) mette insieme le annotationi che si fecero al tempo di Paulo IIII, sopra il breuiario et il messale, et dice che le manderà quanto prima potra a le SS.rie VV. Ill.me insieme con alcune considerationi che papa Paulo medesimo haueua fatte sopra questa materia* (G. Mercati, *Opere minori*, III (1907-1916, Città del Vaticano 1937, pp 370-371).

³⁰⁰ Frutaz, op. cit., pp 188-189: *Hauendo il S.or Car.le di loreno ueduto in questa libreria vaticana un Messale antico che chiamano di san Gregorio; sua Sig.ria Ill.ma hà guidicato molto a proposito che si mandi costà, acciò sia uisto da li Deputati a riformar il Messale moderno. Così di ordine di N. S.re io lo mando con questo ordinario a le SS. VV. Ill.me in una tela cerata, et ben conditionato. Prego quelle a farmi dar auuiso a parte de la riceuuta per satisfattione, et chiarezza di questi custodi de la libreria, et sopra tutto faranno hauergli buona cura, acciò non si perda, ma si restituisca in man loro, et si riporti insieme con gli altri a Roma* (Archivio Segreto Vaticano, *Conc.* 68, f. 139 (304)). We also know that the Tridentine Fathers also had recourse to a contemporary Missal, edited at Venice in 1558.

³⁰¹ Frutaz, op. cit., p 189; cf. CT II, 706.

³⁰² Frutaz, op. cit., p 189-190; cf. Biblioteca Ap. Vaticana: cod. Vat.1at.6189, f.198.

³⁰³ CT IX, 1106 (*De indice librorum, et catechismo, breuiario et missali*).

liturgical form, for the celebration of the Sacraments and Divine Office, was safeguarded.

Having seen the basis of liturgy, the Fathers were aware that there needed to be a reform in the sense of a fixing of the tradition, on the basis of the Roman liturgy. The principles of reform were thus set: restoration of the Roman Rite, reform of liturgical discipline in order to abolish abuses, retention of the Latin liturgical language as the norm, refusal to give a whit to Protestant pressure.

As a result of the Decree of the twenty-fifth Session, the Council gave to the Roman Curia the exclusive right of jurisdiction in liturgical matters. It was obviously the most prudent solution to the medieval situation of liturgical anarchy, where diocesan bishops and religious Orders enjoyed an excessive independence. The Council of Trent, in matters of liturgy, as in all other aspects of Church life, marked the beginning of a policy of Roman centralism.

IV. THE POST-TRIDENTINE REFORM OF THE ROMAN MISSAL

We have seen that most of the deliberations of the theologians and Fathers of the Council of Trent were of a very general nature. The Council established that the faithful had need of the liturgy to nourish their spiritual lives, that ritual ceremonial was an integral and deeply rooted aspect of human nature and the Catholic tradition, and for these reasons should not be abolished. On account of the late medieval situation of liturgical anarchy, it was decided that the liturgical life of the Church was in need of a reform, but without radically altering or substituting the rite. Though some Fathers made suggestions for particular reforms³⁰⁴, the Council confided the work of codifying the liturgy to the Holy See. We have discovered, in studying the medieval development of the liturgy, that our period is characterised by a theme of codification of the oral tradition and Roman centralism. By the late Middle Ages, the sense of liturgical mystery and transcendence, such as was known in early Christianity or in the Byzantine Church, had been largely lost in the west. Thus, it was no longer possible to leave liturgical development to diocesan bishops, religious communities and parish priests. To compensate for such profound ignorance in liturgical matters, it became necessary to codify the rubrics in canonical form, and to fix the style of celebration. The spirit of spontaneity was inevitably lost, but, in an environment of liturgical and spiritual anarchy, discipline and order were gained.

THE POST-CONCILIAR COMMISSION OF PIUS IV

After the death of Paul IV in 1559, Giovanni Angelo di Medici was elected Pope after a Conclave of four months. He took the name of Pius IV (1559-1565)³⁰⁵. Unlike his predecessor, di Medici took a great interest in the progress of the Council of Trent.

³⁰⁴ Cf. Reinold Theisen, *Mass liturgy and the Council of Trent*, Collegeville 1965, pp 111-112. Such suggestions for reforms in the liturgy included some of those advanced by protestant reformers, eg: the use of the vernacular language, communion under both Kinds for the laity, or a restructuring of the Canon.

³⁰⁵ Jean Mathieu-Rosay, *Chronologie des Papes*, Bruxelles 1988, pp 382-384. Giovanni Angelo di Medici was born at Milan the 31st March 1499. Despite his name, he had no relation with the famous Florentine di Medicis family. Having studied medicine and law, he began his career under Paul III (1534-1549) as Papal Commissary to the army which fought against the Turks in Hungary. He became Bishop of Ragusa in 1545, and Cardinal in 1549. Having acceded to the See of Peter the 26th December 1559, unlike his predecessor, Paul IV, Pius IV was a much more affable man, a born diplomat. His moral life was typical of many men of the Renaissance, being the father of three illegitimate children, all born before 1542. He abolished many of the excessive measures taken by Paul IV, re-establishing the censored Scriptural Books and patristic writings to their rightful honour. He practised nepotism and set his family

The Council having resumed in 1562, Pius IV sent to the Fathers the liturgical work of Paul IV that concerned mainly the Breviary. It was to avoid further delays in closing the Council that the Legates finally confided the liturgical reform to Pius IV, this resolution, as we saw in the last chapter, having been approved in the twenty fifth Session. The manuscripts of Paul IV were taken back to Rome, and Pius IV instituted a Commission to undertake the work of codifying the Missal and Breviary. Pius IV had barely instituted his Commission when he died in 1565³⁰⁶.

The work of this Commission founded by Pius IV was to produce a definitive edition of the Roman Missal and Breviary. The work of liturgical reform was to be undertaken in Rome, not only for practical reasons, but also because it was seen to be fitting that the Rite should be that of Rome, and not a mixture of any number of particular rites.

We know little neither about this Commission nor of its work³⁰⁷. The Commission, much to the frustration of historians, left no minutes of its deliberations³⁰⁸. However, the liturgical historian is not left totally bereft of working material.

Available sources and documents

Two major documents on the Tridentine reform of the Missal exist, and give us some idea of the Commission's working methods³⁰⁹. The other most

against that of the deceased Paul IV, murdering the nephew of the previous Pope, Cardinal Carlo Caraffa. In the face of pressure from German Bishops under the Emperor Ferdinand to introduce neo-protestant reforms such as communion under both Kinds, the abolition of clerical celibacy and a conciliarist Church constitution, Pius IV forbade the continuation of these discussions in order to protect the rights of the Holy See. In 1564, Pius IV promulgated the *Tridentine Profession of Faith* which all bishops and priests had to sign. He spared no efforts in reforming the College of Cardinals and the Conclave, and to impose the obligation for bishops to reside in their dioceses. Pius IV died the 9th December 1565 having successfully closed the Council.

³⁰⁶ Guéranger, *Institutions liturgiques*, I, Le Mans-Paris 1841, pp 413-414.

³⁰⁷ P. Frutaz, *Contributo alla storia Messale promulgato da san Pio V nel 1570*, in: *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento*, Padova 1960, p 191; Theodor Klauser, *A short history of the western liturgy*, Oxford 1979, p 124-129; Guéranger, op. cit., p 415.

³⁰⁸ J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite (Missarum Sollemnia)*, Westminster (Maryland) 1986, vol I, p 135. Cf. J. Schmid, *Studien über die Reform des römischen Breviers und Missale unter Pius V*, in: *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 66 (1884), pp 451-483, 621-664; P. Batiffol, *Histoire du Bréviaire romain*, Paris 1911, pp 294-314; Jedin, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform der liturgischen Bücher*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, LIX (1945), pp 5-38; idem., *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Römischen Messbuches*, in: *Liturgisches Leben VI* (1939), pp 52-54.

³⁰⁹ These documents are conserved at the Vatican Library: cod. Vat. lat. 6171, f. 67r-v (12 questions treated by the Commission); cod. Vat. lat. 12607, ff. 8r-11v (information for the

important document is the Bull *Quo primum* of Pius V, in which some indications concerning the Commission are given. Amato Pietro Frutaz, during extensive research in the Vatican Library, discovered the two Vatican documents. The only other available document is a Missal printed at Venice the 8th October 1497 by Giovanni Battista di Sessa³¹⁰. In this Missal, there is to be found a considerable quantity of notes handwritten by Cardinal William Sirleto (1514-1585)³¹¹. The authenticity of these notes is verifiable by comparison with other autograph manuscripts of Sirleto³¹². Though we have already seen evidence of his interest in this matter at the Council of Trent, in form of letters to the Legates, these notes give valuable indications on Sirleto's work on the Missal. This Missal annotated by Sirleto is divided into five parts: the Calendar, Temporal, Sanctoral, Common of Saints and Votive masses. The content, except the Calendar, is substantially identical to the *Princeps* edition of the *Missale Romanum* published by Antonio Zarotto at Milan in 1474. Sirleto's annotations are mostly in the margins, but sometimes between the printed lines. In the Calendar, many saints' feasts are deleted and notes inserted³¹³.

The working methods of the Commission

The task of the Commission was not to give to the Church a *new* liturgy, but to purify and correct the books of the traditional western liturgy according to solid historical sources and theological truth, and in conformity to canonical decisions. It was decided that this restoration should be within a single rite:

correction of the Missal). The latter document bears the signature of Leonardo Marini, a member of the Commission and Archbishop of Lanciano (1560-1566) and Bishop of Alba (1566-1572).

³¹⁰ Bibl. Ap. Vat., Inc. IV,29; cf. Duc de Rivoli, *Les Missels imprimés à Venise de 1481 à 1600. Description, illustration, bibliographie*, Paris 1896; M. Sander, *Le livre à figures italiens depuis 1467 jusqu'à 1530. Essai de sa bibliographie et de son histoire*, II, Milano 1942.

³¹¹ Frutaz, op. cit., pp 193-194. William Sirleto was born in 1514 of poor parents, and studied brilliantly in philosophy, mathematics and theology. He excelled particularly in ancient languages, and his talent was quickly recognized when he went to Rome. He was taken under the wing of Cardinal Cervini, who became Pope in 1555 under the name of Marcel II, and made Sirleto his secretary. He became protonotary under Paul IV and was made a prelate. Pius V confided in him the charge of librarian of the Roman Church. Sirleto took an important part in the work of the Commission, particularly on the Roman Catechism, the Missal, Breviary and the Vulgate of Sixtus V. During Schotto's absences, Sirleto took over the presidency of the Commission. His work was highly esteemed by Pius V. He died in 1585.

³¹² Cf. Cardinal G. Mercati, *Opere minori*, Città del Vaticano 1937, Studi e Testi 76-79; Mgr Pio Paschini, *La Riforma Gregoriana del Martirologio Romano*, in: *Schola Cattolica* 1923; *Guglielmo Sirleto ed il Decreto Tridentino sull'edizione critica della Bibbia*, Lecco 1935; *Guglielmo Sirleto prima del cardinalato*, in: *Tre ricerche sulla storia della Chiesa nel Cinquecento*, Roma (1945) pp 155-281; *Il cardinale Guglielmo Sirleto in Calabria*, in: *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia*, I (1947), pp 22-37.

³¹³ Frutaz, op. cit., p 196-197.

that of Rome. It was the Roman Rite on which were based the great majority of western local usages³¹⁴.

Despite the assiduous research of many liturgical historians, such as Jedin, Bäumer, Batiffol, Frutaz, Jungmann and Schmid, if any minutes of the Commission's deliberations are still in existence, they have yet to come to light. We have only the Missal annotated by Sirleto, the Bull *Quo primum* and the two scanty documents from the Vatican Library. Though we can but make conjectures on the Commission's working methods, we do know a few things about the Commission itself.

Pius IV having died on the 10th December 1565, Michael Ghislieri succeeded him, taking the name of Pius V (1566-1572)³¹⁵. Saint Pius V confirmed the institution of the Commission and augmented its numbers. Pius IV had chosen four members, and this number was increased to eight³¹⁶: Cardinal Bernardine Schotto (Sciotto or Scotti) (†1568)³¹⁷, William Sirleto, Julius Poggiani (Giulio Poggi)³¹⁸, Curtio di Franchi³¹⁹, Vincenzo Masso³²⁰, Messer Accursio³²¹, Cardinal Antonio Caraffa (†1591)³²² and Pedro Ponce de Leon de

³¹⁴ S. Bäumer, *Histoire du Bréviaire*, vol II, Freiburg 1967, p 167.

³¹⁵ Mathieu-Rosey, op. cit., pp 386-388. Michael Ghislieri (1504-1572) was born at Bosco in the Savoie and entered the Dominican Order at the age of 15. After his university studies at Bologna, he taught philosophy and theology. He became an Inquisitor, and under Paul IV, he became Bishop of Sutri and Nepi, then in 1557 he was created Cardinal. As Pope under the name of Pius V, Ghislieri practised a life of extraordinary austerity and charity. He reformed the diocese of Rome, repressing prostitution and reforming the life of the clergy. Pius V condemned the doctrine of Baius and excommunicated Queen Elizabeth I of England in 1570. His great triumph was his victory over the Turks at the Battle of Lepanto in 1571. Pius V died in 1572, and was canonized by Clement XI in 1712.

³¹⁶ Bäumer, op. cit., pp 168-174.

³¹⁷ Cardinal Bernardine Schotto presided the deliberative meetings of the Commission, apart from a few months he spent away from Rome in his episcopal residence at Piacenza. He originated from a noble family from Magliano di Sabina, and entered the Theatines in 1525. He excelled in his studies of ancient oriental languages and in his administrative talents. He was made Bishop of Trani by Paul IV in 1555, and Cardinal soon afterwards. He was translated to Piacenza four years later and died at Rome in 1568.

³¹⁸ Julius Poggiani (Giulio Poggi), an esteemed latinist worked closely with Sirleto, above all in the literary composition of the Breviary lessons, and the adaption of those taken from the Breviary of Quiñones.

³¹⁹ Curtio di Franchi took an important advisory role in the reform work of the Commission. He became Canon of Saint Peter's in 1568 and was proposed to Pius V as canonical Visitor of several Italian dioceses.

³²⁰ Vincenzo Masso was a Theatine regular cleric, reputed for his knowledge of ecclesiastical history.

³²¹ Messer Accursio is mentioned in a note of Cardinal Sirleto as having collaborated in the work of the Commission, but we know nothing precise about him.

Plasencia (1559-1573)³²³. It is very possible that other scholars or advisors belonged to the Commission, under Pius IV and Pius V, who worked on the Missal and Breviary.

What we can gather from Sirleto's missal is that not all the corrections he proposed were included in the definitive rite of 1570³²⁴. Sirleto made no change in the *Ordo Missæ* except for a simplification of the *fractio panis*³²⁵.

Investigations by Theodor Klauser, Ernst Focke and Hans Heinrichs³²⁶, carried out during World War II, gave ideas of a working method of the Commission by what is known about its work on the Calendar. We shall treat this in greater detail later in this chapter, but it suffices to mention that the whole spirit of the Commission was to restore the pristine purity of the Roman liturgy. By what was removed from the Calendar, it is possible to say that the ideal the Commission had in mind was the Roman Rite of the time of Gregory VII, who was in its eyes the champion and defender of Roman tradition. The guiding ideal was that of Roman centralism. The restored liturgy was then sparingly embellished with a few more recent feasts of universal interest. The result was a purified rite in which anarchy and abuse

³²² Cardinal Antonio Caraffa according to a text in the Vatican Library (Codex Urbinas, Cod. Vatic. 1666, fol. 119), belonged to the Commission. From his short biography by Moroni, (*Dizionario di erud. stor. eccl.*, vol IX, p 245, col a.. *Fu nominato prefetto della Congregazione del concilio e della stabilità da Sisto V per la correzione della Biblia, del Breviario e del Messale romano.*), we know something of his work on the Vulgate, the Breviary and the Missal. Caraffa was born at Naples in 1538 from a noble family. He came to Rome under the protection of his uncle Paul IV, but fell into disgrace when the Pope died, and was deprived of his Canon's stall at St Peter's. Pius V reinstated him and made him Cardinal in 1568. On the death of Sirleto, he was appointed Vatican librarian by Gregory XIII. He was equally honoured by Sixtus V. Caraffa translated several writings of the Greek Fathers into Latin, made a corrected version of the Septuagint with notes and a few acts of the Latin and Greek Councils. He led an austere life in his palace, practicing penance and charity towards the poor and sick. He was Cardinal Protector of the Olivetan Benedictines, and died in 1591.

³²³ Pedro Ponce de Leon de Plasencia was a foreign bishop who did not take a direct part in the work of the Commission. However, he corresponded with Cardinal Sirleto, and was certainly very useful for their work. We can quote a proposition he made concerning the Mass: the Saints named in the Canon of the Mass should be taken into account when working on the Calendar. However, this would concern the Sanctoral of the Breviary more than the rite of Mass.

³²⁴ Frutaz, op. cit., p 197.

³²⁵ Ibid., p 198. The change proposed was to remove the *little elevation* at the *Per ipsum* (end of the Canon), which was not adopted in the 1570 Missal. Another proposition was a rewording of the formula for when the priest drops a small part of the broken Host into the chalice before the *Agnus Dei*.

³²⁶ Klauser, op. cit., p 124.

had no part, thus facilitating a disciplinary and pastoral reform of liturgical practice in the Church.

THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE COMMISSION'S WORK

It is clear that the principle which determined all the deliberations was the restoration of the Roman Rite as it stood in the eleventh century under the Pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-1085), a period of relative spiritual health and vitality in the Church. The emphasis was heavily laid on the restoration of a traditional Roman rite, and not the mixture of a number of rites or the invention of a new order to take the place of the old.

The Commission had decided against merely giving guidelines for the abolition of abuses; it established an uniform Missal, based on the *Missale secundum consuetudinem Romanæ Curia*³²⁷. Finally, the restored and codified Roman Missal was ready for promulgation two years after that of the Breviary, which was published in the summer of 1568. This Missal (*Missale Romanum ex decreto ss. Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*) was promulgated by a Bull of the 14th July 1570.

Restoration and codification of the Roman Rite

The Commission's cardinal ideal was a return to the ancient liturgy of the city of Rome, but the prelates did not intend to make an archæological reconstruction of the Gregorian Sacramentary, with which they were familiar, or an earlier rite. Already in 1563, when the correction of the Missal was being discussed at the Council, a Vatican manuscript of the Gregorian Sacramentary was sent from Rome to Trent. The fact that the Commission investigated the ancient sources is attested from this extract from the Bull *Quo primum*:

*“We resolved accordingly to delegate this task to a select commission of scholars; and they, having at every stage of their work and with the utmost care collated the ancient codices in Our Vatican Library and reliable (original or amended) codices from elsewhere, and having also consulted the writings of ancient and approved authors who have bequeathed to us records related to the said sacred rites, thus restored the Missal itself to the pristine form and rite of the holy Fathers”*³²⁸.

As we know nearly nothing about the Commission's deliberations about the Mass, it is reasonable to compare what is known about its work on the Breviary³²⁹. The word that most adequately describes the Commission's work is restoration, not compilation or fabrication. By this means the continuity of

³²⁷ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 135.

³²⁸ Pius V, *Bull Quo primum*, quoted in: Frutaz, op. cit., 192-193.

³²⁹ Bäumer, op. cit., pp 175-176.

tradition is assured in the liturgy³³⁰, Frequent declarations of Cardinal Sirleto prove this attitude that the Commission wished to create nothing new. It set out to improve the traditional rite, adapting a few details to the needs of the times, without substantially altering it³³¹.

Referring to one of the Vatican documents previously mentioned, the *Information for the Correction of the Missal*, we observe that the Commission links closely the Missal and the Breviary. It would logically follow that the principle governing the reform of the Breviary would apply to that of the Missal.

The prelates wished to take as reference a fully developed Roman liturgical rite, but one in which the late medieval decadence played no part. The Missal of 1570 was to restore simplicity in liturgical life, to create unity in ritual and to give clarity to the rubrics³³². The achievement of the work of liturgical centralization would prove a bulwark against protestant influence, but at the price of the rich pluriformity hitherto known in the West³³³. The work of purifying accretions was accomplished with remarkable energy, and the members of the Commission were not held back from abolishing many features held to be untouchable by pious minds, for example the Marian interpolations in the Gloria. The Commission did not seek to abolish certain recent elements of value, for example, the new polyphonic church music which was of true merit³³⁴, for it was interested more in the reality of Church life than in sterile speculation and archæologism.

The ideal of restoring a eleventh century version of the Roman Mass with a few contemporary elements was very certainly a measure of pastoral realism and the expression of a respect of tradition. Not once during the Council of Trent or what little we know of the Commission's deliberations is our attention drawn towards a notion of restoring a primitive liturgy, or fabricating a new rite to replace the old. Such ideas were known only among the Protestant Reformers. The Commission was much less concerned with matters such as communion under both Kinds or the use of the vernacular

³³⁰ Ibid, p 176: *Par ce moyen seul on pourrait conserver la continuité de la tradition chrétienne dans la liturgie et montrer que, de même que la foi et l'organisation de l'Eglise sont toujours restées les mêmes, de même sa liturgie ne s'est pas modifiée essentiellement, encore que chacun des membres de ce corps organique se soit développé dans le courant des siècles a la façon de tout corps vivant.*

³³¹ In one of his writings (cod. Vat. 6171), Sirleto protests against the expression *compilare* which figures in the Bull of promulgation of the Breviary. For the president of the Commission, the Breviary was not *compilatatum* but corrected and reformed: *Fu riformato co'li Breviarii antichi quanto alle cose essenziali e importanti* (cod. Vat. 6171, fol. 15).

³³² Klauser, op. cit., p 127.

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ Jungmann, op. cit., I, pp 137-138.

instead of Latin, for no mention of these subjects is found in the documents; the prelates were interested in the rite. The Commission was interested not only in restoring the traditional Roman liturgy, but also in cutting away all the later accretions that favoured abuses in the celebration of Mass.

The resolution of liturgical anarchy and the abolition of abuses

With the uppermost principle of restoring the traditional Roman liturgy, the most urgent task of the Commission was to put an end to the abuses in the Church, in accordance with the document drawn up by the Conciliar Commission on this subject. It is clear that liturgical anarchy reigned in the pre-Tridentine Church, as was reported to the Council. In some places, different rites could be found in a single church, in which each priest did as he pleased³³⁵. The obvious solution to this was to impose a single rite onto the whole Latin Church, which was to be legally binding on pain of canonical sanctions. For this reason, it was no longer possible to leave liturgical matters under the jurisdiction of diocesan bishops.

The desire to restore the Roman Rite was certainly motivated by the consideration of what was causing the abuses, and the effects of a defective eucharistic theology. Many of the late interpolations, arising from private religiosity, which were not in accord with the spirit of the Roman liturgy, or which were of a legendary character were eliminated³³⁶. It was felt that the removal of these elements would make abusive practice more difficult. In this spirit, the rubrics were clarified and expressed in canonical form. This enabled an uniform celebration by educated and uneducated priests alike.

However, the Commission and Pius V did not intend to impose the Roman Missal of 1570 with an absolute rigour in the whole Church, and this is where we can detect a principle of moderation. We know that liturgical uniformity in the whole Church was never an absolute ideal, but it was reasonable that the liturgy within a single Rite, such as that of Rome, should be uniform and its celebration disciplined³³⁷.

In respecting local rites of more than two hundred years of continuous usages, Pius V showed that he did not wish to destroy all local or particular liturgies, but to abolish those that were the cause and effect of abusive practice. This was the case with the religious Orders that had introduced their

³³⁵ Cf. Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 134; Jedin, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Römischen Messbuches*, p 34-35. Jedin observed that the confusion of rites was confounded by the onset of the Reformation. At this time, many priests started their own reforms, in some cases even leaving out the canon.

³³⁶ Jedin, *Concilio tridentino e riforma dei libri liturgici*, in: *Chiesa della Fede. Chiesa della storia*, Brescia 1972 (Italian translation of the article in *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, , p 416.

³³⁷ Adrian Fortescue, *The Mass: a study of the Roman liturgy*, London 1917, p 208.

own variants of the Romano-Frankish liturgy from the eleventh century. Pius V's own Order, the Dominicans, had their own liturgy, which he celebrated even as Pope. Many dioceses, such as Milan, Toledo, Braga and Lyon, took advantage of this concession. The Congregation of Rites in view of restoring them and abolishing abuses later reformed some of these rites.

THE ROMAN MISSAL OF 1570 IN DETAIL

Having examined the general principles of the Commission, we have now to consider how the Missal was restored to the standards of the Roman tradition. Pius V, in his Bull, wrote that the Commission had restored the Missal in the light of ancient liturgical and patristic sources. Most of the available information from our sources concerns the Calendar; the rest has to be conjectured mainly by comparing the 1570 Missal with the Commission's known Sources³³⁸.

The Order of Mass

It is for the purpose of a restoration of the Roman liturgy, in the light of older documents, that the Commission chose the Missal of the Roman Curia and the *Ordo* of John Burchard³³⁹ as its two primary sources. The text of the Order of Mass before and after 1570 are nearly identical. This was perhaps the least changed aspect of the restored liturgy. The differences are few, but are significant.

Sirleto proposed very few changes to the Ordinary, and not everything he wanted was adopted. For the feast of the Transfiguration, Sirleto proposed the Preface of the Epiphany, which was turned down³⁴⁰. He deleted Prefaces for the feasts of Saint Francis of Assisi and Saint Augustine. Sirleto corrected the text of the final Blessing from *In unitate Sancti Spiritus, benedicat vos Pater et Filius* to the formula found in the 1570 Missal: *Benedicat vos omnipotens Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus*³⁴¹.

We know of no other deliberations or propositions concerning the Ordinary. The differences between the Missal of 1570 and the former Missal of the Roman Curia are apparent on comparison of the two texts. The first innovation in the *Ordo Missæ* is that all the prayers at the foot of the altar were really to be said at that place, whereas previously, the Psalm *Iudica me* was frequently said in the sacristy or on the way to the altar in the older medieval

³³⁸ Klauser, op. cit., p 124.

³³⁹ Cf. Legg, *Tracts on the Mass*, London 1904, pp 119-178.

³⁴⁰ Frutaz, op. cit., p 200.

³⁴¹ *Ibid*, p 201.

rites³⁴². The Missal of Pius V eliminated the system of troping the Introit texts³⁴³. The practice of farcing the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*, for the sake of simplicity, was swept away, leaving the ninefold *Kyrie* and the primitive text of the *Gloria*³⁴⁴. Farcing was numbered by the Tridentine commission among the abuses, and this rubric was still found in nineteenth century missals *Thus shall be said the Gloria in excelsis, even at Masses of Blessed Mary, when it is to be said*³⁴⁵. The most distinctive reform in the Pianine Missal is the elimination of all but five of the sequences: the *Lauda Sion*, the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, the *Victimæ Paschali laudes*, the *Dies Iræ*, the *Stabat Mater*, which were undoubtedly the best. The *Victimæ Paschali laudes* was slightly retouched, leaving out the fifth strophe and improving the Latin of the fourth. The reason for this is that the sequence, occupying a space between the *Alleluia* and the proclamation of the Gospel were not typical of the ancient Roman liturgy. Nor was it typical of the humanist tradition³⁴⁶.

Unfortunately, the Commission, probably for fear of pecuniary abuses on the part of the clergy abolished the Offertory procession that had somehow survived in Burchard's Ordo. Still on the subject of the Offertory, a very slight change can be detected in the *Suscipe, Sancta Trinitas*. Attention is drawn to the ablative case of *in honore beatæ Mariæ* that was rendered in the accusative case in the Pianine Missal³⁴⁷.

The Commission could have paid more attention to the Prefaces. In the Leonine and Gelasian Sacramentaries, we find no special mention of the

³⁴² Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 294. The reason for this was that if these prayers were recited in procession, they were likely to be said without attention or devotion. For the Pianine Commission, all the prayers of the Mass had to have a true meaning.

³⁴³ Ibid., I, p 327. Troping had been the practice of extending the length of the Introit by adding texts, not always of biblical origin. However, in later reforms of the Missal of 1570, a whole psalm could be sung at the Introit, as was done at the Coronation of Pius XI in 1922.

³⁴⁴ Ibid., I, pp 345 and 359; cf. Fortescue, op. cit., p 238. A vestige of this farcing was kept in the Tridentine Missal, or more precisely in the Gradual: the names *Kyrie Rex Genitor*, *Lux et origo*, *Orbis factor*, etc. are preserved as titles for the different Gregorian musical settings of the Masses found in the *Graduale Romanum*.

³⁴⁵ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 359: *Sic dicitur Gloria in excelsis, etiam in missis beatæ Mariæ, quando dicendum est.*

³⁴⁶ Ibid., I, p 437; cf. Fortescue, op. cit., p 275. It can be argued that the prudence of the Commission was a little excessive. For example, the *Lætebundus* of Christmas, a fine Sequence, as still found in the Dominican Missal, could have been retained.

³⁴⁷ Pierre Lebrun, *Explication des prières et cérémonies de la Messe*, vol I, Paris 1828, pp 285-286. Jungmann, op. cit., II, 50. The expression of this word in the accusative case was not standardised absolutely until a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites on the 25th May 1877. Many medieval versions of this prayer read *in commemorationem*, as did a number of French missals in the 17th century.

Prefaces; they formed the variable part of the Eucharistic Prayer or Anaphora. Unlike in the east, the Roman Preface is of a brief and sober character. It was always laudative: it praised and thanked God for his good deeds. The Preface was never an occasion of supplication: asking God for favours. The later tendency in Rome was to reduce the number of prefaces, and the Tridentine Missal contains only eleven, of which ten come from the Gregorian Sacramentary³⁴⁸. The most mysterious preface of the Roman Missal is that of the Apostles; it is a prayer of supplication: *VD Te Domine, suppliciter exorare...* The Commission must have considered this normal, since a number of these supplicatory prefaces can be found in the Gregorian Sacramentary. Sirleto recommended an improvement to the chant of the Prefaces³⁴⁹.

The Fathers of Trent had desired that the Canon be the most sacrosanct part of the liturgy, and should in no way be changed. Indeed, this canon was substantially fixed in the Gelasian Sacramentary, and slightly retouched by Gregory the Great. This most sacred part of the Mass included the Canon, the *Pater noster* following it and the Embolism. The Commission respected this wish of the Conciliar Fathers, but slightly modified the rubrics: at the elevation and at the Embolism³⁵⁰. The most significant innovation is the genuflection at the elevation of the sacred species during the canon. This ritual action appeared in Rome for the first time in 1498, before and after the elevation of each species. This was made definitive in the 1570 Missal³⁵¹.

In the Tridentine Missal, the paten is taken from under the corporal during the Embolism after the *Pater noster*. During this prayer, the priest makes the sign of the cross with the paten, kisses it and slips it under the host that had been lying directly on the corporal. He then genuflects and breaks the host, not over the paten, but over the chalice in order not to lose any particles³⁵². This ceremony was of a refreshing simplicity compared with that of many medieval missals, which was frequently highly elaborate. Instead of one sign of the cross there were several, sometimes over the celebrant's head.

³⁴⁸ Fortescue, op. cit., pp 315-320.

³⁴⁹ Frutaz. op. cit., p 213: *Il canto delli prefatij si è detto correggerlo secondo la capella di S. S.ta e quando si potesse mettere il canto disteso ad ogni prefatio si farria cosa molto commoda ad ognuno (Informatione per la correptione del Missale).*

³⁵⁰ The Embolism is the prayer following the *Pater*, beginning with the words *Libera nos, Domine...* The rubrics concern the sign of the cross with the paten during this prayer and the Fraction which takes place during the doxology.

³⁵¹ Jungmann, op. cit., II, p 213; cf. Fortescue, op. cit., p 341. A kind of "half genuflection" was known in some of the medieval rites. This action was accomplished by touching the calf of the left leg with the right knee. In most places, up to the fifteenth century, the simple bow prevailed.

³⁵² Jungmann, op. cit., II, p 308.

Sometimes, the mouth and eyes were touched with the paten, and the host was likewise touched, and the chalice three times.

Until the reform of Pius V, the three private communion prayers were not fixed in a definitive manner³⁵³. The reform of 1570 tidied up many ambiguities at the ablutions. Unlike some medieval rites, they were to be done directly after communion, not after Mass. The old custom in many places, for want of a purificator, of laying the chalice on the paten to catch the last drops, was abolished. The use of the purificator thus became standard, to enable the subdeacon to dry the chalice³⁵⁴.

Concerning the blessing to be given after the end of Mass, neither Burchard nor Pius V entirely cleared up all ambiguities. It was still permissible for a simple priest to give a triple blessing at Solemn Mass as a bishop does today³⁵⁵. In the various editions of the Roman Missal of 1574, 1530 and 1540, the blessing was sometimes given before the *Placeat*, because this was a later innovation than the blessing. This would seem to be more correct, as in the Requiem Mass where there is no blessing. This order was inversed in the Missal of Pius V. This inversion seems to have originated from the notion that the blessing was a form of dismissal³⁵⁶. Some Roman Missals of before 1570 gave the possibility of a special form of blessing at Masses of the Dead, but the Commission decided that there should be no blessing of the living in these Masses.

The Last Gospel, a pericope taken from the Prologue of Saint John (1,1-14), read after Mass had become a long tradition. Before the 1970 reform, it was in most rites read as a private devotion by the priest on his way back to the sacristy, having left the altar. Pius V had it read at the altar, immediately after the blessing, with the introduction:

³⁵³ Fortescue, op. cit., p 382.

³⁵⁴ Jungmann, op. cit., II, p 418.

³⁵⁵ Ibid., II, pp 444-445. This triple blessing followed the versicles and responses as at a Pontifical Mass: *V. Sit nomen Domini benedictum. R. Ex hoc nunc et usque in sæculum. V. Adiutorium nostrum in nomine Domini. R. Qui fecit cælum et terram.* Cf. *Missale Romanum, Ritus serv.*, XII, 7; Antwerp edition of 1572. This was abolished by Clement VIII in 1604. Following this directive, a simple priest may no longer sing the blessing or make the triple sign of the cross. Some liturgists find it puzzling to see the blessing given after the *Ite Missa est*. The reason for this is that the blessing was a late innovation, and the *Ite Missa est* was thus the last thing heard by the people, to which their reply was *Deo gratias*. While this response was being sung, the priest recited the *Placeat* and kissed the altar. The obvious testimony to this is the Mass for the Dead, in which the blessing is omitted.

³⁵⁶ Jungmann, op. cit., II, p 446. Another reason has been advanced, which seems little convincing, that the Mass that has begun with the kissing of the altar should end likewise. This reasoning was certainly adopted by the post Vatican II *Consilium* in the reforms of 1967 and 1969.

V. Dominus vobiscum. R. Et cum spiritu tuo. ✠Initium sancti Evangelium secundum Ioannem. R. Gloria tibi, Domine.

The priest, ministers and people genuflect at the words *et Verbum caro factum est*. The pericope ends with the response *Deo gratias* as for a simple Lesson of the Epistles or Old Testament. At Solemn Mass, the pericope is read *submissa voce*, which is incongruous with its having been announced like the Gospel of the Mass, with the people crossing themselves with the priest³⁵⁷.

We have seen how the Commission simplified the rite of the eucharistic celebration and kept it pure from medieval accretions from other rites or variations of the Roman Rite. Though the Commission had the utmost respect for liturgical tradition, it was not afraid to retouch and improve certain prayers. The ceremonies were considerably simplified, compared with some of the rites of the late middle ages, and this helped to alleviate the risk of superstition and abuse. By means of the 1570 rite, the Commission had cleared up many variations that had largely lost their meaning.

The liturgical year in general

It is on the subject of the Calendar that we have substantial information on the Commission's work, mainly from Frutaz, Bäumer and Klauser. Most of Sirleto's annotations in the Venice Missal concern the Calendar and more especially the Sanctoral.

By the end of the middle ages, the Calendar had become so full of Saints' Feasts that the Temporal Cycle was almost totally obscured. It was the Calendar of 1568 and 1570 that halted the trend of increasing numbers of saints' feasts³⁵⁸. The Commission reduced the number of Feasts in the Sanctoral to allow the Temporal Cycle to manifest itself on some 150 days of the year, not counting octaves³⁵⁹. Indeed, the prelates introduced no new feasts. This reduction was achieved by keeping only those feasts which were kept in Rome up to the eleventh century³⁶⁰. A few of the later feasts introduced under the influence of the Franciscans were retained, and few of those were non-Italian saints³⁶¹. Eighty five per cent of the saints retained

³⁵⁷ Ibid., II, p 450. Some *Proper Last Gospels* were instituted by Pius V as a relic from the days of the *Missa sicca*, but such *Proper Last Gospels* were rare until a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites of the 29th March 1922; cf. *Additiones et variationes*, IX, 3.

³⁵⁸ Klauser, op. cit., p 125.

³⁵⁹ Jungmann, op. cit., I, pp 135-136.

³⁶⁰ Klauser, op. cit., p 125; cf. Jungmann, op. cit., p 136; cf. E. Focke and H. Heinrichs, *Das Kalendar des Missale Pianum und seine Tendenzen*, in: *Theol. Quartalschrift*, CXX (1939), pp 383-400, 461-469.

³⁶¹ Jungmann, op. cit., p 136; cf. Focke and Heinrichs, op. cit., p 466. Germany was represented only by Saint Ursula.

belong to the first four centuries of the Church's history, and half of these are martyrs. The remainder of the feasts falls into groups of doctors, founders of religious orders, confessors and virgins. All the feasts of Our Lord and of the Blessed Virgin Mary were retained, with the exception of the Presentation of Our Lady in the Temple (21st November)³⁶². Concerning the origin of the saints retained, more than a third of the number are Romans, and twelve per cent are Italians. All the New Testament saints are included, and Spain, France and England each contributed two saints. As we have already mentioned, Germany is represented by Saint Ursula³⁶³.

This quite drastic pruning back of the Sanctoral is proof of the Commission's guiding principle: that of restoring the ancient Roman Rite. A study of the history of the Calendar reveals that what the Commission produced was that the liturgy of the time of Gregory VII was their ideal³⁶⁴. Gregory VII was a most significant figure in the movement of ecclesiastical reform and the formation of medieval Church politics. We are led to believe that the Commission saw themselves as renewing the same work of reform and Roman centralism. The attitude of the post Tridentine prelates was to restore the liturgy of the time of the reformer Pope, and to retain a few contemporary elements of universal significance or pastoral value³⁶⁵.

The Calendar was the point of Pius V's reform that required several corrections³⁶⁶. The aim of freeing all the Sundays was not entirely achieved. However, it can be asked if such was the desire of the Commission. The reform of the Calendar, being the aspect about which we know the most, merits a detailed study.

The reform of the Calendar in detail

The liturgical year of the Missal of 1570 followed exactly that of the Breviary of 1568. Of the reform of the Breviary, we have more direct information of the

³⁶² Klauser. op. cit., p 126. The feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary was reintroduced under Gregory XIII at the behest of Sirleto. Also reinstated was Saint Anne (26th July).

³⁶³ Klauser. op. cit., p 126.

³⁶⁴ Ibid.; cf. Focke and Heinrichs, op. cit., p 461-469.

³⁶⁵ Cf. Klauser, op. cit., p 127; cf. Jedin, all op. cit.

³⁶⁶ The last of these corrections, before the promulgation of the *Novus Ordo* of Paul VI in 1969, was that of John XXIII in 1962, prepared by Pius XII. The reason for these corrections of successive Popes, apart from the first (the rectification of the method of calculating the date of Easter) was the increase in the number of saints' feasts, a resumption of the pre-Tridentine trend.

work of the Commission³⁶⁷. We can thus discover its working principles on the liturgical year of the Missal, which was exactly that of the Breviary. We can therefore go to the Commission's work on the liturgical year of the Breviary³⁶⁸.

It is in the aim of restoring the Roman rite, as insisted Sirleto³⁶⁹, that the Temporal Cycle was to be given greater importance by the pruning back of saints' feasts. This Temporal Cycle was divided into three main parts: Christmas with Advent and Epiphany, Easter with preceding solemnities and seasons from Septuagesima to the Octave of the Ascension, Pentecost and subsequent feasts. As well as these three great seasons, the liturgical weeks and days after Pentecost (*Dominicæ et feriæ per annum una cum feriis privilegiatis post Epiphaniam et Pentecosten*) had to be maintained. It was in order to preserve the liturgical year that an excessive number of saints' feasts had to be cut back.

Was the intention of the Commission that of simply representing an archaic calendar? If this was the case, it would have retained only those saints in the 1474 Calendar which came from the Gelasian tradition of the VIIIth century with a few additions. Focke and Heinrichs³⁷⁰ proved that the Pianine Calendar reflects the *Ordo officiorum Ecclesiæ Lateranensis*³⁷¹ composed by Prior Bernard about 1145. The Calendar is not only based on Roman usage in general, but on that of the Pope's own Church. It is in this light that Sirleto modified the Calendar of the Venice Missal of Sesso, which was of a Franciscan type³⁷². A number of Franciscan saints were deleted from the

³⁶⁷ Frutaz, op. cit.; Bäumer, op. cit., II, pp 175-220. Apart from the Vatican documents mentioned for the Missal, mostly concerning the Calendar, there are three documents for the reform of the Breviary: the Breviary itself and the Bull of promulgation of Pius V. We have parallels of these two for the Missal. The third document giving information of the Commission's work is a report in Italian or *Promemoria* in the form of a letter. It was composed by a member of the Commission, probably Archbishop Leonardo Marini of Lanciano, and addressed to one of his Cardinal friends. It begins: *Perchè si comprendra bene in che consiste la corettione del Breviario qual'si e fatta...* and ends: *Occorrono delle altre cosette (...) quelle nel scorrere del Breviario si potranno un'altra volta dire*. This document is in codex 47 (*Concil. Trident.*, fol. 312 sq.) of the Vatican Archives.

³⁶⁸ Frutaz, op. cit., p 201. Before the Missal of 1570, there was diversity, not only between the Calendars of the Missal and Breviary, but between those of different editions of the Missal. Cf. G. Low, *Calendario della Chiesa universale*, in: *Enciclopedia Cattolica*, III, Citta del Vaticano 1950, pp 364-372.

³⁶⁹ Bäumer, op. cit., p 176.

³⁷⁰ Focke and Heinrichs, op. cit., pp 383-400, 461-469.

³⁷¹ Cf. Ed. L. Fischer, *Bernhardi cardinalis et Lateranensis Ecclesiæ Prioris Ordo officiorum Ecclesiæ Lateranensis*, Monaco 1916.

³⁷² Frutaz, op. cit., p 204.

universal Calendar, which became a combination of the twelfth century Lateran Ordo and the Franciscan Sanctoral with feasts removed and others added³⁷³. Sirleto was particularly concerned to free the Ferias of Lent³⁷⁴. The work of Sirleto goes into minute detail, correcting the Latin text, deleting feasts and amending priorities of those retained³⁷⁵. Many of these corrections were accepted by the Commission and adopted in the Calendar of 1568 and 1570.

The Calendar of the Pianine Missal was defective in its method of computing the date of Easter, and Gregory XIII, Pius V's immediate successor, remedied this in 1582³⁷⁶. The Calendar of 1568 and 1570 counted, including feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary and simple feasts, 185 or 190 saints. Out of this number, twenty had only a simple commemoration. Other feasts, such as those of the Nativity and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Saint John the Baptist, Saints Peter and Paul, Saint Laurence and All Saints, had octaves during which no other saint's feast was celebrated. Apart from these 182 days occupied by saints' feasts, the other days, nearly half a year, were left free for feasts of the Lord and Sundays. The number of free days for Sunday and Ferial Masses was not the same every year, owing to the variable date of Easter, and that many semi-double saints' feasts displaced by a Sunday were celebrated on another day during the week. There were some sixty double feasts, for some feasts, such as those of Saints Joachim, Anthony of Padua, Louis of Toulouse and the Presentation were nearly never celebrated. Other double and semi-double feasts had been simply commemorated. This frighteningly complex situation was alleviated by a wholesale abolition of many saints from the Roman Calendar and by the re-classing of those which remained³⁷⁷.

The system of Octaves³⁷⁸ was happily simplified. These octaves had excessively multiplied since the thirteenth century. Those of the Franciscan

³⁷³ Ibid., p 205.

³⁷⁴ Sirleto was familiar with the canon from the Decretals of Gratian (Causa 33, q. IV, c. VIII et c.IX): *Non oportet in quadragesima aut nuptias vel quælibet natalitia celebrari. 33 q IIII Non oportet ex concilio laodicensi; Non licet in XLma natales martyrum celebrare 33 q IIII*. Cf. Ed Æm Friedberg *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, in: *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Leipzig 1879, p 1249.

³⁷⁵ Cf. Frutaz, op. cit., pp 206-207. The annotations of Sirleto for the month of January are given as an example.

³⁷⁶ Bäumer, op. cit., p 194. The problem was the question of calculating the lunar cycle by means of the Golden Numbers. Pius V's correction of this was erroneous, and did not take into account the fact that the Julian Calendar was ten days late.

³⁷⁷ Ibid., pp 195-198.

³⁷⁸ An Octave is the prolongation of a solemn Feast over eight days. The pre 1962 system of commemorating Octaves becomes particularly complex between the feast of Saint Stephen

feasts (Saints Francis, Clare, Anthony of Padua, Bernardine, Louis of Toulouse), and those of the feasts of the Conception³⁷⁹ and the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary were abolished. The two latter octaves were abolished because they fell in the season of Advent and during the octave of Saint Peter. After this, a general rule was established. Firstly, two categories of octaves were distinguished: those of feasts of the Lord, those of the Saints and the Dedication. In this first category, the most ancient feasts: Easter and Pentecost have the most privileged octaves, whose privilege is absolute. The octaves of Christmas, Epiphany and Corpus Christi, were simply privileged octaves. They admitted the celebration of only the most important feasts. The Octave of Epiphany allowed no feasts without special authorisation. The octave of the Ascension was not privileged and allowed feasts of greater privilege to that of itself. The octaves of the second category were usually celebrated only as commemorations, and what is most important, they left the Sundays free for the celebration of the temporal Proper. No octaves were celebrated during Lent. Sundays in general were celebrated as semi-doubles and commemorated at the double feasts that replaced them. The Collect, Secret and Postcommunion were read, and in some cases, the Gospel was read in place of the Joannine Last Gospel. Sundays of Advent, Septuagesima, Lent to the Sunday *in albis* (the Octave Day of Easter) admitted no doubles in their quality as privileged Sundays³⁸⁰.

The Common of Saints

One very useful innovation was the Common of Saints that enabled the codified Missal to be much more practical for use at the altar³⁸¹. The Common of Saints is fixed Proper Mass formulæ, which are classed into several categories. These were Vigils of Apostles, for one Martyr outside Paschal time, for several Martyrs outside Paschal time, for Martyrs during Paschal time, Confessor Bishops, Doctors of the Church, Confessors not Bishops, Abbots, Virgins, non-Virgins (matrons), for the Dedication of a church, Feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the Blessed Virgin Mary on Saturdays. The scanty formulæ found in most of the old sacramentaries was expanded and organized into complete Mass propers and included the sung parts and biblical readings, some new material being added. The most probable reason for the introduction of these Commons would be to standardise the

(26th December) and the 1st January. By the end of this time, no fewer than five Octaves are commemorated.

³⁷⁹ The qualification *Immaculate* for the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary was a later innovation, specially after the definition of this dogma in 1854.

³⁸⁰ Bäumer, op. cit., pp 199-200. Details of the modifications of the Breviary, some of which apply to the Missal, can be found on pp 215-220 of Bäumer's work.

³⁸¹ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 136. A Common of Saints is to be found in some of the ancient Sacramentaries, lectionaries and antiphoners.

celebration of local feasts, and to give a point of reference for the celebration of future saints.

Votive Masses

It was without doubt the system of Votive Masses that was the most in need of reform. We have seen how covetous priests profited from a superstitious understanding of Votive Masses and the application of the *fruits* of the Mass for particular intentions. It was the Votive Mass contributed to the loss of the sense of the liturgical mystery on the part of many priests and faithful. It was certainly the origin of the Low Mass, ie: the multiplied celebrations of Masses, a kind of *Gnadenkapitalismus*³⁸².

The Council of Trent did not condemn Votive Masses out of hand, but desired to bring them within control. The Council said: *If anyone says that it is a deception to celebrate Masses in honour of the Saints and in order to obtain their intercession with God, as the Church intends, let him be anathema*³⁸³. The decree at the same Session of the Council, concerning liturgical abuses, desired to recover a sense of the purity of the liturgy by the abolition of all things that led to covetousness, idolatry and superstition. This, in practical terms was a responsibility of the Commission of Pius IV, to purify the liturgy of the Mass, to make such superstition impossible or at least difficult. It is also in this context that Pius V abolished all rites of less than two hundred years standing; many of these rites were infected with legendary content, theological errors and superstitions - and largely composed by men incompetent in the field of liturgy.

The abusive celebration of votive masses was brought within limits imposed by a liturgical spirit. Many of the formularies of these votive masses were abolished, and what remained of these in the Missal was a much smaller selection of possibilities. There are in the Tridentine Missal thirty-seven complete Votive Mass formulæ³⁸⁴. Thirteen of these are in the honour of saints, the Holy Spirit and mysteries of our Lord. Eleven are ritual Masses, such as for weddings or blessings of Abbots. Thirteen are for particular necessities or to obtain certain favours from God, for example, the end to a war, for a sick person or for thanksgiving. After this, there are a number of sets of collects, secrets and postcommunions that can be inserted into the Mass of the day according to the rubrics which govern the rules of

³⁸² *Gnadenkapitalismus* is a German term, literally translated *grace-capitalism*. This was the tendency of conceiving grace as something numerically multipliable by the performance of certain fixed religious duties.

³⁸³ Session XXII, Canon 5. Cf. DS 1755.

³⁸⁴ Jungmann, op. cit., I, p 136.

commemoration³⁸⁵. Rubrics were formulated to restrict severely the use of Votive Masses³⁸⁶. Under the conditions of these rubrics, a Votive Mass may be celebrated on any day of the week except Sunday.

The rubrics

It was for the rubrics and complex rules concerning which Mass was to be celebrated on a given day that the Commission turned to the *Ordo Missæ* of John Burchard, which appeared in 1485³⁸⁷. It could be said that these rubrics, adopted in the Tridentine Missal, were a synthesis and codification of the *Ordines Romani*³⁸⁸. Burchard's *Ordo* began in 1534 to be printed as a preface to the Missal. The *Ordo* of Burchard was slightly revised by order of Alexander VI. The *Liber Sacerdotalis*, published in Venice in 1523, contains Burchard's *Ordo*³⁸⁹. Le Brun attests that Burchard's *Ordo* is copied almost word for word³⁹⁰. This may seem a little exaggerated, but the two documents (the *Ordo* and the rubrics of Pius V) are closely related³⁹¹.

The content of first few pages of Burchard's *Ordo* are taken up in the first section of the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ* of the Pianine Missal. The text, except for the vesting prayers and the *Summe sacerdos* prayer, is entirely remodelled. In the Pianine Missal, this extremely long prayer is divided up into the days of the week, to be recited with the other prayers of preparation for Mass. Page 133³⁹² corresponds with section two of the *Ritus: De Ingressu Sacerdotis ad Altare*. Again the wording is considerably modified and the directions recast. Pages 134 to 137 of the *Ordo* correspond with section 3: *De Principio Missæ...*, but only a few rubrics of the latter indicate its source³⁹³.

³⁸⁵ *Rubricæ generales*, VII, 5.

³⁸⁶ *Rubricæ generales*, IV, 3.

³⁸⁷ Legg, op. cit., pp 124-174. These pages contain an edition of John Burchard's *Ordo Missæ*. Legg erroneously gives 1502 as the date of publication.

³⁸⁸ F. Cabrol, *Missel Romain*, in: DACL, vol XI, col 1487.

³⁸⁹ Legg, op. cit., pp 25-22 (in Roman numerals for the introduction).

³⁹⁰ Lebrun, op. cit., p 423: *L'Ordo Missæ de Burcard (sic), imprimé vers l'an 1500, et copié presque de mot à mot par le saint Pape Pie V.*

³⁹¹ Legg, op. cit., p xxvii. Legg, in a note on p 249, makes it clear that the Pianine Missal he uses for comparison with Burchard's *Ordo* is one printed at Venice in 1571 by Ioannes Variscus.

³⁹² This page number, of course, refers to the edition found in Legg's Tracts on the Mass.

³⁹³ Legg, op. cit., p 249.

The text of the Order of Mass is exactly the same as that in the Missal of the Roman Curia of 1474. The resemblance of the rubrics concerning the *Aufer a nobis*, Introit, *Kyrie* and *Gloria* are more marked³⁹⁴. The *Gloria* in the *Ordo* indicates the possibility of farcing, which was completely abolished by Pius V. The rubrics dealing with the Epistle, Gradual, etc. up to the Offertory show much influence in section VI of the *Ritus Servandus*. Though much of the wording shows a degree of resemblance, the sentences are quite considerably altered. The rules for the *Credo* correspond with the *De Symbolo* in the General Rubrics of the 1570 Missal³⁹⁵.

The section of the *Ordo* beginning *Dicto Symbolo* corresponds with section VII of the *Ritus servandus: De Offertorio*. There was provision for an offertory procession in Burchard's *Ordo*, but this was dropped in the Pianine reform of 1570³⁹⁶.

The resemblance between Burchard's treatment of the Canon to the end of the Mass, and that of the Tridentine Missal, is very marked. The reference to the minister lighting a consecration candle at the *Hanc igitur* is not found in any Tridentine Missal until 1605³⁹⁷. Burchard's rubric on what is to be omitted at Masses of the Dead is greatly expanded in the Pianine Missal, but the rubric on celebrating two or three Masses in one day is omitted³⁹⁸. Any reference to *Missæ siccaë* is omitted in the 1570 Missal, for this medieval devotion was abolished.

It can be seen, from this comparison of Burchard's *Ordo Missæ* with the rubrics of the 1570 Missal, that the former distinctly inspired the latter. However, it can be seen that the comment of Lebrun is exaggerated. The amendments and remodeling were entirely motivated by the Commission's desire to restore the Roman Rite and to abolish all abuses. It has sometimes been said that the exact formulation of rubrics was a sign of Roman legalism. This is certainly a point to consider, but these ritual rules were highly pertinent at a time when priests and liturgical ministers had lost a sense of the liturgy; they ensured a dignified and worthy celebration. Adrian Fortescue

³⁹⁴ Ibid.

³⁹⁵ Ibid., p 250.

³⁹⁶ Jungmann, op. cit., p 136. The wording of this rubric in Burchard's *Ordo* was: *Si sint qui volentes offerre: celebrans accedit ad cornu Epistole: ubi stans detecto capite latere suo sinistro altari verso deponit manipulum de brachio sinistro: et accipiens illud in manum dextram porrigit summitatem eius: singulis offerentibus osculandum dicens singulis. Acceptabile sit sacrificium tuum omnipotenti Deo. Vel Centuplum accipias: et vitam eternam possideas. Accepta omnium oblatione celebrans reponit manipulum in brachium sinistrum, etc.*

³⁹⁷ Legg, op. cit., p 250.

³⁹⁸ Ibid.

made the comment: *Such increased definiteness was bound to come in, after all, you must incense an altar somehow; it does not hurt to be told how to do so*³⁹⁹.

The Lectionary

The Lectionary of the Tridentine Missal adopted was that of Murbach⁴⁰⁰, which was poor considering the amount of Scripture used. There are nearly always two readings at the Mass, the first taken from either the Old Testament, from the Epistles of the Apostles or from the Apocalypse. The second is always taken from the Gospels, and is read with solemnity. Old Testament Lessons are read at the Ferias of Advent, Lent and the Ember Days (at which there are more than two readings). The Acts of the Apostles are read during the Ember Days of Pentecost due to the influence of the Octave. The Old Testament is read also at the feasts of Epiphany, All Saints and some feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary and other saints. At most saints' feasts and all Sundays, including the Ember Saturdays, the Epistle is taken from the New Testament. The amount of Old Testament Scripture adopted is the following: the Books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, the third and fourth Books of Kings, Esdras, Esther, Judith, the two Books of the Machabees, the four Books of Proverbs, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and the Song of Solomon, these last four being collectively called *Book of Wisdom*⁴⁰¹. Also adopted were the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah (with Baruch), Ezechiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Jonas, Micheas, Zacharias and Malachias. The only New Testament Books from which nothing has been taken are the Second Epistle to the Thessalonicians, the Epistle to Philomena and the second and third Epistles of Saint John. The Psalms, for the most part, are used in the sung parts of the Mass, especially for the Introit and Gradual.

The version used for the Scripture readings is the Vulgate, which was revised under Clement VIII in 1592. For the Psalter, the sung parts of the Mass are from the Old Roman version⁴⁰².

The weakness of the Lectionary of Pius V is that there is no constant principle of *lectio continua*; only isolated fragments of Scripture. However, in the first to fourth Sundays after the Epiphany, chapters 12 and 13 of the Epistle to the Romans are read nearly without omissions. From the sixth to the twenty-

³⁹⁹ Fortescue, op. cit., p 230.

⁴⁰⁰ Nocent, *La célébration eucharistique avant et après Saint Pie V*, Paris 1977, p 45. The Lectionary of Murbach dated from the end of the VIIIth century. Cf. A. Wilmart, *Le Comes de Murbach*, in: *Revue Benedictine* (1913), pp 25-29.

⁴⁰¹ The title found in the Missal for such lessons is *Lectio Libri Sapientiae*.

⁴⁰² Henri Rabotin, *Les textes liturgiques*, in: *Liturgia*, Paris 1930, p 354. The Old Roman Psalter is not used for the psalmody in the Office, but the Vulgate Psalter.

fourth Sundays after Pentecost (except the eighteenth) there is a continued reading of the Epistles to the Romans and to the Colossians⁴⁰³.

For most feasts and liturgical seasons, the Lessons, Epistles and Gospels were chosen in function of their content, laying aside any desire to give a *lectio continua*. The content went with the general theme of the liturgy, for example, during Advent, the texts chosen bore an eschatological character, whilst those of Lent showed a baptismal and penitential content⁴⁰⁴.

The obvious choice that confronted the Commission was that of *lectio continua*⁴⁰⁵, or a concord of the content of the readings with the rest of the liturgical texts. The problem is that the two systems had overlain each other, and any one system was no longer recognisable⁴⁰⁶. What is obvious from the Roman Lectionary is that provision is generally made only for Sundays, and for these readings to be repeated on Ferial weekday Masses. It had been suggested at the Council of Trent that unused Pauline and Gospel passages be used for these ferial weekday Masses, inserting them into the formulæ of the previous Sunday⁴⁰⁷. This plan was not considered, and nothing came of it. What is evident is that the Commission did not attempt to remodel the Lectionary.

SOME CANONICAL ASPECTS OF LITURGICAL CODIFICATION

It was inevitable that, by the sixteenth century, the study of the liturgy became increasingly centred on its canonical aspect⁴⁰⁸. The situation of decadence and crisis that we discussed in our first chapter was the cause of this trend. Though liturgists at the Council of Trent had studied the theological aspect - the permanent meaning of worship, it was now necessary to determine how the liturgy was celebrated, how it must be done, and to enforce this by juridical means. Canon law and Roman centralism became the means of an effective ecclesiastical reform.

⁴⁰³ Ibid., p 360.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., p 361.

⁴⁰⁵ This is to be found to an extent of the Parisian Missal of Vintimille, published in 1737.

⁴⁰⁶ Fortescue, op. cit., p 261.

⁴⁰⁷ Jungmann, op. cit., p 403; cf. Jedin, *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Römischen Messbuches*, p 55. A similar type of weekday ferial lectionary was authorised in 1964.

⁴⁰⁸ On the customary character of liturgical legislation concerning the Mass before 1570, cf. C. Vogel, *Medieval liturgy: an introduction to the sources* (English translation), Washington 1986, pp 1-20; Noirot, *Liturgie* (droit) in: *Dictionnaire de Droit catholique*, VI., Letouzey et Ané 1957, pp 535-594; F. Cimitier, *La liturgie et le Droit canonique*, in: *Liturgia*, Paris 1930, pp 29-58.

Two canonists have produced recent studies on the legal aspects of the Bull *Quo primum*⁴⁰⁹. We are thus brought to a reflection on the relation of liturgical tradition and ecclesiastical law. The significance of *Quo primum* is that liturgical tradition became, for the first time, a subject of ecclesiastical law. The observance of the liturgy became binding under pain of canonical sanctions. Historians are brought to ask themselves if this event marked the end of liturgical tradition and the beginning of an oppressive system of juridism and rubricism⁴¹⁰.

The Bull of Saint Pius V

The Bull *Quo primum* was a complete innovation in the history of ecclesiastical law. It was the first act of liturgical legislation binding on the whole Church, that the Roman Missal was to become the standard for every Church⁴¹¹. Only Churches that could prove a custom of at least two hundred years standing would be allowed to retain their own particular rite, by virtue of immemorial custom⁴¹². Both the Roman Rite and other liturgies with a custom of more than two centuries were thus codified. Liturgical rites thus became a subject of canon law.

The Bull *Quo primum* made a law of existing liturgical custom, and was an act of the Council of Trent, for Pius V made reference to its decrees. The Council decreed the restoration of the Missal, and the Pope ordained its publication. All contrary liturgical custom ceased with the promulgation of *Quo primum*: henceforth the only Missals allowed were to be the Roman Rite of 1570, and other liturgies of more than two hundred years of custom. This Bull confirmed the right to use these traditional local rites, and gave all priests without exception the right to lay aside an approved rite in favour of the 1570 Roman Missal⁴¹³. In giving this latter right, Pius V conferred a privilege⁴¹⁴, also known as an indult:

“Furthermore, by this present and by virtue of Our Apostolic authority We give and grant in perpetuity that for the singing and reading of Mass in any church whatsoever this Missal may be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgement or censure,

⁴⁰⁹ Neri Capponi, *Some juridical considerations on the reform of the liturgy*, Florence 1975; Raymond Dulac, *La Bulle Quo primum*, in: *Itinéraires*, 162 (1972), pp 13-47

⁴¹⁰ Cf. Klauser, op. cit., pp 129-135 (Ch IV, iii, *The Congregation of Rites and its working methods*).

⁴¹¹ Capponi, op. cit., p 12.

⁴¹² Ibid., pp 12-13.

⁴¹³ Dulac, op. cit., p 40.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid, p 42. Pius V uses the words *concedimus et indulgemus*, giving a *favour* from the strict application of the letter of the law.

and may be freely and lawfully used. Nor shall bishops, administrators, canons, chaplains and other secular priests, or religious of whatsoever Order or by whatsoever title designated, be obliged to celebrate Mass otherwise than enjoined by Us. We likewise order and declare that no one whosoever shall be forced or coerced into using this Missal; and this present Constitution can never be revoked or modified, but shall for ever remain valid and have the force of law, notwithstanding previous constitutions or edicts of provincial or synodal councils, and notwithstanding the usage of the churches aforesaid, established by very long and even immemorial prescription, saving only usage of more than two hundred years”⁴¹⁵.

According to this privilege, a priest of the Archdiocese of Milan normally uses the Ambrosian Rite, but he may at any time take the Roman Missal, but may not be obliged to do so. Nor may he be forbidden from adopting it if he so wishes. One element is missing in the Bull: that of the eventual introduction and promulgation by a Pope of a new rite distinct from that codified in 1570.

Having decreed the time that the legislation would come into legal force, Pius V continued by laying down rules for the safeguard of the Missal’s integrity. He imposed stiff punishments for printers who did not reproduce exactly the liturgical texts, threatening them with temporal sanctions or excommunication. He prescribed the same on any publisher or bookseller who dealt in illegal missals. In the penultimate paragraph, he decrees that

“no-one whosoever is permitted to infringe or rashly contravene this notice of Our permission, statute, ordinance, command, direction, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree and prohibition. Should any person venture to do so, let him understand that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul”⁴¹⁶.

These sanctions were directed against printers, publishers, bishops and priests who failed to respect the integrity of the Tridentine Missal, or who willingly interfered with it.

It could be asked if the Bull was intended to be perpetually valid or irreformable⁴¹⁷. The Bull of Pius V is an act of ecclesiastical, not divine, law, touching upon matters of liturgical discipline. Therefore, its immutability is not absolute, but governed by the principles of liturgical tradition. There have been several corrections of aspects of the Missal since 1570, but the substantial identity of the rite was respected. This act of legislation, of Pius V, is based on the Roman liturgical custom. The rite of 1570 is the same rite as that which

⁴¹⁵ Cf. M. Davies, *Quo primum*, English translation in: *Pope Paul’s New Mass*, Chumleigh 1980, p 533.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid.

⁴¹⁷ Dulac, op. cit., pp 43-45.

preceded it. The custom made the law, and not law the custom. The Bull of Pius V bears testimony to the fact that the liturgy is something stable. The rites did not change substantially, nor were they brought into being by legislation: they were confirmed and codified by juridical means. The reason why liturgical custom needed to be finally codified in 1570, was because the whole basis of liturgical tradition was called into question.

The unification of liturgical custom and Canon Law

Before the time of the codification of the Roman Missal in 1570, laws governing liturgical practice were custom, and certain canons in the Decretals of Gregory IX⁴¹⁸. The Bull of Pius V, leaving intact customs of more than two centuries standing, removed liturgical legislation from the competence of diocesan bishops⁴¹⁹. Sixtus V founded the Congregation of Rites in 1588, and this dicastery took over the competence in all matters of liturgical law⁴²⁰.

From 1570, all liturgical custom in the Roman Rite of Mass was based solely on the codified Missal of 1570, all previous customs contradicted having been abolished. *The Bull Quo primum* unified custom and law. After 1570, other privileges were conceded and became customs, and the Congregation of Rites determined the relation of these with the common law. Customs began to interpret and complete the liturgical law⁴²¹.

From the necessity to legislate in matters of liturgy came a new tendency in the Church, that of pure rubricism as a science⁴²². Rubricism ensured objectivity, decency and order, in the liturgical celebration, but it led to an excessively restrictive and bureaucratic attitude on the part of the Congregation of Rites until its transformation by Paul VI into the Congregation of Sacraments and Divine Worship.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the corrected and restored Missal of 1570 achieved the medieval process of codification. On the basis of the principles laid down by the Commission and Pius V, the Congregation of Rites regulated the celebration of the Mass and all liturgical services for nearly four centuries.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. L. Coache, *Le Droit canonique est-il aimable?*, Beaumont 1986, pp 46-48.

⁴¹⁹ Martimort, *L'Eglise en prière*, I, Paris 1983, p 129.

⁴²⁰ Cimetier, op. cit., pp 32-39.

⁴²¹ Ibid, pp 48-49.

⁴²² Martimort, op. cit., I, pp 130-131.

We have established that the Missal of 1570 was not a new rite, but the previous one corrected and restored: there remained an homogeneous continuity of liturgical custom in an identical rite, apart from the abolition of elements of recent and un-Roman origin. This principle of restoration and continuity marked the late medieval and Tridentine understanding of liturgical tradition. It was prudently decided, in the face of liturgical anarchy and Protestantism, that there should be generally a single liturgy in the Latin Church (apart from exceptions already mentioned). This was to be the pure Roman rite with those Gallican elements which had entered into the Roman liturgy before the thirteenth century. It was a reasonable ideal for the Commission and Saint Pius V, that those who use the Roman Rite should use it uniformly and, in comparison with the late medieval liturgies, in a relatively pure form. The rite restored in 1570 largely succeeded, at least for a time, in resolving the medieval liturgical crisis and in bringing about a doctrinal and spiritual renewal in the Church.

V. THE EFFECTS OF LITURGICAL REFORM

To conclude our study of the late medieval and post-Tridentine understanding of liturgical tradition, we ask ourselves how this affects our own conceptions. From a point of view of dissatisfaction concerning the work of the modern liturgical movement, we have traced the history of liturgical reform and examined the Missal of 1570 in an historical light. We now attempt to compare and contrast two prevalent conceptions of liturgical reform: that which has been held and practised in the Catholic Church since the Council of Trent, and that which is characteristic of Protestantism or later tendencies such as Modernism.

THE CODIFICATION OF LITURGICAL TRADITION

Codification, especially since the invention of the *Missale Plenum*, has been the means of regulating the celebration of liturgical functions, the Mass in particular, in the Church. It is the fixing of a system of liturgical customs and usages by means of canon law, in order to oblige a correct celebration on pain of juridical sanctions. From a pragmatic point of view, it works. The Mass is celebrated as it should be, but does such correctness take into account the purpose of the liturgy?

The codification of the Roman Missal fulfilled an historical need as a protective measure in times of crisis and anarchy in the Church. The first chapter of our work revealed the existence of a profound malaise in the late Middle Ages. Because of theological confusion, moral decadence, formalism and ignorance in liturgical matters, the celebration of liturgical services was in a state of anarchy. Abuse and the exploitation of the simple were rife. Even priests in good faith were frequently uninstructed and unable to celebrate correctly.

The pragmatic mind of the Renaissance liturgist and canonist set about seeking a remedy. As the Corpus of Canon Law was drawn from the Canons of the Councils and Decretals of Popes, and finally codified in 1917 and 1983, liturgists collected together everything that has been decreed concerning liturgical usage and made from them codes of rubrics. As we saw from the example of Burchard, these codes of rubrics were intended to instruct the clergy in how the Mass was celebrated by and in the Church. The *Indutus Planeta* of Hymo of Faversham was given in the form of instructions, but as the liturgical crisis grew worse, it became necessary to make these instructions mandatory and binding, supported by the authority of the Apostolic See. Even the admirable *Ordo* of Burchard was to little avail; it was

necessary to go further. The solution adopted was the imposition of a purified and uniform Roman Missal, enforced by the institution of the Congregation of Rites.

What began as a corrective measure to remedy a situation of anarchy in the Church became a permanent institution. Rubricism became a system in itself. However, rubrics are necessary for a celebration in conformity with liturgical tradition. This respect of the Church's liturgy is to be carefully distinguished from rubricism, which can present a danger to the whole spirit of Christian worship.

This danger of a fixed and uniform liturgy is that of losing sight of the very reason of the celebration: the action of thanksgiving and praise of the Church, and the rendering present of the Mystery of Christ in salvation history. Human nature is easily wont to tend towards formalism, acridly criticized by Louis Bouyer:

*“When tradition is no more than the transmission of formulæ or patterns of behaviour supposed to be dictated, originally or at any moment, by an authority entirely exterior to the conscience, and that this last has only to receive without being able to make it its own, without adulterating it, tradition is in fact no more than a stunted routine. When the moment come to reject it, all that is rejected is what one has long ceased really to possess”*⁴²³.

Bouyer draws attention to a certain mentality that has prevailed in the Latin Church until recently, considering things solely in terms of authority, obedience and obligation. These things are necessary in the life of the Church, but it seems that Bouyer finds these things have been given an absolute value instead of being considered as mere moral means to an end.

The danger of rubricism is not intrinsic to the proper observance of the ceremonies, but is present when a sense of balance is lost, when a liturgist no longer knows why the rubrics are to be observed. Tradition is not a dead and oppressive system to be accepted blindly only under the external pressure of authority. On the other hand, tradition cannot be taken away from the regulation of authority and developed in an entirely arbitrary fashion.

The Tridentine reform of the Missal was opposed to both these errors of excess. The liturgy had to pass under the jurisdiction of Rome and the Congregation of Rites, but the Tridentine Church was far from any desire to impose a prefabricated tradition upon the faithful. The great rubricists and liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such as Lebrun or Benedict XIV, understood that the authority attached to the liturgy was not dependent on the rubrics codified by this or that Pope or Bishop. They knew that the authority governing the sacred rites was the tradition itself,

⁴²³ L. Bouyer, *La décomposition du catholicisme*, Paris 1968, p 101.

guaranteed by the various codifications and preceptive measures adopted by the Magisterium⁴²⁴. The rubrics are supposed to express in practical form the principles of the liturgy passed down by the living tradition. The question is what comes first: the way that the Church celebrates Mass, or the instructions she prescribes to ensure that the Eucharist be correctly celebrated.

Rubricism can be defined, thus, not as fidelity to the rubrics, but a mentality according to which the liturgy is considered solely under the aspect of being fixed by juridical means, without any possibility of natural development. The Tridentine reform and the foundation of the Congregation of Rites froze this development, known in the Latin Church until the sixteenth century, as the only means available of preserving the liturgy against further decay. It was an opposite reaction from the late medieval situation of anarchy and the Protestant revolt. It can be seen, in the light of history, that two seemingly opposing tendencies exist: free development of rites, and when this goes beyond certain limits, there is need of a restoration of the authentic Roman liturgy by means of authoritative measures. It is a phenomenon like the accelerator and brake of a motor car: the two work together in opposing directions to ensure the vitality of the Church's liturgical life. What is needed is a sense of balance: a gradually developing liturgy, regulated by the *Magisterium* whose function is to eliminate from Catholic worship any abuse or spirit of the arbitrary.

It is on the basis of these considerations, that the liturgy is neither to be fossilized nor left to the arbitrary, that Christian worship may truly be pastoral. The Catholic liturgy is the living heart of theological tradition, embodying the revelation of the eternal Word of God and the rendering present of the Mystery of the Redemption. To distort what has been received from tradition, whether by way of fossilisation or the caprice of change for the sake of change, is not pastoral.

To oppose liturgical integrity to the requirements of the pastoral ministry of the Church is a sophism. At the same time, the rubricist mentality, excluding any organic development of the liturgy is anti-pastoral, for it suffocates life. Neither liturgical stability nor reform can be imposed on the faithful from without. Ultimately the question of reforming the rite enters little into pastoral considerations. What is needed above all, in the Church's pastoral ministry is not what is termed in modern times as *inculturation*⁴²⁵, but to educate the faithful and priests, who are, as in pre-Tridentine times, profoundly ignorant of the history or meaning of the liturgy. Such a catechesis in biblical and dogmatic theology, in the history and theology of the liturgy, is essential if the liturgy, celebrated in any rite, is to be more than

⁴²⁴ Cf. L. Bouyer, *Life and liturgy*, London 1956, pp 70-74.

⁴²⁵ Cf. A. Schönberger, *De la revolution à l'inculturation*, in: *Una Voce* 157 (1991), pp 50-58.

a mere formality to be liquidated in the shortest time possible. It is as a result of such catechesis that it becomes possible to consult the faithful, priests and bishops in the existence of organic developments, whose authenticity is discerned by the teaching and governing Magisterium.

The unfortunate effect of the Tridentine reform is that it created a precedent for future reforms, as Paul VI implied in *Missale Romanum* of 1969. If the liturgy was to be reformed in the sixteenth century, why should it not also be “renewed” in the twentieth? We are truly caught in a dilemma: a situation of decadence, or everything pre-fabricated and imposed by authority in sterile packages. Some of the following criteria can be considered as we seek a solution.

THE REFORM OR RADICAL RECASTING OF LITURGICAL RITES

Any period in the history of the Church in which a tendency arises to simplify and logically re-order the eucharistic liturgy is shown by this very fact to be a period of decay, preparing only for future corruption⁴²⁶. The various Protestant liturgies of the sixteenth century are all new rites fabricated with little reference to the development of traditional rites whether from the East or from the West. Bouyer warned in 1956⁴²⁷ of a desire for a new liturgy intended to bring about a spiritual renewal, made on the basis of paraliturgical forms without any basis on tradition. Under the pretext of adaptation to modern times, such a new liturgy would be fabricated according to criteria of expediency and fashion. There are two main elements in such creations: archæologism, the re-use of archaic elements of ancient liturgies; and the desire of novelty.

Archæologism

Return to sources is the theme of any reforming movement in the Church. Each new religious Order was in its own way a restoration of the values of the Primitive Church; the Tridentine reform of the Missal was a restoration of an older form of the Roman liturgy, whose guiding ideal was the heritage of the holy Fathers. However, the Pianine Commission we have discussed at great length did not impose the eighth century Roman Mass as they might have done; they restored the modern liturgy in the light of the old. This method ensured that all work done was to conform to objective standards, and not to the subjective taste of this or that historian, canonist or theologian.

The Protestant reform had as its ideal the abolition of all contemporary liturgical forms, and the substitution of what were believed to be long

⁴²⁶ Bouyer, *Life and liturgy*, p 75; cf. Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharistic faith and practice*, London 1930, pp 18-69.

⁴²⁷ Bouyer, *Life and liturgy*, p 67-70.

obsolete liturgies, to which new elements were to be added. The Anglican Benedictine Gregory Dix⁴²⁸ had observed that the sixteenth century reformers largely failed in their ideal; what they produced were new liturgies incorporating late medieval low-mass devotions. In some of the reformed liturgies, the Protestants had succeeded in inserting a few fragments of ancient Oriental liturgies⁴²⁹. In more recent times, a great interest has been shown in the eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus, but only fragments of this have actually been used in officially approved rites. Archæologism is, in practice, a very selective method of liturgical reform.

The Encyclical *Mediator Dei* of Pius XII⁴³⁰ warns of an excessive archaism in liturgical matters. In praising a desire to return in spirit and affection to the sources of the liturgy, Pius XII condemned the tendency to return to the ancient rites and usages, discarding all development that had since taken place and had been approved by authority. This is a principle constantly practiced in the history of the Church, and perfectly observed by the post-Tridentine Commission and Saint Pius V.

The radical recasting of a liturgical rite or substitution of rites

The sixteenth century Protestants, in claiming to return to the liturgical practice of the primitive Church, in fact composed new liturgies. On the other hand, the Pianine Missal and Breviary were a restoration of the contemporary Roman Rite in the light of the ancient sources then available to scholars. In the case of Cranmer, the new Anglican service of 1549 was disguised to look like the Catholic rite in order to get it accepted in the parishes. Many of the faithful, likening it to a *Christmas game*, were aware that there had been a substitution of rites. In view of the popular reaction against the 1549 Prayer Book, it can be said that new rites cannot be assimilated except by force, until the old has been forgotten.

Dom Guéranger⁴³¹ gives in succinct form twelve points of what he terms *hérésie anti-liturgique*. These are principles that governed the creation of new liturgies by the Protestant confessions or later heterodox tendencies in the Catholic Church. The first principle is disregard of tradition in favour of an expression of new doctrines. The second is systematically to prefer biblical texts to formulæ of ecclesiastical style. Thirdly, new formulæ are elaborated,

⁴²⁸ Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London 1945, pp 605-612; cf. pp 613-734.

⁴²⁹ Ibid., p 657. Archbishop Cranmer inserted an epiclesis in the Communion Service of the 1549 Prayer Book. Some elements of his eucharistic prayer vaguely resemble parts of the Liturgy of Saint James. Most of the rite is a new composition based on the order of the Roman rite (Use of Sarum).

⁴³⁰ Benedictine Monks of Solesmes, *Papal teachings: The Liturgy*, Boston 1962, pp 313-407.

⁴³¹ P. Guéranger, *Institutions liturgiques*, I, Paris 1878, pp 397-407.

and the fourth principle is that of archaism. In these two principles, there is an essential contradiction, which Guéranger underlines, between the confection of new texts and the appeal to antiquity. The abolition of a sense of unction or mystery, for Guéranger, is a characteristic of the Protestant liturgies, what we to day would call the sense of the sacred. The suppression of feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints is the seventh point mentioned by the Abbot of Solesmes, but we introduce a distinction between the total abolition of the Sanctoral and the work carried out by the Pianine Commission to give place to the temporal cycle. Guéranger attaches a particular importance to the use of Latin. Especially significant are the last four points: the tendency to shorten liturgical celebrations, aversion to what is Roman, and the anticlerical reaction common to many heretical movements.

The liturgy is not a book written by theologians, professors or experts, but is a living Mystery whose ritual expression organically develops in the Church. It is our conviction that the *Novus Ordo* of Paul VI is a distinct rite from the Roman Rite it was intended to replace. The fault we find with this new rite is not only situated at the level of validity or doctrinal orthodoxy, but at that of the integrity of liturgical form and symbolism that developed in the history of the Church. We consider the new *ordo*, and rites derived from it, from this point of view, to be a substantial break from the previous Roman Rite and tradition⁴³². It is seen that both innovation and archaism are profound errors, destroying the homogeneity of this process of growth.

CRITICISM OF IMMOBILISM AND EVOLUTIONISM

In the light of the first and second sections of this chapter, we are able to discern three main conceptions of liturgical and theological tradition. These are a simple conservation of the deposit of faith, from which any variation is heresy⁴³³, a form or theory born of a reaction to the Protestant revolt, or an evolutionary theory according to which the content of Revelation may change

⁴³² Cf. Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci, *Breve esame critico del Novus Ordo Missæ*, Rome 1969; M. Davies, *Pope Paul's New Mass*, Chumleigh 1981; L. Salleron, *La Nouvelle Messe*, Paris 1976; R. Coomaraswamy, *The problems with the New Mass*, Rockford 1990; A. da Silveira, *La Nouvelle Messe: Qu'en penser?*, Vouille 1975; Mgr K. Gamber, *La Réforme liturgique en question*, Le Barroux 1992. In the present-day controversy concerning the rite of Mass, certain authors attempt to prove that the *Novus Ordo* is a normal development from the traditional liturgy, reformed in an homogenous continuity. Cf. A. Nocent, *La célébration eucharistique avant et après Saint Pie V*, Paris 1977; G. Oury, *La Messe de S. Pie V à Paul VI*, Solesmes 1975; J. Ratzinger, *Feast of Faith* (translation of *Das Fest des Glaubens*, Einsiedeln 1981), San Francisco 1986, pp 79-95. The observations of Ratzinger, with those of Gamber, are the most balanced, in an attempt to criticise the 1969 reform. Paul VI himself uttered a number of statements on the matter, some to the effect that he had promulgated a new rite to take the place of the old, others maintaining a substantial identity between the two rites.

⁴³³ Cf. Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman*, Cambridge 1987, pp 1-20 (Chapter I: *Semper eadem*).

or grow according to time and local mentalities or cultures (Modernism)⁴³⁴. There is also a theory of an immutable deposit of faith or basic liturgical form whose theological or ritual expression, or tradition, develops according to certain rules⁴³⁵. The first position is historically untenable. Protestantism and the Modernist position (as condemned by Pius X) are heretical. The third can cogently be applied to the liturgy, and is in some ways a *via media* between the other two.

Immobilism

As we have shown in our third chapter, the Tridentine approach to Tradition was necessarily apologetic, in the face of Protestant polemics, for the Reformers denied any kind of tradition. Generally, the conception of tradition before the nineteenth century was that the Apostles gave to their successors, and through them to us, a corpus of teaching which the Church must preserve. This corpus of doctrine had to be what had always been taught, everywhere and universally⁴³⁶. Tridentine apologetics sought to establish that a given doctrine is explicitly or implicitly expressed in Scripture, taught by the Fathers, and continuously believed by the whole Church in all places and times. So it was for the Tridentine method of defending the liturgy: Mass was celebrated in the same way since the time of the Apostles. Biblical references are cited to prove that liturgical gestures were known in the primitive Church, and so forth. Between the Catholic conception of an immutable Tradition and the Protestant idea of an unchanging Bible, there was no common ground on which to make progress. The feud between Catholics and Protestants, locked in the same essential mentality, quickly became a situation of stalemate.

Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704), Bishop of Meaux, was an exponent of this post-Tridentine apologetic approach to Tradition. He put forward a theory⁴³⁷ by which all variation in religion was a sign of error suggesting that

⁴³⁴ This conception of tradition is expressed in these condemned propositions: *Constitutio organica Ecclesiae non est immutabilis; sed societas christiana perpetua evolutioni æque ac societas humana est obnoxia.* and, *Christus determinatum doctrinæ corpus omnibus temporibus cunctisque hominibus applicabile non docuit, sed potius inchoavit motum quemdam religiosum diversis temporibus ac locis adaptatum vel adaptandum.* Pius X, *Syllabus Lamentabili*, in: *My words will not pass away, doctrinal writings of St Pius X*, Greenhills 1974, pp 159-174; cf. *Ibid.*, pp 177-303: the Encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*. For a study of Modernism in general, cf. P. Scoppola, *Ricerche per la storia religiosa di Roma*, vol 8, Edizioni di Storia e di Letteratura, Rome 1990; E. Poulat, *Histoire, Dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste*, Paris 1962; G. Siri, Gethsemani. Réflexions sur le Mouvement Théologique Contemporain, Paris 1981.

⁴³⁵ Chadwick, *op. cit.*, pp 139-163; Constitution *Dei verbum* of Vatican II, in: *Concile oecuménique Vatican II*, Paris 1967, pp 125-146.

⁴³⁶ Chadwick, *op. cit.*, p 2.

⁴³⁷ Cf. Bossuet, *Histoire des variations des Eglises protestantes*, cited in: Chadwick, *op. cit.*

Christianity came from its Founder completely formulated, and had always been maintained in its integrity by the Magisterium of the Church. Therefore, any religion that varied in its teaching or practice was deemed heretical. Only the Catholic Church, according to the Bishop of Meaux, had remained immutable.

The apologetic mentality of the Tridentine theologians had become a permanent theological theory. If change in the Catholic Church was admitted, Protestants qualified it as a corruption⁴³⁸. The controversy between Protestants and Catholics produced a kind of dialectic mentality: immutable and orthodox, or varying and heretical. Such an argument supporting the immutability of the Catholic Church was frequently supported by spurious documents, which historical scholarship has refuted⁴³⁹. It is to be seen that the conception of an immutable Church is historically untenable, which implies that the liturgy does not remain exactly the same everywhere and in all periods of time; it has developed in its ritual form.

Evolutionism or the dissolution of liturgical form

The possibility that the liturgy was given no basic substantial form, and that this may evolve, change and be manipulated in any direction according to temporal and local circumstances is proposed by some progressive theologians, particularly in the various liberal Protestant confessions. Such a point of view is widespread also in the Catholic Church, particularly since the mid 1960's, but going back to the beginning of the twentieth century.

The problem of evolution in the liturgy came into being among modern liturgical scholars, when a distinction came to be made between liturgical *form* and the dogmatic and canonical approaches to the liturgy. This *form* or *structure* was found to be a theological and spiritual reality with an integrity of its own⁴⁴⁰. It gave to liturgical studies its specificity, leading to the movement for reform. However, in the light of modern biblical exegesis, there was a considerable amount of controversy on the basic form of the Mass. It is not possible to develop this theme in the scope of this work, but it can be seen that what is developed or *evolved* is what exists in the first place⁴⁴¹.

The concept of an arbitrary evolution in the liturgy sprang from these difficulties in determining the origin of its forms, as well as from the notion

⁴³⁸ Chadwick, op. cit., p 13.

⁴³⁹ Examples of such documents are the Isidorian decretals and the Clementine Recognitions.

⁴⁴⁰ Ratzinger, op. cit., p 33; cf. Dix, op. cit.; R. Guardini, *Besinnung vor der Feier der heiligen Messe*, 2 vols, Mainz 1939; Joseph Pascher, *Eucharistia, Gestalt und Vollzug*, Münster-Krailling 1947.

⁴⁴¹ Cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., pp 39-60.

that Revelation or even God Himself is evolving. Evolution became a pretext of a fundamental change in the principle governing the basic structure of the liturgy. Dialectic was created between rite, Church, authority and objectivity; and creativity, freedom, celebration and community⁴⁴². This is now to be found in more or less extreme forms. There is no development of any kind in this view of liturgy, but simply the basis of total anarchy and banality. The Eucharist becomes no longer the celebration of the Paschal Mystery, but simply a meeting of human beings like any other.

A view of the liturgy that seeks to *liberate* it from ecclesiastical authority leads, as it was the case for the Protestant reformers, to *make* new liturgies to replace the old. Such is entirely opposed to the spirit of the Catholic liturgy, which, having a cosmic and universal dimension, is received as a given reality, expressed in the form of a rite, which may be Roman, Gallican, Byzantine or a number of others. For this reason, the fundamental law of liturgy, as for the doctrinal expression of dogma, is that of organic growth within the universality of a tradition⁴⁴³.

It is sometimes objected that a set rite excludes creativity. To the contrary, the creativity involved in synthetic or *homemade* liturgies has a very restricted scope. In the Church's traditional liturgy, there are many more opportunities for creativity. We have only to think of Gregorian chant and the music of Palestrina and Mozart, of the preaching of Bossuet and Lacordaire, of the delicate work of contemplative nuns in the making of fine vestments, not to mention the architects and builders of our churches and cathedrals.

Those who have made an honest study of the history of the liturgy know that organic development within a tradition has always been the rule. Whether this tradition is that of the Roman Rite celebrated nearly everywhere, or of a particular Church, such as that of Milan or Braga, or in the Oriental Church, liturgical rites always imposed an obligatory form of worship on each congregation and priest. It is through this acceptance of something from above and beyond oneself that true Christian freedom is acquired. What is wonderful about the Church's liturgy is that it brings us out of our individualism and enables us to partake of the love and Truth of the living God.

⁴⁴² Cf. E. Bickl, *Zur Rezeption des Gotteslob. Einführungsschwierigkeiten und Lesungsvorschläge*, in: *Singende Kirche* 25 (1977-1978), pp 115-118: *Liturgy is not some officially prescribed ritual but a concrete celebration, fashioned as an authentic expression of the celebrating community, with the minimum of external control. Liturgy is not a specifically ecclesiastical cult with its own spirituality, to be performed in an objective manner... The priest's missal is his guidebook for his particular role... Liturgy is created in a particular place at a particular time; this emphasizes the role of the community...*

⁴⁴³ Cf. Sacrosanctum Concilium, no 23.

PRINCIPLES OF LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT

We are aware that the Roman liturgy has developed in history and has been several times reformed and corrected. However, are all developments and reforms for the good?

It is an established principle that the law of prayer fixes the law of faith, and vice versa. The liturgy is a witness of the theological tradition of a particularly high authority⁴⁴⁴. For the reason that the liturgy renders truly present the Mystery of God throughout the whole of salvation history, it is the surest expression of the living Tradition in the Church. Similarly, the development of the Church's dogmatic teaching has its effect on the liturgy, as we have seen in our first three chapters. For example, the development of the doctrine of the Real Presence brought about the genuflection and the Elevation, both gestures being nearly unknown before the fifteenth century. Both these have become an established part of the liturgical tradition. It is the ecclesial character of the liturgy that brought the Church to introduce elements into the celebration, which safeguard orthodoxy against threats of heretical deviations. The shining example of this was the restoration of the Missal under Saint Pius V by authority of the Council of Trent. This close link between the liturgy and the Deposit of Faith opens for us a method by which we can discern principles for the authentic development of the liturgy.

We have seen that the *progressive* theory and praxis of the liturgy is profoundly wrong, for it destroys the basis of organic development. What is this basis, and how can we discern and distinguish genuine developments from deviations? One way is by the historical study of the *Gestalt* or form of the liturgy, to distinguish essential from non-essential elements⁴⁴⁵. The Tridentine theologians attempted to do just that, but from very limited historical knowledge. We know much more to-day, and we have at our disposal many critical editions of ancient liturgical sources. However, we do not know everything, and what we do not know marks the limits of the historical method alone. For instance, we know nothing certain about the Greek Roman liturgy of the first three centuries; there are vast gaps in our knowledge.

The Principles of liturgical development in Sacrosanctum Concilium

We now turn to the teachings on this subject of the second Vatican Council and its Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*⁴⁴⁶. Much of what we have said

⁴⁴⁴ A. Martimort, *L'Eglise en prière*, I, Paris 1983, p 286; cf. B. Capelle, *Autorité de la liturgie chez les Pères*, in: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 21 (1954), pp 9-18.

⁴⁴⁵ *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no 23.

⁴⁴⁶ Vatican II, op. cit., pp 151-171.

concerning liturgical tradition and development is confirmed by the conciliar Constitution:

*“The liturgy is made up of unchangeable elements divinely instituted, and of elements subjected to change. These latter not only may be changed but ought to be changed with the passage of time, if they have suffered from the intrusion of anything out of harmony with the inner nature of the liturgy or have become less suitable”*⁴⁴⁷.

This principle is nearly that of the Council of Trent, provided that the so-called *changeable elements* are in reality recent corruptions. The Fathers of Vatican II, formed in the post-Tridentine tradition, admit an essential immutability of the rite in its development.

In order to limit unauthorised developments, the Council clearly defines the authority in the matter of liturgy: the Apostolic See, episcopal conferences and diocesan bishops⁴⁴⁸. The Fathers adopted a prudent attitude concerning tradition and development:

*“In order that sound tradition be retained, and yet the way remain open to legitimate progress, a careful investigation ... should always be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised. Furthermore the general laws governing the structure and meaning of the liturgy must be studied... Finally, there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them, and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing”*⁴⁴⁹.

Reforms of the liturgy and Pope Montini’s revolution in the 1960’s and 70’s were not implemented according to these principles. The care that should have been taken that these innovations mentioned had really to grow organically was non-existent.

⁴⁴⁷ *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no 21.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, no 22.

⁴⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, no 23.

CONCLUSION: THE FUTURE OF THE ROMAN RITE OF THE MASS

The Roman Rite, from the evidence of history, reached the natural term of its organic development by about the eleventh century. Over the next four centuries, of which we have studied a certain amount, its liturgical form was canonised by custom and ecclesiastical law. The mature Roman liturgy has been the constant point of reference to anyone reforming ritual usage or Church discipline. So it was for the rubricists of the great religious Orders, the renaissance canonists and humanists. The Popes, in making corrections in the calendar and adding new feasts, referred to the adult liturgy as to a living tradition, though no longer substantially changing.

The characteristic of the authors of the post Vatican II liturgy is their attitude faced with a liturgy that no longer develops substantially, as it did before the eleventh century. Their central tenet is that, because the liturgy ceased to change, it necessarily fell into a period of decay and fossilisation, and that a liturgical renewal would consist in the resumption of an evolutive process. As this was impossible on the basis of a fully developed and adult rite, the need was felt to introduce an entirely new liturgy based on a number of archaic sources. On this basis, as is believed by some, a new process of development and adaptation would bring about spiritual renewal in the Church. This has been proven to be an illusion, a pastoral failure.

Consistent with the earlier tendency of abolishing regional rites and usages in favour of the Roman liturgy, the conciliar Roman authorities consider the *Novus Ordo* to be *the* only official liturgy of the Latin Church. Paul VI had said, without making it an official act, that the new rite was *promulgated to take the place of the old*. Most priests considered the rite of 1969 to be no more than an updated reform of the old Missal, simplified and rendered into the vernacular. The problem is that the *Novus Ordo* is *not* an organic development, but a new fabrication using parts of the old rite, as did some of the Protestant liturgies of the sixteenth century. This came to light during our historical study of this period. The reality is that the Roman Rite was *destroyed*, and nothing of lasting value has taken its place.

The events of the summer of 1988 proved a partial turning point: a diversity of opinions among Roman clerics, faced with a new and threatening situation when Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1992) consecrated four bishops at Ecône. When negotiations between the Archbishop and the Rome had failed, John-Paul II issued a *Motu Proprio Ecclesia Dei* with the intention of providing a “pastoral” measure for those Catholics who wished to use the old rite *and* remain in communion with Rome. These measures remain largely blocked by

most of the diocesan bishops of the Latin Church. In the late 1990's, the liturgical question is an *impasse*. It would seem that the Church has some very fundamental questions to resolve, such as the state of the Papacy and the problem of an heretical Pope, or one who inflicts considerable damage on the Church by imposing a new liturgy or immoral laws.

What is the solution for the future? The outlook is bleak, apart from the knowledge that the Roman Mass has never been canonically abrogated, seeing the evidence. Still to this day, liturgical "pluralism" is still one-sided: traditionalists are ostracised, and the tendency to reduce and rationalise the new liturgy even further goes largely unchecked. The same old abuses of Communion in the hand, female altar servers, unauthorised readers and ministers of the Sacraments, etc., with which we are all familiar, continue to shock and scandalise believers - as they are without doubt meant to do. What would the Tridentine commission of seven prelates have thought?

It is seen that there has to be discipline in liturgical matters, as in all questions of ecclesiastical law. No society can work without authority and order, and this is what is most lacking in the Church. Ironically, those who are the most disposed to religious obedience are those who are the most ostracised by the law of the arbitrary that has taken the place of justice and equity. This brings us to the point of seeing a lesson in this whole study: mere *authority* is insufficient. There must be a sense of the wholeness of Christian Tradition, which has been largely lacking in the Latin Church for many centuries. The problems in the liturgy of the early sixteenth century, due to ignorance or wickedness, have but reappeared. The *reformed* liturgy was *unreformed*.

What is the future of the Roman Rite? Providence only knows, but it is unlikely at this present time to be restored as the *official* rite of the Roman Church. It will continue to be celebrated by traditionalist priests and religious communities. It will continue as a kind of *Indian Reservation* for those considered to be behind the times. It is unlikely that a liturgical restoration will come from Rome in the near future, because fundamental ecclesiological problems have still to be resolved, as already mentioned. This work will have to be prepared by the humble ministry of priests who have no ambition of ecclesiastical preferment.

Some see signs of hope seeing certain religious and priestly communities committed to this goal. The communities depending on the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission show certain signs of success among traditionalists. Other people among the laity continue to attend Mass in churches and chapels of the Society of St Pius X. An unresolved problem is the difficulty young men with priestly vocations have to face, if they wish to use the ancient Roman Rite. Where can they go to seminary, and *where will they be able to minister as priests?* Since 1988, the movement has grown, and already shows signs of influence among several Roman clerics. Some members of the high clergy have shown

interest in the cause for the restoration of the Roman liturgy, as have numerous professors, authors and other intellectuals. All this gives cause for hope, but on the other hand, serious underlying ecclesiological questions have never even been asked.

In this work of liturgical history, we have learned many things that shed light on the present. The decadence in the liturgy in the fourteenth and fifteenth century in many places (by no means universal) colludes in a striking fashion with the Avignon Papacy and the great schism of the west. It has to be admitted that the Church is in a state of an advanced crisis, not only of authority, but the very meaning of the Church, of religion, or even of God. It is no small wonder that to a priest who has lost the Faith, and chases after some humanist chimera, the liturgy will mean very little to him. Perhaps, we can understand a little more of history through our own experience.

One day, the world will see the restoration of the Papacy and a glorious resurrection of the Church from the ruins of her shame. Perhaps there will be a new *Counter Reformation* and a re-iteration of the work of the Council of Trent and Saint Pius V, a newly codified Missal to replace the *Novus Ordo*. The Church needs saints more than scholars, men of vision and force of personality more than conformists. Such men already exist, but their voices go unheard, shunned as ridiculous pariahs. This is not the first time this has happened. The experience of our own times will certainly help us to remove a certain romantic gloss from the conditions that threatened the existence of the Catholic Church before the Council of Trent. May this humble piece of work help to stimulate priests and layfolk alike to fight on the front lines - for the soul of God's Holy Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANDRIEU, M., *L'Ordinaire de la Chapelle papale et le Cardinal Jacques Gætani Stefaneschi*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* 49 (1935), p 230-260.
- ANDRIEU, M., *Les Ordines Romani du Haut Moyen Age*, 5 vols., Louvain 1931 ss.
- ANDRIEU, M., *Le Pontifical romain au moyen âge*, 4 vols., Vatican City 1938-1941.
- AYLMER, G.E. and CANT, R., *A History of York Minster*, Oxford 1977.
- BATTIFOL, P., *Histoire du Bréviaire Romain*, Paris 1911.
- BATTIFOL, P., *Leçons sur La Messe*, Paris 1927.
- BAUMER, S., *Histoire du Bréviaire*, 2 vols, Freiburg i. Br. 1967.
- BICKL, E., *Zur Reception des Gotteslob. Einführungsschwierigkeiten und Lesungsvorschläge*, in: *Singende Kirche* 25 (1977-1978), p 115-118.
- BOSSUET, J.-B., *Histoire des variations des Eglises Protestantes*, Paris 1688.
- BOUYER, L., *Life and Liturgy*, London 1956.
- BOUYER, L., *Liturgy and Architecture*, Notre Dame 1967.
- BOUYER, L., *La Decomposition du Catholicisme*, Paris 1968.
- BOTTE, B., *L Ordinaire de la Messe*, Paris 1953.
- BRILIOTH, Y., *Eucharistic faith and practice*, London 1930.
- BURCHARD, J., *Sacrarum cæremoniarum sive Rituum ecclesiasticorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ libri tres*, ed. J. Catalani, Rome 1750.
- CABROL, F., *Missel Romain*, in: *Dictionnaire d'Archæologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Vol XI, Paris 1934, col. 1468-1494.
- CABROL, F., *La Messe Romaine*, in: *Liturgia*, Paris 1930, p 509-553.
- CABASILAS, N., *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, ed. J.M. Hussey and P.A. Mc Nulty, London 1960.
- CALVIN, J., *Petite Tracte de la Sainte Cène de Nostre Seigneur*, in: *Corpus Reformatorum*, 33 (Joannis Calvini Opera V), Geneva 1691.

- CAPELLE, B., *Autorité de la Liturgie chez les Pères*, in: *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 21 (1954), p 9-18.
- CAPPONI, N., *Some juridical considerations on the reform of the liturgy*, Florence 1975.
- CHADWICK, O., *The Reformation*, London 1972.
- CHADWICK, O., *From Bossuet to Newman*, Cambridge 1987.
- CHEDOZEAU, B., *La Bible et la Liturgie en Français. L'Eglise tridentine et les traductions bibliques et liturgiques (1600-1789)*, Paris 1990.
- CIMITIER, F., *La Liturgie et le Droit Canonique*, in: *Liturgia*, Paris 1930, p 29-58.
- CLARK A., *The Origin and Development of the Offertory Rite*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* LXIV (1950), p 309-344.
- CLARK, F., *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, Oxford 1967.
- COACHE, L., *Le Droit canonique est-il aimable?*, Beaumont 1986.
- COOMARASWAMY, R., *The Problems with the New Mass*, Rockford 1990.
- CROUAN, D., *Histoire du Missel Romain*, Paris 1988.
- CUMING, G.J., *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, London 1969.
- DAVIES, M., *An open lesson to a Bishop in the development of the Roman Rite*, Chumleigh 1980.
- DAVIES, M., *Pope Paul's New Mass*, Chumleigh 1980.
- DAVIES, M., *Cranmer's Godly Order*, Chumleigh 1980.
- DICKINSON, F.H., (ed.) *Missale ad usum insignis et præclaræ Ecclesiæ Sarum*, London 1883.
- DIJK, S. van, and J. HAZELDEN, *The origins of the modern Roman liturgy ; the liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the thirteenth century*, London 1960.
- DIJK, S. van, *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and related documents*, Fribourg 1975.
- DIX, G., *The Shape of the Liturgy*, London 1945.
- DULAC, R., *La Bulle Quo primum*, in: *Itinéraires* 162 (1972), p 13-47.
- DUMOUTET, E., *Le Désir de voir l'Hostie*, Paris 1926.

- DURET, G., *Les Livres Liturgiques*, in: *Liturgia*, Paris 1930, p 397-435.
- DUVAL, A., *Des Sacrements au Concile de Trente*, Paris 1985.
- FERRERES, *Historia del Misal Romano*, Barcelona 1929.
- FISCHER, L. (ed.), *Bernhardi cardinalis et Laterarensis Ecclesiae Prioris Ordo officiorum Ecclesiae Laterensis*, Monaco 1916.
- FLETCHER, A., *Tudor Rebellions*, London 1973.
- FOCKE, E. & HEINRICHS, H., *Das Kalendar des Missale Pianum vom Jahre 1570 und seine Tendenzen*, in: *Theol. Quartalschrift* 120 (1939), p 383-400; 461-469.
- FORTESCUE, A., *The Mass a study of the Roman liturgy*, London 1917.
- FRANSEN, P., *Reflexions sur l'anathème au Concile de Trente (Bologne 10-14 Sept. 1547)*, in: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 29 (1953), p 657-672.
- FRANZ, A., *Die Messe im Deutschen Mittelalter*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1902.
- FREIDBERG, A. (ed.), *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, in: *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Leipzig 1879.
- FRUTAZ, A.P., *Contributo alla storia della riforma del Messale promulgato da san Pio V nel 1570*, in: *Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento*, Padova, Ed. ANTENORE, 1960 (Italia sacra), p 187-214.
- FUNK, F., *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderborn 1905.
- GAMBER, K., *La Réforme liturgique en question*, Le Barroux 1992.
- GÖRRESGESELLSCHAFT, *Concilium Tridentinum; Diarorum, Actorum, Epistolarum, Tractatum nova collectio*, 16 vols., Freiburg im Breisgau 1901-1980.
- GUARDINI, R., *Besinnung vor der Fier der heiligen Messe*, Mainz 1939.
- GUÉRANGER, P., *Institutions Liturgiques*, 3 vols, Le Mans and Paris 1840-1842.
- GY, P.M., *La Liturgie dans l'Histoire*, Paris 1990.
- HUGHES OLIPHANT, O.G. *The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship*, Zürich 1975.
- HUGHES, P., *A History of the Church*, 3 vols, London 1952.
- JEDIN, H., *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des römischen Messbuches*, in: *Liturgisches Leben* VI (1939), p 30-66.

- JEDIN, H., *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient, Band II: Erste Trienter Tagungsperiode (1545-1547)*, Freiburg 1957.
- JEDIN, H., *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform der liturgischen Bücher*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* LIX (Rome 1945), p 5-38.
- JEDIN, H., *Girolamo Seripendo. Sein Leben und Denken im Geisteskampf des 16. Jahrhunderts*, vol II, Würzburg 1937.
- JOUNEL, P., *Les Rites de la Messe*, Tournai 1963.
- JUNGMANN, J., *The Mass of the Roman Rite (Missarum Sollemnia)*, 2 volumes, Westminster (USA) 1986.
- KING, A.A., *Liturgy of the Roman Church*, London 1959.
- KING, A.A., *Liturgies of the Past*, London 1959.
- KING, A.A., *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*, London 1955.
- KING, H.C., *The Chancel and the Altar*, London 1911.
- KLAUSER, T., *A short history of the Western Liturgy*, Oxford 1979.
- KOROLEVSKIJ, C., *Liturgie en langue vivante, Orient et Occident*, Paris 1955.
- LANG, A., *Der Bedeutungswandel der Begriffe fides und hæresis und die dogmatische Wertung der Konzilsentscheidungen von Vienne und Trient*, in: *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 4 (1953), p 133-146.
- LEBRUN, P., *Explication des Prières et Cérémonies de la Messe*, Paris 1716-1726.
- LEGG, J.W., *Tracts on the Mass*, London 1904.
- LENNERZ, H., *Notulæ Tridentinæ*, in: *Gregorianum* 27 (1946), p 136-142.
- LEWIS, C.A., *The silent recitation of the Canon of the Mass*, Bay Saint Louis 1962.
- LODI, E., *Enchiridion Euchologicum Fontium Liturgicorum*, Rome 1979.
- LÖW, G., *Calendario della Chiesa universale*, in: *Enciclopedia Cattolica*, III, Vatican 1950, p 364-372.
- MARCO, A. de, *The Church of Rome and the Problem of the Vernacular versus the Liturgical Language*, Washington DC 1960.
- MARTIMORT, A.G., *L'Eglise en Prière*, 4 vols, Paris 1983.
- MENTHE, R., *Ein Missale Romanum von 1481*, in: *Franziskan Studien*, 20 (1933), p 89-129.

- MERCATI, G., *Opere minori*, Vatican 1937.
- MESSENGER, E.C., *The Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood*, 2 volumes, London 1937.
- MEYER, H.B., *Luther und die Messe. Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Verhältnis Luthers zum Messwesen des späten Mittelalters*, Paderborn 1965.
- MISSALE ROMANUM, Ratisbonne 1941.
- MISSALE ROMANUM, Milan 1474, edited by R. LIPPE, 2 volumes, Henry Bradshaw Society, London 1899 and 1906.
- NOCENT, A., *La célébration eucharistique avant et après Saint Pie V*, Paris 1977.
- NOIROT, M., *Liturgie (droit)*, in: *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique*, tome VI, Paris 1957, p 535-594.
- OTTAVIANI, A. and BACCI, A., *Breve esame critico del Novus Ordo Missæ*, Rome 1969.
- OURY, G., *La Messe de S. Pie V à Paul VI*, Solesmes 1975.
- PALLAVICINI, S., *Histoire du Concile de Trente*, 3 volumes, Paris 1844-1845.
- PASCHER, J., *Eucharistia, Gestalt und Vollzug*, Münster-Krailling 1947.
- PASCHINI, P., *Guglielmo Sirleto ed il Decreto Tridentino sull'edizione critica della Bibbia*, Lecco 1935.
- PASCHINI, P., *Guglielmo Sirleto prima del cardinalato*, in: *Tre ricerche sulla storia della Chiesa nel Cinquecento*, Rome (1945) p 155-281.
- PASCHINI, P., *Il cardinale Guglielmo Sirleto in Calabria*, in: *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia*, I (1947), p 22-37.
- PATRIZI, *Cæremoniale Romanum*, Farnborough 1965. In the same volume is found: *Pontificalis ordinis liber*. See Burchard.
- PLAT, J. le, *Monumentorum ad Historiam Tridentini*, 4, Louvain 1784.
- POULAT, E., *Histoire, Dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste*, Paris 1962.
- PROCTER, F., and W.H. FRERE, *A new history of the Book of Common Prayer*, London 1920.
- PUNET, P. de, *The Roman Pontifical*, London 1932.
- RABOTIN, H., *Les Textes liturgiques*, in: *Liturgia*, Paris 1930, p 343-370.

- RATZINGER, J., *Das Fest des Glaubens*, Einsiedeln 1981.
- RITTER, K.B., *Zur Lehre vom opus operatum*, in: *Una Sancta*, (May 1959), p 34-39.
- RIVIERE, J., *La Messe durant la période de la Réforme et du Concile de Trente*, in: *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, volume X (1929), col 1085-1142.
- RIVOLI, D. de, *Les Missels imprimés à Venise de 1481 à 1600. Description, illustration, bibliographie*, Paris 1896.
- ROULIN, E.A., *Vestments and Vesture*, London 1931.
- SALLERON, L., *La Nouvelle Messe*, Paris 1976.
- SANDER, M., *Le livre à figures italiens depuis 1467 jusqu'à 1530. Essai de sa bibliographie et de son histoire*, vol II, Milano 1942.
- SANDON, N., ed., *The Use of Salisbury*, Newton Abbot 1984.
- SCHMIDT, H., *Liturgie en langue vulgaire, le problème de la langue liturgique chez les premiers réformateurs et au Concile de Trente*, Rome 1950.
- SCHRÖDER, J., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, St Louis 1941.
- SCHÖNBERGER, A., *De la Révolution à l'Inculturation*, in: *Una Voce* (France) 157 (1991), p 50-58.
- SCOPPOLA, P., *Ricerche per la storia religiosa di Roma*, vol 8, Edizioni di Storia e di Letteratura, Rome 1990.
- SILVERIRA, A. da, *La Nouvelle Messe: Qu'en penser?*, Vouille 1975.
- SIMMONS, T.F., *The Lay Folks' Mass Book* (Early English Text Society), London 1879.
- SIRI, G., *Gethsemani. Réflexions sur le Mouvement Théologique contemporain*, Paris 1981.
- SOLESMES, Benedictine Monks of, *Papal teachings: the Liturgy*, Boston 1962.
- THEISEN, R., *Mass liturgy and the Council of Trent*, Collegeville 1965.
- TIROT, P., *Histoire des prières de l'Offertoire dans la liturgie romaine du VIIe au XVIe siècle*, Rome 1985.
- TUFO, J., *Historia della religione dei Padri Cherici regolari* (original spelling), tome II, Rome 1609-1616.
- VOGEL, C., *Medieval liturgy: an introduction to the sources*, Washington 1986.

WILMART, A., *Primum in Ordine*, in: *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, 50 (1936), p 133-139.

WILMART, A., *Le Comes de Murbach*, in: *Revue Bénédictine* (1913), p 25-29.

WINCH, R., *The Canonical Mass of the English Orthodox*, Oxford 1988.

ZACCARIA, F.A., *Bibliotheca Ritualis*, 2 volumes: Tomus I: *De Libris ad Sacros utriusque Ecclesiæ Orientalis, et Oceidentalis ritus pertinentibus*, Rome 1776., Tomus II: *Supplementa continens Præmisso CL. viri Joannis Maldonati, inedito de Cæremoniis tractatu cui præter adnotationes adcedit gemina Editoris dissertatio*, Rome 1781.

ZAK, A., *Über die Præfationen*, in: *Theol. prakt Quartelschrift*, 58 (1905), p 307-325.