

THE ORATIONS OF THE VATICAN II MISSAL: POLICIES FOR REVISION¹

• Lauren Pristas •

“We learn from Dumas’ essay that the policies approved in 1966 were revised during the course of the Consilium’s labors.”

Introduction

The Paul VI Missal has been well studied in itself, but most of the specific decisions that gave the present missal its shape and character have yet to be placed under the scholarly microscope. This is understandable. The sweeping nature of the reforms and the nearly countless particular decisions that make up the whole define a task that is vast almost beyond imagining. Still, it is a lamentable lacuna. More than thirty years after the promulgation of the Paul VI Missal, the scholarly work essential for situating the new rite in relation to the whole of the Western liturgical tradition is only in its infancy.

By specific decisions I refer to the revisers’ choice of one prayer over another, of one textual variation over another, and so forth. The very first proper Mass oration of the liturgical year, the collect for the first Sunday of Advent, typifies one common

¹I am grateful to the Intercultural Forum for Studies in Faith and Culture of the Pope John Paul II Cultural Center, Washington, D. C., for the support, and to Caldwell College, Caldwell, N. J., for the leave, that enabled me to research and write this article.

sequence of specific decisions and can serve as an example.² The revisers chose *Gelasianum Vetus* 1139, an Advent postcommunion in an eighth-century Mass book to be the collect for the first Sunday of Advent in the new missal.³ Before inclusion, however, the ancient oration was edited so that its meaning was altered.⁴ Moreover, the decision to adopt a new collect required displacing a collect that had been in unbroken use on the first Sunday of Advent for at least

²Namely, to replace an oration for a particular Mass setting with a completely different oration from a different setting, and to present the adopted oration in an edited form.

³Cuthbert Johnson and Anthony Ward, “The Sources of the Roman Missal (1975),” *Notitiae* 22 (1986): 468 cites *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aedis ordinis anni circuli*, ed. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, Leo Eizenfoefer, and Peter Siffirin (Rome: Herder, 1960), the critical edition of *Codex Vaticanus Reginensis* 316, which was copied at Chelles circa 750 and is usually called the Old Gelasian Sacramentary (*Gelasianum Vetus* = *GeV*). The manuscript is a unique Frankish recension of a Roman book that was probably composed between 628 and 715 A.D. See Cyril Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. by William Storey and Neils Rasmussen (Washington, D. C.: The Pastoral Press, 1981), 64–70 for details. *Gelasianum Vetus* is the oldest, not the only, codex that bears witness to the oration under discussion. Cf. Eugene Moeller and Iohanna Maria Clément, *Corpus Orationum*, t. 4, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, 160A (Turnholt: Brepols, 1993), 71–72, n. 1006, which lists 12 other codices in which forms of the same oration appear. In every instance the prayer is used as an Advent postcommunion or *super populum* (prayer over the people or blessing). It is used as a collect for the first time in the 1970 missal.

⁴Compare *GeV* 1139, “Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Deus, cunctae familiae tuae hanc voluntatem in Christo filio tuo domino nostro venienti in operibus iustis aptos occurrere, et eius dexteræ sociati, regnum mereantur possidere caeleste” [Grant, we beseech you, almighty God, to your whole family this will in Christ your Son, our coming Lord, to meet [him] made fit in just deeds, and joined (or assigned) to his right, may they be worthy to possess the heavenly kingdom], to *Missale Romanum* (1970), “Da quaesumus, omnipotens Deus, hanc tuis fidelibus voluntatem, ut, Christo tuo venienti iustis operibus occurrentes, eius dexteræ sociati, regnum mereantur possidere caeleste” [Grant, we beseech you, almighty God, this will to your faithful, that, hastening in righteous deeds to meet your coming Christ, assigned to his right, they may be worthy to possess the heavenly kingdom].

The Gelasian oration begs a will in Christ to meet Christ made fit, or prepared, in just deeds. The 1970 collect does not specify a will “in Christ” or speak of the transformation of the person. On the face of it, neither the theological anthropology nor the eschatology of the two prayers is exactly the same.

The translations of all Latin texts appearing in this article are my own.

twelve hundred years.⁵ Otherwise unchanged, the former collect for the first Sunday of Advent is now the collect for Friday of the first week of Advent.

These facts arouse curiosity. Of all the orations in the Church's treasury, why did the reformers choose this particular Advent postcommunion to be, as it were, the first draft of the collect in the new missal?⁶ Why did they edit it? Why did they decide to set aside a twelve-hundred-year-old tradition? The sequence of decisions outlined above gives rise to these and many more questions, and all with respect to just one prayer. An in-depth examination of the decisions of the reformers with respect to all the changes would multiply the questions and the materials to be studied exponentially.

Unfortunately the revisers did not, as a rule, leave us detailed information about particular decisions or sets of decisions. Cuthbert Johnson and Anthony Ward tell us:

The material conserved in the Congregation's⁷ archive documenting any particular text is uneven, depending on the work methods of a particular group (*coetus*) of revisers, the opportunities offered by distance, commitments to meet in person and so on. It should not be forgotten that all those involved were in some way experts in their field, many having worked for the best part of a lifetime with the texts in questions. Accordingly, there was often no need to prepare extensive written explanations, but

⁵Eugene Moeller and Ionanne Maria Clément, *Corpus Orationum*, t. 4, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 160C, (Turnholt: Brepols, 1994), 242, n. 2875b lists the thirty-nine codices dating from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries in which the 1962 collect for the first Sunday of Advent appears in the same or in an equivalent setting (in some missals the first Sunday of Advent is designated "the fourth Sunday before the birth of the Lord"). See also Placide Bruylants, *Les Oraisons du Missel Romain text et Histoire*, vol. 2 (Louvain: Centre de Documentation et d'Information Liturgiques, 1952), n. 546.

⁶The choice of the new collect for the first Sunday of Advent was not governed by the readings appointed for the same day in the new lectionary. Not only were the missal and lectionary produced independently [Cf. Franco Brovelli, "Le Orazioni del Tempo di Avvento e di Natale," in Aa. Vv., *Il Messali Romano del Vaticano II: Orazionale et Lezionario*, vol. 1, *Quaderni di Rivista Liturgica*, N. S. n. 6, (Turin: Elle di ci Leumann, 1984), 128, n. 115], but the parable to which the collect alludes, Matthew 25:31ff, is the Gospel appointed for the last Sunday of the year, the Solemnity of Christ the King, in Cycle A of the new lectionary.

⁷The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments.

simply to operate selections, and revisions of texts, the rationale of the details being more or less obvious to fellow specialists once broad policies had been defined. Let all users of this work be therefore assured that personal access to the official archival material would reveal no further information, except of the most incidental variety. Of what is available, the fullest use has been made.⁸

The only broad policies for the revision of orations named in the official records are those which were approved in 1966 and later summarized by Annibale Bugnini in his tome on the liturgical reform, namely:

1. That the text of orations not be repeated in the revised missal.
2. That corrupt texts be corrected.
3. That a) the commemoration of local or historical events whose significance has been lost to the Church universal of the present day be removed from orations; and b) orations be accommodated to the rules/customs of Christian life today in cases where there are discrepancies.
4. That the proper literary genre be preserved or restored in each prayer present in, or inserted into, the missal.
5. That the orations of the Roman Missal, in general, be directed to the Father.
6. That new texts, composed principally by the method of centonization, be inserted into the Roman Missal.⁹

⁸Johnson, "Sources of the Roman Missal (1975)," 454.

⁹My list follows Schema n. 186, De Missali n. 27, September 19, 1966, p. 2–4 and addendum, p. 1. Annibale Bugnini, *La Riforma Liturgica (1948–1975)* (Rome: CVL Edizione Liturgiche, 1984), 393 discusses the meeting at which these policies were approved. When Bugnini names the principles, he phrases them quite differently and omits the fifth entirely. Bugnini's intention at this point in his narrative, however, is not to present a verbatim list of policies but to explain that, at the Fall 1966 meeting, the members got no further than the discussion of principles (that is, they were not able to discuss the revised texts that had been submitted by *Coetus* 18bis), and to give his reader a sense of the direction that was the outcome of their discussion.

All the *Consilium* schemata quoted or referred to in this article are on file at the offices of the International Commission on English in the Liturgy, Washington, D. C. I am grateful to Rev. Bruce Harbert and Mr. Peter Finn for permitting me access to the ICEL collection of *coetus* notes.

We shall revisit these policies and discuss them further at pertinent junctures below. For the present it suffices to observe that, on the basis of them alone, the series of particular decisions that resulted in the former collect for the first Sunday of Advent being replaced by the present one could not have been “more or less obvious to fellow specialists” in the sense that this series of decisions was required and none other would have been acceptable. And we cannot state positively that the policies present no obstacle to this particular series of decisions because the policies seem to provide for modifications to existing prayers only when corruptions required correction (policy n. 2) or a prayer had been rendered outmoded by changes in practice or by references that had become obscure (policy n. 3). In fact, the proposed cycle of orations *de tempore* included in the same schema in which the policies were first articulated retains the 1962 collect for the first Sunday of Advent on the same day without any change at all, and presents *GeV* 1139 as the collect for Thursday of the fourth week of Advent with only relatively minor changes to the text.¹⁰ This confirms that the above-named policies did not require a change in the collect for the first Sunday of Advent. It also suggests that the revision practices, perhaps even the revision policies, developed during the period in which the revision work was done.

¹⁰Schema 186, p. 5 and 11. *GeV* 1139 appears as “Da, quaesumus, omnipotens Deus, cunctae familiae tuae hanc voluntatem, Christo filio tuo domino nostro venienti in operibus iustis aptos occurrere, *ut* eius dexteræ sociati, regnum mereantur possidere caeleste” [Grant, we beseech you, almighty God, to your whole family this will, to meet Christ your Son, our coming Lord, made fit in just deeds, that joined (or assigned) to his right, they may merit to possess the heavenly kingdom]. Here there are only two changes: *ut* replaces *et*, and a comma replaces *in* after *voluntatem*. The *et* of *GeV* 1139 is unique. In changing the *et* to *ut* the revisers made the prayer conform to every other extant witness and almost certainly corrected an error in the Gelasian codex. The second change, removing the *in* following *voluntatem*, follows Ménard, a 1642 reprint of a tenth century manuscript (Bibliothèque Nationale *codex lat.* 12051), #192a. Thus the version of *GeV* 1139 proposed in 1966 corresponds exactly to an extant, albeit unique, version of the prayer. In other words, while the revisers of the missal exercised considerable critical discretion in choosing the particular variant of the oration that they proposed in 1966, they did not rewrite any portion of the prayer themselves. When the missal appeared in 1970, however, the prayer had been significantly redrafted by the modern editors (cf. fn. 4 above). The schemata tell us nothing about the decisions to edit the oration and move it to the first Sunday of Advent.

This article has four logically interconnected objectives: first, to explain the makeup and the working methods of the group charged with the revision of the liturgical books; second, to present a contemporary account written by the man who headed the group that actually revised the orations; third, to show from official records and from the contemporary account that certain of the revision policies underwent modification during the course of the revision work; fourth, to inquire into the nature of these modifications.

Part I: Background

The Fathers of Vatican II decided that there would be a reform of the liturgy and outlined its contours in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Sacrosanctum Concilium)*.¹¹ On January 25, 1964, Pope Paul VI issued a *motu proprio* in which he announced the establishment of a special commission whose principal task would be to implement the prescriptions of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*.¹² The new commission was called “the *Consilium* for carrying out the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.”¹³ This *ad hoc* body, not the Fathers of Vatican II, did all the editorial work that went into producing the new liturgical books.

The *Consilium* was comprised of members, consultors, and advisors. Members alone held deliberative vote. They were responsible for making policy decisions and approving revisions. All but three of the members were bishops.¹⁴ The vast work of actually revising the liturgical books was done by the consultors who worked

¹¹Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II, *Constitutiones Decreta Declarationes*, vol. 1 (Civitas Vaticana: Vaticanum Typographium, 1967), 3–54.

¹²“Sacram Liturgiam,” *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 140: “peculiarem condimus Commissionem . . . cuius praecipuae erunt partes, ut ipsius Constitutionis de sacra liturgia praecepta sancte perficienda curet.”

¹³*Consilium ad Exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia*. *Consilium* is Latin for “consultation” or “council.”

¹⁴*Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia, Elenchus membrorum - consultorum - consiliariorum coetuum a studiis* (Vatican: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1964), 9–14 lists forty members, thirty-seven of whom were cardinals or bishops. The non-episcopal members are identified as Benno Gut, Abbot Primate of the Benedictine Order; Ferdinand Antonelli, Promoter General of the Faith; Julius Bevilacqua, pastor.

in small study groups called *coetus*.¹⁵ *Coetus* were comprised of a handful of consultors (usually between five and seven), a *relator*, and a secretary. Each *coetus* was given a particular task. *Coetus* 18bis, whose work we are discussing, revised the orations and prefaces. Advisors reviewed the work of particular *coetus* before it was submitted to the members.¹⁶

The *relator* of each *coetus* organized the group's work and signed its official submissions to the members. These written submissions are called schemata. Schemata contained a report on the group's progress, any procedural questions requiring a decision from the members, and any liturgical texts that the *coetus* had prepared since the last report.¹⁷ The six policies listed above are the result of the members having voted affirmatively on six questions submitted to them with supporting rationale by the relator of *Coetus* 18bis in Fall, 1966.¹⁸

Over the course of its history, the group responsible for the revision of the Mass orations had two *relators*. The first *relator* of *Coetus* 18bis was Placide Bruylants, who died unexpectedly in October, 1966.¹⁹ Bruylants was succeeded by Antoine Dumas.²⁰ Later

¹⁵*Coetus* is simply the Latin word for "group" or "groups."

¹⁶For descriptions of the structure and working methods of the *Consilium* see Bugnini, *La Riforma Liturgica (1948–1975)*, 60–64, 71–78; Bernard Botte, *Le Mouvement Liturgique: Témoignage et Souvenirs* (Paris: Desclée, 1973), 156; Pierre-Marie Gy, *The Reception of Vatican II Liturgical Reforms in the Life of the Church* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2003), 8–10; *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia, Elenchus membrorum - consultorum - consiliariorum coetuum a studiis*, 7–8, 39–51.

¹⁷Sections of the revised missal were submitted to the members *en bloc*. Schema n. 186, De Missali n. 27, September 19, 1966 contained the proposed orations *de tempore* and Schema n. 319, De Missali n. 56, October 7, 1968, the proposed orations for saints.

¹⁸In actual fact, three of the questions (nn. 4–6) were rephrased before the members approved them. Cf. Schema n. 186, De Missali, n. 27, September 19, 1966, addendum, p. 1.

¹⁹Bugnini, *La Riforma Liturgica (1948–1975)*, 394 reports that Bruylants died of a heart attack on October 18, 1966. He was 53 years old.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 393 and 393, n. 10. The English translation of Bugnini's book, *The Reform of the Liturgy (1948–1975)*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 397, n. 10 mistakenly reports that André Rose became *relator* upon Bruylants' death.

Dumas went on to the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship,²¹ the new congregation that Paul VI created in 1969 and put in charge of everything pertaining to divine worship in the Latin rite including the revision and preparation of liturgical texts.²² At the same time, Paul VI appointed many who had taken part in the work of the *Consilium* to the new congregation and dissolved the *Consilium*.²³

In 1971, Dumas published an essay on the principles of revision that guided the redaction of the orations entitled “Les oraisons du nouveau Missel.”²⁴ A translation of the full text of the essay follows. However odd it may be to reprint an article in translation some thirty years after its initial appearance, there are six reasons why this one deserves our attention. First, the essay is authoritative; it was written by someone intimately involved in the decisions that he names, explains, and illustrates. Second, the essay abounds with factual details. Third, it is extremely succinct; no summary could be shorter than the original and still do it justice. Fourth, the essay demonstrates that the work of revision was not confined to the straightforward implementation of policies but included passing judgment on delicate matters of considerable significance. Fifth, Dumas expresses his personal opinions with striking candor and reveals the extent to which these opinions colored editorial decisions. Sixth, the essay is a witness to the spirit of the age.

The text is translated from French. The essay contains many Latin words and phrases that Dumas does not translate but for which I have provided a translation in brackets at the first appearance. Unless noted, the footnotes in the body of the text appear in the original article, but Dumas’ numbering is replaced by lowercase alphabetical lettering. The line numbering was not a feature of the

²¹Dumas signs his 1971 essay, (see below) “Member of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship” [*membre de la S. C. du Cult Divin*]. He is listed in *Annuario Pontificio* 1971, 995 under the heading, “Minor Officials of the Third Grade” [*Officiali Minori di III Grado*].

²²“*Sacra Rituum*,” *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 61 (1969): 299–301.

²³Comparison of the *Elenchus membrorum - consultorum - consiliariorum coetuum a studiis*, 53–59, with *Annuario Pontificio* 1971, 995–996, shows that twenty-eight of those appointed to the *Consilium* in 1966 were serving the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship in some capacity in 1971.

²⁴*Questions Liturgiques* 25 (1971): 263–270. Published by permission.

original article but has been introduced to provide a means of reference in the comments that follow.

Part II: The Essay in Translation

1 THE ORATIONS OF THE NEW ROMAN MISSAL^a
2 by Antoine Dumas, O. S. B.

3 The revision of the texts of the Roman Missal, decided by
4 the Second Vatican Council, was accomplished within the frame-
5 work of the *Consilium* of the Liturgy in the course of a labor that
6 lasted more than five years, and was published in the Spring of 1970
7 under the auspices of the Congregation for Divine Worship.

8 The work of the revisers, although long and arduous,
9 remained obedient to certain very simple principles which never
10 ceased to guide them in their critical examination of the mass of
11 texts collected into the missal over the course of centuries without
12 order or unity—especially if one considers the successive “layers” of
13 sanctoral orations and ancient “votive” Masses. It was a unique
14 opportunity to restore the unity of a missal that, while remaining
15 faithful to the Roman style characterized by the complementary
16 qualities of clarity, density, and sobriety, had to open itself to
17 contemporary aspirations—according to the very fruitful directives
18 of Vatican II.

19 Our purpose here is limited enough, but can be quite
20 instructive for understanding the new missal: to extricate from the
21 totality of old and new texts that make up the orations the principles
22 that guided us in their revision, to define by what means we applied
23 these principles, and to illustrate both aspects with diverse examples
24 that a person might add to at leisure through personal study.

25 I. THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REVISION

26 1. *Truth*

27 The prayer of the Church, because it is a call of the people
28 of God to their Lord whom they adore in spirit and truth, must

^aText published with the kind authorization of *Rivista Liturgica* which published an Italian version in its first issue of 1971, p. 92–101.

29 above all be true: true with respect to God and his mysteries; true
 30 with respect to men, to their relations, to their needs, to the worship
 31 that they celebrate, and to the saints whom they honor. This care for
 32 the truth manifests itself particularly in the following ways.

33 *a) The text itself*

34 When the text of the missal had become corrupted over the
 35 course of the centuries, we always restored it according to the best
 36 witnesses. See, for example, the prayer over the offerings on Easter
 37 Sunday, where the unnecessary *et pascitur* [and fed] became again
 38 *renascitur* [reborn] (Gelasian 470).

39 *b) The nature of the texts*

40 We took care to situate each text according to its true
 41 function: the collect, which is the true proper prayer of the Mass and
 42 which, according to its name, retains the solemn form of Trinitarian
 43 conclusion; the prayer over the gifts, which completes the presenta-
 44 tion of gifts without encroaching upon the offering of the sacrifice
 45 and, normally, heightens the Eucharistic prayer; the prayer after
 46 communion, which asks to receive the fruits of the Eucharist. These
 47 last two orations, appropriately functional with respect to the
 48 Eucharist, always refrain from justifying a saint or inordinately
 49 exalting his intercession while blurring the effectiveness of the
 50 sacrifice. Many corrections have been made in the sanctoral orations
 51 to this end. These corrections affect not only the style, but also the
 52 use of the text, which was frequently moved in order to find a
 53 setting suitable for it. So the beautiful prayer *Gratiam tuam* [your
 54 grace], the pseudo-postcommunion for the 25th of March, has
 55 become the collect for the fourth Sunday of Advent and also, with
 56 a short Marian clause, for Our Lady of the Rosary.

57 Sometimes the restoration of a text reestablished its true
 58 character. For example, the old postcommunion for Tuesday after
 59 Easter^b has become, after the correction *reparet* [may restore] =
 60 *praeparet* [may prepare], the prayer over the offerings for Saturday
 61 morning, the vigil of Pentecost.

62 We note, finally, that certain prayers over the people
 63 formerly used in Lent have retaken their place as collects. Oppo-

^b[The oration in question is the postcommunion for the Tuesday after Pentecost.—*Trans.*]

64 sitely, the series of *super populum*, usable in all circumstances, includes
65 only authentic prayers over the people.

66 *c) Historical truth*

67 Working with the revisers of the calendar, the revisers of the
68 missal discarded without appeal the sentimental recollections of
69 hagiographical legends: the dove of Saint Scholastica, the maritime
70 exploit of Saint Raymond, the miraculous choice of Saint Peter
71 Chrysologus.

72 *d) The truth of inspiration and of style*

73 Examples here would be too numerous, and one will find
74 some of them in the second part. It suffices to declare that we no
75 longer find in the orations mention of fasts that are no longer
76 observed, nor of torrents of tears that were never shed. Many
77 superlatives and excessive adverbs, even if tolerable in Latin, have
78 been unsentimentally eliminated.

79 At a more profound level, liturgical texts, no longer failing
80 to recognize the horizontal dimension, have finally opened them-
81 selves to the human preoccupations that constitute the major care of
82 the Church today. It is clear that we do not pass directly from earth
83 to heaven, and that the body has a great part to play in our journey
84 to God. We are able to say that, henceforth, liturgical prayer helps
85 us better to understand that the kingdom of God is constructed here
86 below out of humble human realities.

87 In the sanctoral prayers we have avoided all excessive
88 justification, all recalling of famous feats that are common to many
89 (foundations, miracles, etc.) in order to put greater emphasis on the
90 personality of the saint, his mission in the Church, the practical
91 lesson that his example gives to men of today. All the corrections or
92 new compositions in the new missal proceed in this direction, which
93 will be easy to notice.

94 We note again, that, according to ancient liturgical tradition,
95 it was more fitting to address the prayer to God the Father, through
96 the mediation of the Son. Save for rare exceptions, the prayers of the
97 recent era underwent numerous corrections in this direction.

98 *e) Theological truth*

99 Finally and above all it was necessary, although rarely, to
100 make some corrections out of concern for theological truth. For
101 example, the former secret for the Friday after Easter speaks of

102 sacrifice offered for the sins of the newly baptized as though baptism
 103 had not completely purified them: from whence the correction to
 104 this text (*renatorum expiatione peccati = renatis gratanter*) [(for) the
 105 expiation of the sins of those who have been reborn = joyously (for)
 106 those who have been reborn], which in the new missal has been
 107 moved to the Thursday after Easter.

108 *2. Simplicity*

109 Truth and simplicity are of a piece. Without doubt, because
 110 of the complexity of our life dominated by industrial technology,
 111 these values exert a greater attraction upon our contemporaries for
 112 whom the sober harmony of Roman art is prized above the artificial
 113 elegance of the Baroque. Simple in ideas and in style, the prayer of
 114 the Church must soar up to God as a breath emanating from deep
 115 life. A vital act, it brings before God adoration, thanksgiving,
 116 petition, and repentance from the élan of the heart. It suffices,
 117 therefore, that each prayer express the essence of its content without
 118 repetition or detours, submissive to the principles required for a
 119 good homily: to have something to say, to know how to say it, and
 120 to stop after it has been said.

121 The consequence of this principle is a considerable reduction
 122 in the length of certain recent prayers (compare, for example, the
 123 two states, old and new, of the collect of Saint Jane Frances de
 124 Chantal), and the elimination of prayers of a homiletic type (the
 125 prayer after communion for the Holy Name of Jesus, which is not
 126 used in the votive Mass of the present missal), types of prayers that
 127 moreover are inclined to be obscure or tedious in some renderings
 128 into modern languages.

129 Nevertheless, we note that the rigorous simplicity to which
 130 we have bound ourselves does not imply an impoverishment or
 131 indigence. It suffices to compare the former missal with the new in
 132 order to see evidence that the texts of the second are much more
 133 numerous and varied than those of the first. This observation is
 134 verified especially with respect to the orations for ferials, commons,
 135 and the faithful departed, once reduced to constant repetition, and
 136 even more in the new parts such as the orations for ritual Masses and
 137 *ad diversa* [for various needs and occasions] now characterized by
 138 variety and abundant wealth. A new abundance that runs the risk of
 139 surprising and troubling those who have not yet been educated in
 140 their freedom concerning liturgical matters, but that already fully

141 satisfies pastors who are attentive to the needs of their communities
142 in prayer.

143 *3. Pastoral awareness*

144 This principle, one knows, was the pivot of Vatican II; it
145 remains the guiding light for all those who work, in the service of
146 the Church, at the immense task of adaptation required by the
147 evolution of contemporary civilization. In the liturgical renewal,
148 from the beginning the revisers regarded concern for truth and
149 simplicity to be particularly indispensable so that the texts and rites
150 might be perfectly—or at the least much better—accommodated to
151 the modern mentality to which it must give expression while
152 neglecting nothing of the traditional treasury to which it remains the
153 conduit.

154 In our above consideration of the diverse ways in which care
155 for the truth manifested itself, we have already noted the extent to
156 which pastoral requirements were respected. An angelic prayer that
157 fails to recognize the earth is not able to be true as long as our
158 earthly condition endures. This principle was applied especially in the
159 Masses *ad diversa*, whose realistic themes (peace and justice, progress,
160 work, evangelization, social turmoil, etc.) required of the redactors
161 new compositions inspired by human, economic, and social realities.

162 The pastoral sense and care for the truth have likewise led
163 the authors of the new missal to reserve to Sundays prayers that are
164 conspicuous in their richness of doctrine and clarity of expression,
165 and to weekday Masses prayers which less easily apply themselves
166 without difficulty to the assembly. Similarly, the collects of many
167 Sundays after the Epiphany and after Pentecost, inspired by anti-
168 Pelagian quarrels or marked by penitential coloration, have been
169 moved in order to find a better place for them in Lent.

170 Finally, one will see also, in the thread of the Latin, a pastoral
171 concern that never lost sight of the arduous task of those who
172 translate orations into modern languages. We have set forth the
173 essence of this delicate problem elsewhere;^c from this perspective,
174 many ancient texts, virtually untranslatable, were set aside not
175 without regret.

^cCf. “Pour mieux comprendre les textes du Missel romain,” *Notitiae* 54 (1970): 194–213.

176

II. ASPECTS OF THE REVISION

177

1. Choice of texts

178 a) *Preservation of the prayers of the former missal.* When they
179 posed no problem relative to the principles named above, the texts
180 of the former missal were kept, either in the same or in a more
181 suitable place. Many among these, retained in the same setting, were
182 restored according to the best source. This is the case, among others,
183 for the collect of Easter Sunday (Gelasian 463).

184 Occasionally a slight rearrangement of words assures a better
185 Latin *cursus*:^d a concern that some persons may regard as excessive
186 scrupulosity but which was required in the judgment of specialists.

187 b) *Utilization of ancient sources.* We have drawn amply from the
188 treasury of the Leonine and Gelasian sacramentaries, less often from
189 the Gregorian. In Advent, for example, numerous are the borrow-
190 ings from the *Rotulus* [scroll] of Ravenna (collect for the third
191 Sunday, etc.), whose texts are perfectly in character and provide
192 some of the prayers for weekdays. The eighth-century Gelasians, in
193 particular that of Angoulême, have provided interesting, appropriate
194 pieces.

195 c) *Utilization of other liturgical sources.* More rarely other sources
196 are used but only by way of remainder: the Bergamese and Mozar-
197 abic sacramentaries, the Gothic and Bobbio Missals, the Visigothic
198 *Orationale*, etc.^e The Parisian Missal called the “de Vintimille,” even
199 if it was never adopted literally, has inspired many new composi-
200 tions, particularly in the case of the “gospel” saints (Apostles, Mary
201 Magdalen, Parents of the Virgin Mary), thanks to its felicitous
202 biblical citations. Numerous propers (Lyon, Toulouse, Belgium, the
203 Dominicans, Japan, North Africa . . .) have supplied worthy texts for
204 the sanctoral cycle. For example, certain borrowings were indispens-
205 able, such as that of the oration for Saint Hilary from the proper of

^d[*Cursus* is a technical term that refers to the arrangement of stressed and unstressed syllables at the end of the oration.—*Trans.*]

^eOne will find the citations of these texts with variants, corrections, and adaptations in our edition of the sources of the new missal now in the course of preparation. In the meantime, see the lists published in *Notitiae* since no. 60 (January, 1971).

206 Poitiers, that of Saint Thomas Becket from the proper of England,
207 that of Saint Martha of Tarascon.

208 Often, texts of the Missal of Pius V disappeared following the
209 elimination of certain Masses (Ember days, vigils, octaves) or of
210 certain saints from the calendar. The revisers always endeavored to
211 protect the best orations by using them for other Masses. Even some
212 expressions that would have been lamentably consigned to oblivion
213 were able to be saved by insertion into new compositions. For
214 example, the words *ad montem qui Christus est* [to the mountain who
215 is Christ], from the collect of Saint Catherine of Alexandria, have
216 passed into that of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.

217 *2. Adaptation*

218 Concern for the truth required adaptation in the case of
219 numerous orations, as we have said above. For example, many texts,
220 for a long while too well known, put heaven and earth into radical
221 opposition—from whence the antithetical couplet oft repeated in the
222 former missal: *terrena despiciere et amare caelestia* [to look away
223 from/refuse to obey earthly things and to love heavenly things],
224 which, although a right understanding is possible, is very easily
225 poorly translated. An adaptation was imperative that, without
226 harming the truth, took account of the modern mentality and the
227 directives of Vatican II. Thus the prayer after communion for the
228 second Sunday of Advent quite justifiably says *sapienter perpendere* [to
229 weigh wisely] in place of the word *despicere* [look away from or
230 refuse to obey] which is so often poorly understood.

231 Other texts, having become shocking for the man of today,
232 have been frankly corrected while respecting the structure of the text
233 and the movement of the phrase. For example, the former secret for
234 Saturday of the second week of Lent, which has become the prayer
235 over the offerings for the third Sunday of Lent, changes the expres-
236 sion: *non gravemur externis* [may we not be weighed down (by the
237 sins) of those outside], difficult to understand, to: *fraterna dimittere*
238 *studeamus* [may we strive/be eager to forgive (the sins) of our
239 brothers], decidedly more evangelical.

240 Frequently the direction of the phrase has been turned
241 around, going from a negative to a more dynamic positive. Thus, in
242 the prayer after communion for the fourth Sunday in Paschal time,
243 the text (Gelasian 272) referring to the Good Shepherd no longer
244 reads: *diabolica non sinas incursione lacerari* [may you not allow (us) to

245 be wounded by diabolical attack], but: *in aeternis pascuis collocare*
 246 *digneris* [may you vouchsafe to place (us) in eternal pastures]. In an
 247 analogous manner: *nostrae fragilitatis subsidium* [a help to our frailty]
 248 (prayer over the offerings for the tenth Sunday *per annum* moved
 249 from the eleventh Sunday after Pentecost), has become *nostrae caritatis*
 250 *augmentum* [an increase of our charity].

251 It happened sometimes that beautiful texts, retained after the
 252 rigorous selection process or even perfectly restored, and put in the
 253 place that suits them best, still do not give complete satisfaction. In
 254 this case a slight adaptation remained necessary. The most typical
 255 case is that of the collect of Easter Sunday, which, rescued from the
 256 Gregorian deformation in which it passed into the Missal of Pius V
 257 and made to conform to the best witness (Gelasian 463), ended with
 258 a regrettable collapse evoking death for the second time in a few
 259 words. We believed it good to put the ending in harmony with
 260 Paschal joy by replacing *a morte animae* [from death of the soul] with
 261 *in lumine vitae* [in the light of life].

262 In the orations of the Paschal Vigil, after the third lesson,
 263 slavery “in Egypt” has become “slavery under Pharaoh” for reasons
 264 one can imagine. On the other hand, it is easy to understand why,
 265 in certain collects for Christian leaders, the expression *culmine imperii*
 266 [at the summit of sovereignty] was changed to *cura regiminis* [care of
 267 government] (St. Henry), while *terreno regno* [earthly kingdom] gave
 268 way to *terreni regiminis cura* [care of earthly government] (St. Louis):
 269 a simple change of perspective for the same reality.

270 Finally, one will note many transfers of orations from one
 271 Mass to another for the sake of a better fit. For example, the
 272 overflowing joy expressed in the former missal for a secondary
 273 apostle like Saint Bartholomew (as elsewhere for most of the titulars
 274 of Roman basilicas, patrons of quarters where their feasts are
 275 celebrated with reveling) is in a better place in the collect of the holy
 276 apostles Peter and Paul, at whose solemnity the whole Church
 277 rejoices.

278

3. Creation

279 A rigorous and constructive critique clearly had to lead the
 280 revisers to pass over a great number of ancient texts, very beautiful
 281 in themselves but completely unsuitable. From whence the recourse
 282 to new compositions which appear in different forms that are easily
 283 recognizable and are also found in the body of the 82 prefaces,

284 which, by binding the new and the old harmoniously together,
285 guarantees a considerable unity to the new missal.

286 a) *Centonization of liturgical texts.* This is a method that
287 allowed a revival of the ancient euchological treasury by using the
288 best texts in order to present them under a new form in the
289 traditional Roman style. One will notice, for example, the prayer
290 after communion for the first Sunday of Advent, formed from
291 elements drawn from Veronese 173 and 1053; the prayer over the
292 offerings for December 22: Veronese 666 + 1261 + 146; the prayer
293 over the offerings for Ash Wednesday: Gelasian 106 + Bergamense
294 454; the prayer after communion for Passion Sunday: Gelasian 332
295 + 330.

296 b) *Liturgical transposition of biblical texts.* One will be pleased to
297 find many cases where the word of God has become, completely
298 naturally, the prayer of the Church. These instances are, however,
299 less frequent in the orations than in the prefaces. For example, the
300 prayer after communion for the first Sunday of Lent: Matthew 4:4
301 + John 6:51, and also most of the orations for the apostles and other
302 saints of the New Testament.

303 c) *Liturgical transposition of patristic texts.* Less easy to discover
304 than the biblical sources, the Fathers are sometimes encountered in
305 the orations, particularly passages of Saint Leo: the collects of
306 Wednesday of the third week of Lent (Sermon 2, 4), of the Ascen-
307 sion (Sermon 73), of the 27th Sunday *per annum* (Sermon 63), of
308 March 25th (Letter 123). Likewise, one finds passages from Saint
309 Augustine: on his feast day, the prayer over the offerings (*In Ioannem*
310 26, 13), after communion (Sermon 57, 7); from Saint Hilary: the
311 collect of Saints John Fisher and Thomas More (*De Trinitate* 6, 20 +
312 *In psalmos* 144,17). The prayer of Saint Polycarp is used in the collect
313 of his Mass.

314 d) *Liturgical transposition of ecclesiastical texts.* Although the style
315 of the acts of the Magisterium is quite different from that which
316 characterizes the Roman liturgy, we have retained for use, by
317 transposing them, some of the most suggestive passages of the
318 documents of Vatican II in order to nourish the prayer of the
319 Church. It is above all in the series of 46 formularies *ad diversa* that
320 one will notice the inspiration of this original source.

321 For example, collect A [in the Mass] For the Church, drawn
322 from *Ad gentes* 2 + *Gaudium et spes* 45; collect B from the same
323 formulary unites extracts from *Lumen gentium* 9 and *Gaudium et spes*
324 40. One finds *Lumen gentium* 23 in the first collect [in the Mass] For

325 the Pope (formularies A and B), *Lumen gentium* 20 in the first collect
 326 [in the Mass] For the Bishop (A); *Ad gentes* 15 in the second collect
 327 [in the Mass] For Evangelization (A) and *Ad gentes* 1 in the collect of
 328 formulary B For Evangelization also. One will also note that the first
 329 part of the collect of Saint Charles Borromeo cites some words of
 330 Pope Paul VI's address at the opening of the second session of
 331 Vatican II in 1963.

332 *e) Entirely new compositions.* This is the case for orations for
 333 which the text in the former missal was particularly weak and for
 334 which there was no equivalent in the old sacramentaries (Holy
 335 Family, Saint Joseph, Holy Name of Jesus, etc.). It is also the case for
 336 orations that are not found in the former missal, and that it was
 337 necessary to create to meet a new need when the above-mentioned
 338 procedures proved insufficiently effective. See, for example, the
 339 three orations for the feast of the Baptism of the Lord, those of the
 340 new Masses for unity, many of the orations *ad diversa*: for the
 341 ministers of the Church, for the laity, etc.

342 Finally, one is able to appreciate that a complete recasting of
 343 certain texts, while preserving the same theme (Sacred Heart, Christ
 344 the King), was tantamount to a new creation.

345 CONCLUSION

346 After this rapid examination of the principles that were
 347 followed and of the methods applied in the revision of the
 348 missal—because the preceding applies as much to the prefaces as to
 349 the orations—it would be fitting in this third section to name the
 350 result that we have attained. But beyond that the appearance of the
 351 new missal has already been noted by different liturgical journals,^f
 352 nothing is as good as the judgment that each person is able to make
 353 on the whole of the work after serious personal study.

354 We are able to observe, in fact, that the criticisms of those
 355 who are dissatisfied are so much more severe as their authors are

^fSee, following our synthetical exposé: "Le Missel romain 1970," *Paroisse et Liturgie* 4 (1970): 291–296, the more complete presentations appearing in numerous recent scholarly journals: *Rivista Liturgica* 1 (1971), *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (1970), *La Maison-Dieu* no. 105 (1971), etc. Still, the whole of the missal, like each of its parts, will for a long time offer numerous avenues of research and ample material for study to professors and their students: studies necessary to establish a solid liturgical catechesis awaited by Christians and their pastors.

356 unfamiliar with the work they censure. Certainly, criticisms of non-
357 essential particulars cannot be lacking, any more than material
358 failures. But it honestly seems to us that one would do well to read
359 the new texts, to study them, and above all to pray them, in the light
360 of what has been set forth briefly above. One will then see that the
361 Missal of Paul VI responds in the best possible way to the preoccupa-
362 tions of Vatican II by rendering the prayer of the Church accessible
363 to the men of our times and in opening to the unique character of
364 each people a possibility of free choice and of adaptations that we
365 desire to see broadly followed.

Part III: Revised Revision Policies

Dumas discusses the use of ancient sources, but does not name the criteria according to which orations were selected and placed (cf. ll. 178–207) except to say that the revisers were attentive to the “true function” of texts (ll. 40–46, 50–56). Therefore, while he does not answer our initial questions about the choice of the new collect for the first Sunday of Advent, he does perhaps indicate the rationale according to which this postcommunion came to be a collect,²⁵ and he tells us why some Sunday prayers were moved to

²⁵According to the fourth revision policy approved in 1966, the proper literary genre of texts is to be preserved. In introducing this issue to the members, Bruylants made the startling claim that, “In very many orations and prefaces the proper so-called ‘literary genre’ was quite quickly lost. Indeed, from the beginning of their appearance in the liturgical books, they were not always used rightly” [Sch. 186, p. 3: “In permultis orationibus et praefationibus, valde cito, sic dictum ‘genus litterarium’ proprium deperditum est. Immo, ab initio earum apparitionis in libris liturgicis, non semper recte adhibentur”]. For him, prayers over the offerings that do not explicitly mention the gifts, postcommunion orations that do not explicitly mention our participation in the sacrifice, and *super populum* that do not explicitly implore the blessing of God on the people are not true to their nature [ibid.]. The question of whether *GeV* 1139 is really a collect (in spite of its never having been used as such prior to 1970), and, more broadly, whether the revisers’ understanding of what constitutes essential content and vocabulary for *super oblata*, *post communionem*, and *super populum* was less flexible than the tradition’s as a whole, cannot be explored here; but the question is important and deserves serious consideration by scholars with the requisite competencies. The statements of both Bruylants and Dumas, as well as the revision decisions manifest in the missal itself, suggest the possibility that a narrowly functional view of these kinds of orations may have governed the revisers’ appraisal of them.

weekdays.²⁶ More importantly, however, he alerts us to many instances in which the revisers changed existing orations in ways that are not anticipated by the policies listed in Schema 186.

We learn from Dumas' essay that the policies listed in Schema 186 were revised during the course of *Coetus* 18bis' labors. The fact is confirmed in an odd way by the report Dumas submitted to the *Consilium* members in 1968 in his capacity as *relator* of *Coetus* 18bis. Dumas begins the report with the words "In the session of the *Consilium* that we held in autumn of the year 1966, these principles which Dom Placide Bruylants set forth for directing the work of revising the Orations of the Missal (Schema n. 186, De Missali n. 27) were approved by the Fathers."²⁷ A list of the policies or principles follows. The wording of the policies presented by Dumas in 1968, however, is not the same as that employed by Placide Bruylants and voted upon by the members in 1966. The new wording effectively reconfigures the revision tasks defined by at least two of the policies. Intervening schemata, however, do not report any formal decision to revise the policies in question.

The modified policies are those that deal with correcting texts which had become corrupt (policy n. 2) and updating orations (policy n. 3). Although we cannot determine precisely why or even how the policies came to be modified, we can examine the changes themselves and discuss their significance. This we shall do below, beginning with the policy that pertains to updating orations.

²⁶Cf. Il. 162–166. Since the 1962 collect for the first Sunday of Advent was moved to a ferial, the conditions fit. But compare the new collect (see fn. 3 above) with "Excita, quaesumus, Domine, potentiam tuam, et veni: ut ab imminentibus peccatorum nostrorum periculis, te mereamur protegente eripi, te liberante salvari" [Stir up, we beseech you, O Lord, your power and come: that from the threatening dangers of our sins we may be able to be rescued by you protecting, saved by you delivering]. The conspicuous differences between the old and new collects for the first Sunday of Advent are not in doctrinal richness and clarity, but in the tone and petitions of the respective prayers. This invites a closer examination of the revisers' own understanding of their working principles which would exceed the limits of the present study.

²⁷Schema n. 319, De Missali, n. 56, October 7, 1968, p. 2: "In sessione Consilii, quam habuimus autumno anni 1966, haec principia quae Dominus Placidus Bruylants exposuit ad dirigendum opus recognitionis Orationum Missalis (Schema n. 186, De Missali 27) a Patribus probata sunt."

1. Updating orations

The most prominent theme in Dumas' essay is concern for updating orations. His sections on the truth of inspiration and style, simplicity, pastoral awareness, and adaptation all speak of the need for modernization. Our interest in this section is to trace the way in which the idea of "updating" developed during the course of the revision project.

When Bruylants approached the members at the seventh general meeting of the *Consilium* held October 6–14, 1966, to ascertain their will in the matter of updating orations he put his two-part question this way:

Does it please the Fathers a) that the commemoration of local or historical events whose significance has been lost to the Church universal of the present day be removed from orations; b) that, in particular cases [such as those just described], orations may be accommodated to the rules of Christian life today?²⁸

In order that the members could understand the rationale for his question, Bruylants explained that "there are some orations which have lost their historical significance or are no longer in conformity with the norms of Christian life today."²⁹ He supported the declaration with an instance of each type. As an example of an oration whose historical significance has been lost, Bruylants named a Lenten collect that commemorates Cosmas and Damian.³⁰ Between the first version of the schema on file and the second, Bruylants changed his example of orations that do not reflect contemporary Catholic practice.³¹ In the first, he cites a collect for a Monday in

²⁸Schema n. 186, De Missali n. 27, September 19, 1966, p. 3: "Placetne Patribus: a) ut ex orationibus tollatur memoria eventum, localium vel historicorum, quae momentum suum amiserunt pro Ecclesia universali hodierna? b) placetne vobis ut, in casu, accomodentur orationes institutis vitae christianae hodiernae?"

²⁹Schema n. 186, p. 2: "nonnullae orationes, quae momentum suum historicum amiserunt, vel non amplius conformes sunt normis vitae christianae hodiernae."

³⁰Ibid. The prayer is found in the Mass for Thursday of the third week of Lent in the 1962 missal.

³¹Gy, *The Reception of Vatican II*, 10 states that "as a general rule, no relator could propose anything to the cardinals and bishops that had not been approved earlier at the meeting of the relators." Gy's "cardinals and bishops" are the *Consilium* members.

Lent that speaks of abstaining from flesh foods.³² In the draft actually submitted to the members, he cites “the great part of Lenten orations.”³³ Here Bruylants argues that the 1962 Lenten orations as a whole do not reflect the character of Lent described in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 109 because references to baptism are almost entirely absent and references to penitence are almost exclusively confined to fasting.³⁴ It is only after explaining all this that Bruylants asks the two-

Although it is not clear from the schema itself, it seems that the first version, Schema n. 156, De Missali, n. 20 Addenda, April 30, 1966, was submitted to the relators at a meeting held in Spring, 1966. There is no doubt that the second version, Schema n. 186, was actually submitted to the members the following Fall. Bugnini, *La Riforma Liturgica (1948–1975)*, 393 describes the document and says that it was given to the *Consilium* members at the seventh general meeting, which was held October 6–14, 1966. It was at this meeting that the members discussed the policies to be followed in revising the orations, and, in fact, the copy of Schema n. 186 on file at the ICEL office has the results of the members’ votes handwritten in the margins.

³²Schema n. 156, addenda, p. 2: “quando in feria II eiusdem hebdomadae Quadragesimae oramus: ‘sicut ab escis carnalibus abstinemus.’” His point is that Catholics no longer abstain from meat on Lenten Mondays. The prayer in question is the collect for Monday of the third week in Lent in the 1962 missal.

³³Schema n. 186, p. 2: “Pro alteris, exemplum magnae partis orationum Quadragesimae sufficit.”

³⁴Schema n. 186, p. 2–3: “Nam, memoria *et* praeparatio baptismi, quae secundum Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia (n. 109, a) *prima indoles* sunt huius temporis, fere omnino absunt. Quoad *secundum indolem*, characterem nempe poenitentialem, patet quod in orationibus fere unice de ieiunio loquiter [in the ICEL manuscript ‘loquiter’ is crossed out and ‘sermo fit’ handwritten in the margin] et non sufficienter tractatur neque de spiritu poenitentiae in genere, neque de praeparatione mysterii paschalis” [For the memory of *and* preparation for baptism, which according to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (n. 109, a) are the first character [*indoles*] of this season, are almost entirely absent. With respect to the second character, namely, the penitential character, it is evident almost exclusively in the language of fasting and neither the spirit of penance in general nor preparation for the Paschal mystery is sufficiently treated]. The relevant portion of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 109 reads, “Duplex indoles temporis quadragesimalis, quod praesertim per memoriam *vel* praeparationem Baptismi *et* per poenitentiam fideles, instantius verbum Dei audientes et orationi vacantes, componit ad celebrandum paschale mysterium . . .” [The season of Lent has a twofold character [*duplex indoles*]: primarily by recalling *or* preparing for baptism *and* by penance, it disposes the faithful, who hear the word of God and devote themselves to prayer more diligently, to celebrate the Paschal mystery]. Emphasis added. Bruylants ranks the two elements first and second, whereas SC 109 presents the two as equal. They are, as it were, two sides of a single coin. Since SC 109 further instructs that this twofold character be given

part question quoted above. Bruylants' language is formal, even technical: *ecclesia universalis* and *instituta vitae christianae*. *Instituta* can mean precepts, customs, or regulations. The word has legal overtones, and in this context it refers to the binding precepts or customary observances of Catholic life. Thus Bruylants asks only for permission to remove phrases which contain historical references that have become obscure (and therefore cannot be appreciated by the Church universal of the present day) and to change prayers that assume customs or laws which are no longer in force.

In the progress report discussed above, which Dumas submitted to the *Consilium* members in 1968, he words the policy pertaining to updating as follows:

The mention of local and particular deeds, as well as historical remembrances for which the whole significance and function is lost to the Church of our time, are to be removed from certain prayers. These prayers are to be accommodated to the needs of Christian life today.³⁵

The "Church universal of the present day" has become the "Church of our time," and "present-day precepts" or "customs" has become "present-day needs." The movement is from the objective (precepts or customs) to that which is, at least potentially, quite subjective (needs). Bruylants' wording requires only mechanical adjustments to the texts, whereas Dumas' involves the editors in decisions of considerable subtlety.

Further, although the 1968 wording stipulates that only the mention of particular deeds, or of historical remembrances whose significance had been lost, are to be accommodated to the needs of present-day Christian life, Dumas' 1971 essay quite candidly reports that every oration was reviewed in the light of modern

greater prominence in the liturgy and liturgical catechesis, it is possible that the revised Lenten orations reflect Bruylants' misquoting of the document rather than the intention of the Council Fathers as it is expressed in the document they promulgated.

³⁵Schema n. 319, De Missali, n. 56, October 7, 1968, p. 2: "Ex quibusdam Orationibus tollantur mentiones factorum localium et particularium, necnon memoriae historicae quae omne pondus et officium in Ecclesia nostri temporis amiserunt. Quae Orationes tamen accommodentur necessitatibus hodiernae vitae christianae."

needs (cf. ll. 178–181, in connection with ll. 13–18, 29–30, 87–91, 109–116, 145–161). A policy initially instituted for very narrowly defined special cases came, in the end, to be applied universally.

Two questions arise. First, why the policy was expanded. As we noted above, the schemata do not say. Second, whether *Coetus* 18bis succeeded in expressing the holy things signified in the original texts more clearly as it revised orations in the light of its perception of the needs of modern persons.³⁶ The latter question particularly calls for ongoing scholarly and pastoral attention.

2. *Orationes that suffered loss or corruption*

A second policy that underwent revision in the course of the *Consilium*'s labors involves texts that had suffered loss or corruption. In 1966, the second question that Bruylants put to the members was: “Does it please the Fathers that, in the sense in which we have just spoken about these things [he had been discussing orations that had suffered loss or corruption from a philological or theological perspective],³⁷ the texts of prayers be edited, or in the case [of necessity] corrected?”³⁸ Bruylants carefully explains to the members that he is not advocating “archeologism”—that is, a preference for more ancient texts simply because they

³⁶According to Matias Augé, “Le Collete del Proprio del Tempo nel Nuovo Messale,” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 84 (1970): 275–276, the Fathers of Vatican II did not envision a reform or enrichment of the orations of the missal, but that these came to be revised because their qualities and limitations became more apparent in the light of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 21b and the decision to use the vernacular. SC 21b reads: “Qua quidem instauratione, textus et ritus ita ordinari oportet, ut sancta, quae significant, clarius expriment, eaque populus christianus, in quantum fieri potest, facile percipere atque plena, actiosa et communitatis propria celebratione participare possit” [In this renewal, it is necessary that texts and rites be so arranged that they may express the holy things which they signify more clearly and the Christian people, insofar as it can happen, may be able to lay hold of them (the holy things) and participate in celebrations that are full, active, and proper to the community].

³⁷Schema 186, p. 2: “de lectionibus mendosis, sub aspectu philologico vel theologico.”

³⁸*Ibid.*: “Placetne Patribus, ut, sensu quo modo de his locuti sumus, textus orationum recognosca[n]tur, vel in casu, emede[n]tur?”

are more ancient.³⁹ And, indeed, Bruylants does not say anything about restoring the texts to their original, or to the most ancient extant, form. He asks only whether the Fathers desire such texts to be edited or corrected.⁴⁰

There is good reason for Bruylants' clear disavowal of archeologism: Pope Pius XII's explicit rejection of the same in his 1947 encyclical, *Mediator Dei*. Pius XII likens a person who would indiscriminately go back to the liturgical rites and practices of antiquity to one who would reject more recently defined dogmas or more recently promulgated laws in favor of the earliest doctrinal formulations or legal precepts.⁴¹ While Pius XII mentions archeologism only in reference to rites, customs, and ceremonies, everything he says on the subject applies equally well to texts.

The error of archeologism, as Pius XII's analogy demonstrates, is that it makes no distinction between genuine development and enfeebling or misleading corruptions as it casts aside every change in an indiscriminate preference for the most ancient forms. In context, Bruylants' phrasing of the policy presupposes that revisers will distinguish texts that have been refined by the wisdom of the tradition from those that had suffered some sort of loss over the course of time.

Dumas' 1968 rephrasing of the policy reads: "Corrupted texts are to be recognized and corrected according to their pristine (*pristinam*) form."⁴² While *pristinus* can mean former, previous, earlier, original, or pristine, in this context the word means that corrupt texts are to be corrected according to the original or most ancient available text. Dumas does not explicitly reject archeologism as his predecessor had done, and we must look at how the revisers

³⁹Ibid.: "Non agitur hic de aliquo archaeologismo, quo lectio antiquior, ipso facto melior aestimaretur. Sed quibusdam mutationibus texts antequi, sub aspectu theologico vel pastorali, reapse imminuti vel corrupti sunt."

⁴⁰The two examples he offers are of prayers in which he judged obvious corruptions to have altered their theological import.

⁴¹"Mediator Dei," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 39 (1947): 546–547. Pius XII repeats the condemnation of archeologism made by Pius VI in the 1794 Bull "Auctorem fidei."

⁴²Schema 319, p. 2: "Textus corrupti recognoscantur et corrigantur ad pristinam formam."

implemented the policy to learn whether his choice of the word “*pristinam*” is significant.

There are three points at which Dumas’ essay sheds light on the revisers’ handling of texts that were thought to have suffered losses.

In the first of these, Dumas tells us that corrupt texts were restored according to the best witnesses and gives an example: the prayer over the offerings for Easter Sunday in the new missal (see ll. 34–38). Prior to 1570,⁴³ the prayer in question appears in three forms, always as a secret or prayer over the offerings⁴⁴ during the Paschal Octave.⁴⁵ Five codices present the form to which the revisers restored the prayer: “*renascitur et pascitur*” [is reborn and fed].⁴⁶ Four of these date from the eighth century and one from the tenth.⁴⁷ The 1962 missal, which the revisers corrected, reads “*et pascitur et nutritur*” [is both fed and nourished]. Six witnesses dating from the ninth to the sixteenth century omit the first “*et*” and read “*pascitur et nutritur*” [is fed and nourished].⁴⁸ Forty-seven witnesses dating from the eighth to the sixteenth century read “*nascitur et nutritur*” [is born and

⁴³The Roman Missal of 1570 was the first issue of the Tridentine reform, the last was the 1962 missal. The first Vatican II missal appeared in 1970.

⁴⁴The present prayer over the offerings (*super oblata*) was formerly prayed silently by the priest, a practice that gave rise to the name “secret” (*secreta*). In ancient sacramentaries the oration is sometimes called the *secreta* and sometimes the *super oblata*. In the ICEL sacramentary it is called the “prayer over the gifts.”

⁴⁵Eugenio Moeller and Ioanne Maria Clément, *Corpus Orationum*, t. 8, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 160 G (Turnholt: Brepols, 1994), 104–105, nn. 5186a, 5186b, and 5186c.

⁴⁶Except in the oration itself, the phrase “*renascitur et pascitur*” does not appear in *Patrologia Latina*—at least not in the same grammatical form.

⁴⁷Moeller and Clément, *Corpus Orationum*, t. 8, p. 104, n. 5186a. Moeller gives an alphabetical list of all the manuscripts with their respective dates on p. lvi–lxi.

⁴⁸“*Pascitur et nutritur*” forms a parallel couplet in which the idea of the first term is sustained and deepened in the second. Not counting the oration itself, the exact phrase appears seven times in *Patrologia Latina*: 74: col. 989C (the devil is fed and nourished by the death of man); 165: col. 495A (the soul of man is fed and nourished by the Word of God); 174: cols. 527A and 534A (the life of man is fed and nourished by love of neighbor); 184: col. 751B and 189: col. 1743D (the Church is daily fed and nourished from the side of Christ asleep on the Cross); 195: col. 1142B (a person is fed and nourished by resting in contemplation). These citations include only those instances in which verbs have the same voice, mood, tense, person, and number as those in the prayer.

nourished].⁴⁹ In revising the prayer, the editors adopted the wording of the most ancient extant witness.⁵⁰ Determining whether it is also the best witness would take us beyond the compass of our discussion, but two points are worth noting. First, the subject of the verbs *renascitur* [reborn] and *nutritur* [nourished] is *Ecclesia* [Church]. It is not customary to speak of the Church as being reborn through the sacrifice of Christ or through the sacrifice of the Mass.⁵¹ Second, the form adopted by the editors of the new missal is the only one of the three that had fallen into disuse before the Council of Trent (it is not seen after the tenth century).

The revisers adopted the wording of the most ancient witness for this one phrase, but not for the entire oration. There is a second change to the text that Dumas does not mention. The editors replaced the principal verb, “*immolamus*” [we sacrifice], with

⁴⁹Moeller and Clément, *Corpus Orationum*, t. 8, p. 104, n. 5186. Not counting the prayer, the couplet “*nascitur et nutritur*” is found seven times in *Patrologia Latina*: 68: col. 71B and 176: col. 743C (the sensate creature is born and nourished); 94: col. 177B (the sacraments by which the Church is born and nourished in Christ); 113: col. 189B (law is born and nourished); 122: col. 611D (Christ is born and nourished in the womb of faith); 207: col. 982A (the great misery and uncleanness in which man is born and nourished). Again, these citations include only those instances in which the verbs appear in the precise form found in the prayer.

⁵⁰*GeV* 470.

⁵¹We say, rather, that the Church was born from the sacrifice of Christ, or from the pierced side of Christ (cf. Jn. 19:34). In its various forms the verb *renasci* [to be reborn] is found 2,030 times in *Patrologia Latina*. Only five of these speak of the Church being reborn (*PL* 26: col. 952D; 38: col. 1074; 120: col. 1092C; 164: col. 259C and 165: col. 1309), and only one explicitly locates the rebirth of the Church in the sacrifice of Christ. *PL* 120: col. 1092C, from Radbertus’ commentary on the fifth book of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, says that the bride of Christ is not only reborn from the font of Christ’s pierced side but also truly made rich, for she is the font of life for us. Although further study would be required to confirm or contradict, a quick reading of these texts, three of which are patristic commentaries on Old Testament passages, suggests that the use of the verb *renasci* derives from an allegorical understanding that sees the Church as pre-figured in either Israel herself (*PL* 26: col. 952D; 120: col. 1092C; 164: col. 259C) or the Garden of Eden (165: col. 1309), and therefore as pre-existing the birth of Christ. It is in this sense that the Church is reborn—that is, Israel as the Church, born in the Passover and Exodus, is reborn and becomes what we call the Church through the death and resurrection of Christ. The single passage that does not seem to employ this species of allegory is *PL* 38: col. 174, which comes from Saint Augustine, *Sermo* 215, *In redditione symboli* [In the giving back of the Creed].

“*exultantes offerimus*” [exulting we offer] although there is no textual precedent for the substitution.⁵² In short, one phrase of this oration was restored to its pristine form and another was put into a form that has no warrant in the manuscript tradition.⁵³

A second pertinent discussion is found in lines 57–61, where Dumas tells us that a particular revision restored the “true character” of the prayer. Our question is whether “true character” was reckoned according to antiquity alone or upon other compelling evidence. The example involves two issues: text and usage. The text appears in two different forms (*praeparet/reparet*). The *praeparet* form is always used as a secret or prayer over the offerings, and the *reparet* form always as a postcommunion.⁵⁴

The manuscript evidence is as follows:

1. In the Roman missals in use from 1570 until 1969, the *reparet* form of the prayer appears as the postcommunion for Tuesday in the octave of Pentecost and the *praeparet* form is entirely absent.

2. Prior to 1570:

A. The *reparet* form appears, always as a postcommunion, in forty-six Mass books that date from the eighth to the sixteenth century. Thirty-nine of these witness to the constant use of the prayer as the postcommunion for Tuesday in the octave of Pentecost from the ninth to the sixteenth century.⁵⁵

B. The *praeparet* form appears in two Mass books that date from the eighth century. It is the secret or prayer over the offering on Pentecost Sunday in both.⁵⁶ In addition, it appears in one private

⁵²The verb “*immolare*” [to sacrifice] is found in all fifty-eight witnesses to the prayer; “*immolamus*” in fifty and “*immolata*” [have been sacrificed] in the remaining eight. See Moeller and Clément, *Corpus Oratorium*, t. 8, p. 104–105, nn. 5186a, 5186b, 5186c.

⁵³We also note that, prior to Vatican II, the oration was never used on Easter Sunday.

⁵⁴Moeller and Clément, *Corpus Oratorium*, t. 5, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 160D (Turnholt: Brepols, 1994), p. 152–153, n. 3338a and 3338b. Moeller gives an alphabetical list of all the manuscripts with their respective dates on p. lvi–lxi of the same volume.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 152–153, n. 3338b.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 152, n. 3338a.

collection of Roman formularies that never served as a genuine Mass book but whose prayers are variously dated from 400–650 A.D.⁵⁷

3. One Mass book that dates from the eighth century is a witness to both forms and uses of the prayer.⁵⁸

Again the revisers adopted the form, and this time the use as well, found in the most ancient codices; and in so doing, again restored something that the tradition had abandoned. After the eighth century the oration is not found in the *praeparet* form, nor is it used as a prayer over the offerings (or secret), until it reappears in the Vatican II missal. Since there are no obvious problems with the form of the text that has the strongest manuscript support, it is particularly regrettable that Dumas does not tell us why the revisers rejected it.⁵⁹

In the last instance in which Dumas mentions editorial practices pertaining to corrupt texts, he comments that sometimes even perfectly restored prayers still failed to give “complete satisfaction” (ll. 251–253). His example is the collect for Easter Sunday, which was restored according to the best witness, the Gelasian sacramentary. This Paschal collect, as it appears in the 1962 missal, is one of the two orations that Bruylants identified as corrupt in September 1966 when he asked the *Consilium* members if they wanted the

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 152, n. 3338a: *Ver* 223. The codex is the so-called Veronese Sacramentary, Verona, Biblioteca capitolare, *codex* 85 (olim 80), also called the Leonine Sacramentary. It is not organized in the manner of liturgical books. See Cyril Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 38–45 for a description of the manuscript and a survey of scholarly opinions concerning it. The critical edition of the Veronese codex is Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, Leo Eizenhöfer, and Petrus Siffrin, eds., *Sacramentarium Veronense* (Rome: Casa Editrice Herder, 1956).

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 152–153, nn. 3338a and 3338b. Sacramentary of Prague, Metropolitan Kapitoly, *codex* O.83, nos. 128, 2 and 130, 3 shows the *praeparet* form as the secret for Pentecost Sunday and the *reparet* form as the postcommunion for Tuesday within the octave of Pentecost.

⁵⁹The prayer reads: “Mentes nostrae, quaesumus, Domine, Spiritus Sanctus divinis reparaet/praeparet sacramentis, quia ipse est omnium remissio peccatorum” [May the Holy Spirit, we beseech you, O Lord, renew (*reparet*)/ prepare (*praeparet*) our minds through these divine mysteries, for he himself is the remission of all sins]. It seems reasonable that, in the wisdom of the tradition, *reparet* was adopted because it accords better with the oration’s description of the Holy Spirit as the source of the remission of sin, and that the oration came to be used exclusively as a postcommunion because it asks that the divine mysteries be effective in a specific way.

revisers to correct corruptions.⁶⁰ Bruylants cites the full text of the Gelasian version of the collect for the members and does not suggest to them that it is in any way unsatisfactory.⁶¹ Indeed, the collect proposed for Easter Sunday in the *orationes de tempore* included in the same schema is identical to the text that appears in the Gelasian sacramentary.⁶² Here we find 1) a second instance in which the revisers blended the variant found in the most ancient extant codex with innovations entirely of their own making, and 2) compelling evidence that the scope of the revisions expanded during the course of the work.

In the light of the foregoing, it seems possible that the revisers may have succumbed to an uncritical archeologism (which,

⁶⁰Schema 186, p. 2. The 1962 collect reads: “Deus, qui hodierna die, per Unigenitum tuum, aeternitatis nobis aditum, devicta morte, reserasti, da nobis, quaesumus, ut vota nostra, quae praeveniando aspiras, etiam adiuvando prosequere” [O God, who on this day through your Only-begotten Son has, by his having vanquished death, unlocked for us the gate of eternity, grant us, we beseech you, that you also accompany our desires, which you inspire by your antecedent grace, with your assistance]. Sister Mary Gonzaga Haessly, *Rhetoric in the Sunday Collects of the Roman Missal: with Introduction, Text, Commentary and Translation* (Saint Louis: Manufacturers Printery, 1938), 4, who does not seem to know of the earlier form of the collect, describes the 1962 text as the direct result of doctrinal controversy: “The Easter Collect . . . with its emphasis on the operation both of prevention and of concomitant grace, is an echo of the controversy that raged in the Church in the fifth and sixth centuries around the doctrine of grace.” The question of whether changes made to orations so that the Church’s public prayer may clearly set forth the Christian truth entrusted to her, thereby protecting the truth from corruption, constitutes, strictly speaking, the “corruption” of these same orations requires a much larger discussion than can be pursued here.

⁶¹*GeV* 463: “Deus, qui hodierna die, per Unigenitum tuum, aeternitatis nobis aditum, devicta morte, reserasti, da nobis, quaesumus, ut qui resurrectionis dominicae sollemnia colimus, per innovationem tui Spiritus a morte animae resurgamus” [O God, who on this day through your Only-begotten Son has, by his having vanquished death, unlocked for us the gate of eternity, grant us, we beseech you, that through the renewal of the Holy Spirit, we may rise from death of soul].

⁶²Revised orations *de tempore* were, as I have stated, included in Schema n. 186. The revised sanctoral orations were included in Schema n. 319, the schema submitted in 1968 by Dumas that we have been discussing. The orations that actually appear in the *Missale Romanum* (1970) follow neither schema, however. I have not been able to determine when the further revisions were made or why, but only that the answer is not in any of the schemata submitted by *Coetus* 18bis. A complete list of *Consilium* schemata is provided by Piero Marini in “Elenco degli ‘Schemata’ del ‘Consilium’ e della Congregazione per il Culto Divino (Marzo 1964-Luglio 1975),” *Notitiae* 18 (1982): 448–539.

oddly, seems often to have been seasoned with pinches of updating). The likelihood of encroaching archeologism appears even stronger when we read the way in which Annibale Bugnini, the *Consilium's* Secretary, paraphrases the same policy: "texts are to be revised according to the originals, restoring fullness of meaning, even theological meaning, that has sometimes been altered."⁶³ Bugnini stipulates "the original" and does not confine re-pristinization to texts that had suffered loss or corruption. Moreover, he seems to assume that any alteration results in loss of meaning. If this is an accurate description of his view, it is indeed archeologism. It would appear, then, that the question of possible archeologism requires further examination. If a preference for more ancient texts on the basis of antiquity alone is in fact verified, we must recognize that our present liturgical orations may fail to reflect the legitimate developments of the intervening centuries.

Conclusion

Up to the time of the Vatican II reform the euchological texts of the Roman Missal could be likened to a great old city built up over time and containing within its walls not only the old and the new but everything in between. Each building, street, monument and so forth has its place in the whole. Over the centuries certain structures, even whole neighborhoods, were torn down and others renovated or added. But the basic nature of the city, as one that was built over the course of centuries and, on this account, that presented evidence in every quarter of its many and diverse architects, is accepted. Indeed, it is recognized as one source of the city's rich beauty. The two revision policies proposed by Bruylants that we discussed above would not have changed the character of our city. Their intent seems to have been simply to provide for the repair of structures damaged by the storms of time and to install new windows in houses where the glass had become opaque or the casements stuck shut.

In contrast, Dumas' essay describes the construction of an entirely new city. The "authors of the new missal" (l. 163) took

⁶³Bugnini, *La Riforma Liturgica (1948–1975)*, 393: "di rivedere i testi sugli originali, restituendo la pienezza di significato, anche teologico, qualche volta alterato."

from the ancient city all the parts, or parts of parts, that they desired; accepted them “as is” or reshaped them to fit a new plan; and augmented the selected materials with entirely new ones in order to complete the project. The architectural plan for the new city is not unveiled in Dumas’ essay, but there are many indications that the design was drawn with constant reference to “the modern mentality,” and that, practically speaking, there was only a single corporate architect, the *Consilium*.

Perhaps the most striking aspect of Dumas’ essay is its disclosure of the tremendous freedom the revisers enjoyed to create, as it were, new liturgical orations. On the strength of his own testimony, Dumas’ claim that the revisers preserved the traditional character of the missal and its prayers must be questioned, as he fails to substantiate it with the facts he presents. In truth, his essay exhibits a rather cavalier approach to tradition for he deems it entirely fitting for the men of a particular age to sift through a treasury amassed over two thousand years and separate, according to the lights of their own times, the wheat from the chaff. Most significantly, as we have seen, the revisers freely adjusted even the most ancient of the orations that they had selected.

One might wonder whether it is not the very essence of liturgical reform for one generation to review the current rites and texts, and to pass judgment on their continued suitability using the lights of its own times. We can only answer in response that never before have reformers freely altered the texts of orations. Indeed, the strongest proof of the conservative nature of liturgical reform prior to Vatican II is the multiplicity of manuscripts which show that, except in the case of prayers composed for more recently instituted feasts, most of the orations of the 1962 missal had been in use for a thousand years or more—in most cases without any textual change.⁶⁴ And, while our

⁶⁴Cf. T. à K. Reilly, “The Sunday Collects,” *Ecclesiastical Review* 51 (1914): 175–190, at 183: “In perusing the sources mentioned [that is, the ancient sacramentaries: Veronese, Gelasian, Gregorian] we are impressed by the antiquity of the Sunday collects, with which we wish to coordinate those of Christmas, Epiphany, and Ascension. Despite the vicissitudes to which the sacramentaries and the manifold Church customs were exposed, these prayers have come down to us intact from the moment of their first appearance” (Quoted in Sister Mary Gonzaga Haessly, *Rhetoric in the Sunday Collects of the Roman Missal*, 6). See also Placide Bruylants, *Les oraisons du Missel Romain: texte et histoire*, vol. 2 (Louvain: Centre de Documentation et d’Information Liturgiques, 1952), which cites the various manuscripts in which the orations of the 1962 missal appear as well as the extant

oldest sacramentaries do not take us farther back than the eighth century, they do witness to usages older than they themselves are.

The extensive freedom enjoyed by the revisers, and the sheer magnitude of the reforms in both number and kind, require that the work of the reformers in all its various particulars be made subject to serious scholarly and ecclesiastical reappraisal. Dumas' essay suggests a specific focus of reevaluation: whether the *Consilium's* obvious efforts at legitimate development were entirely successful, that is, whether fidelity to the Catholic liturgical tradition can be verified in the *Consilium's* every decision.

Dumas' essay is as much a witness to the spirit of his age as it is to the principles guiding the reform of the liturgy. This being the case, it is not wrong or irreverent to subject the work of the *Consilium* to critical scrutiny. As we wend our way through "post-modernity" we are better able to assess to what extent presuppositions of "modernity" have shaped our new missal and to judge whether the new missal fulfills the mandate given by the Fathers of Vatican II, according to which the rites, where necessary, were to "be carefully revised anew according to the mind of sound tradition, and be imbued with new vigor for the sake of today's circumstances and needs."⁶⁵ There is no question about whether the *Consilium* produced a valid missal, for official ecclesiastical approval makes it valid. Whether the new missal expresses the mysteries it was produced to celebrate as well as its predecessor is another matter altogether, and one which deserves respectful consideration by scholars and pastors alike. □

LAUREN PRISTAS is associate professor of theology at Caldwell College in New Jersey.

variants. The existence of variant forms of a particular oration does not mean that an oration has been deliberately edited or changed. Different forms arose in different traditions. As we saw above, for example, the "*pascitur et nutritur*" and "*nascitur et nutritur*" forms of the Paschal octave *super oblata* or secret had both enjoyed continual use for eight hundred years before the Council of Trent.

⁶⁵*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 4: "caute ex integro ad mentem sanae traditionis recognoscantur et novo vigore, pro hodiernis adiunctis et necessatibus, donentur."

