

THE LITURGICAL RENEWAL (R.C.) IN EUROPE 1909-1950

THE LITURGICAL RENEWAL IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE 1909-1950

D.A. Conliffe

Faculty of Religious Studies

S.T.M.

ABSTRACT

The history of the so-called "liturgical movement" is traced from its background in the nineteenth century when the Benedictine monk, Dom Guéranger, attempted a liturgical restoration. The year 1909 marked a turning point: Dom Beau-
duin, a Belgian Benedictine, spoke at the Malines Congress and a liturgical renewal in Belgium got under way. In Germany, nineteenth century theologians exerted an influence, and men such as Abbot Herwegen and Dom Casel began to make a profound and creative contribution to liturgical study. What began as a liturgical renewal led to a renewal of the Church's understanding of herself. Dr. Parsch in Austria emphasized the

place of the Bible in the Church's worship. Difficulties arose in Germany; the C.P.L. was founded in France after the Second World War; and in 1947 the encyclical Mediator Dei gave the renewal official recognition. There is a brief assessment, in conclusion, of the present state of the renewal.

McGILL UNIVERSITY
MONTREAL, QUEBEC
CANADA

FACULTY OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES

THE LITURGICAL RENEWAL IN THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH ON THE
CONTINENT OF EUROPE 1909-1950

D.A. Conliffe, B.A., B.D.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

Fall 1971

© D.A. Conliffe 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

On s'est servi de
La Bibliothèque du
Grand Séminaire de Montréal
et de
La Bibliothèque de
l'Institut d'études médiévales de
l'Université de Montréal
(au couvent des
Dominicains de S. Albert-le-Grand) .
Les plus sincères remerciements
sont exprimés aux personnels de direction
et aux bibliothécaires
des plus obligeants.

PREFACE

During the twentieth century, the adjustment to a rapidly changing world and the need for renewal have affected the Christian Church in its various branches in varying degrees. The Roman Catholic Church, in particular, has been experiencing a renewal that has resulted in a new awareness and understanding on the part of that Church (and of the Church generally) of what she is. It is a renewal in which the Roman Catholic Church is still engaged.

This renewal originated in Europe in what has been called "the liturgical movement." The word "liturgy" is the Greek word, *λειτουργία*, which was used to describe the public service that a wealthy citizen might be called on to render to the State, such as the staging of a play or the fitting out of a ship. A *λειτουργία* was the offering of a service for the good of all. The word passed over into Christian usage to describe the officially sanctioned rites and ceremonies of the Church's offering to God of her prayer and worship.

The liturgical movement was not, however, an official programme of the Church for the renewal of her liturgy, her worship. It is true that Pope Pius X in 1903 issued his famous Motu Proprio on Sacred Music, Tra le Sollecitudini, which spoke of the need for participation in the liturgy on the part of the faithful, but this might have passed unnoticed had there not been the recognition of the need for renewal on the part of some who did not hold important positions in the Church. The movement was never centrally organized or directed, but was supported by many different people, at different stages, in different places.

This study chooses the year 1909 as a point of departure, because it marks a turning point. It was in 1909 that the Benedictine monk, Dom Lambert Beauduin of Mont-César at Louvain, delivered an address at the National Congress of Catholic Action held at Malines. This address became famous as a rallying call to liturgical renewal.

The year 1950 has been selected as a terminus, because it can be considered as a point at which the movement and its aims had become established and accepted in the Roman Catholic Church.

The roots of the movement go back, however, into the nineteenth century, and so in the first chapter of this study the background of the movement will be examined. Chapters two and three will be concerned with the birth of the movement in Belgium and its development there. Chapter four will be devoted to thinkers and leaders in Germany and Austria whose work had a profound influence upon the movement, and chapter five will, in the main, chronicle progress made in the decade 1940-1950, culminating in the issue of the encyclical, Mediator Dei, in 1947. In the conclusion, a brief assessment will be made of the present status of the renewal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
PREFACE	iii
 Chapter	
I THE BACKGROUND OF THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT . . .	1
Notes to Chapter i	34
II DOM LAMBERT BEAUDUIN AND THE CONGRESS OF MALINES	37
Notes to Chapter ii	61
III THE PROGRESS OF THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN BELGIUM	64
Notes to Chapter iii	98
IV LEADING FIGURES IN THE GERMAN-SPEAKING LANDS AND THEIR INFLUENCE UPON THE LITURGICAL RENEWAL	102
Notes to Chapter iv	140
V THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT COMES TO MATURITY . . .	144
Notes to Chapter v	175
CONCLUSION	178
Notes to Conclusion	191
BIBLIOGRAPHY	192

CHAPTER I

THE BACKGROUND OF THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

The Council of Trent met in three sessions between the years 1545-1563. The Council was a response to the Reformation and the Council Fathers were on the defensive. The stand taken by the Council was a conservative one, and its work represented an entrenchment rather than a reform.

The whole subject of the Church's worship was to come before the Council, but time was running out, and so the reform of worship was left in the hands of the Pope. In their study of the liturgical movement, priests of St. Severin and St. Joseph have written:

As a consequence, during the next half century or so a reformed edition of each of the liturgical books was issued, the last being the Roman Ritual in 1614, which was, in fact, a new creation. In this way the chaotic state of the Church's public worship at the end of the medieval period was remedied, but the reformed liturgy that emerged, inevitably perhaps in view of prevailing circumstances, seemed to be conceived as an entirely clerical affair. The Congregation of Rites, established in 1587, in addition to emphasizing this clerical aspect, contrived to create the impression that liturgy was an affair of rubrical interpretation solely and that it was changeless and unchangeable.¹

In the Baroque Period--roughly the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth century--the influence of ancient Greece and Rome continued to be expressed, for classical culture had been rediscovered at the Renaissance. Classical mythology took the place of biblical imagery, and baroque decoration was classical in its expression. Men were not attracted at this time by the plainness of the traditional liturgy and there developed a mistaken understanding of the liturgy as the external worship of the Church, that which was to be performed, but not an action of the Church and so of all those members of the Church participating in it, in which the faith of the Church was expressed. Bouyer describes this false conception of the liturgy as follows:

Now it is from the sixteenth and seventeenth century idea of court life that Catholics of this kind derived their false notions of public worship. An earthly king must be honored daily by the pageant of court ceremonial, and so also the heavenly King. The courtly atmosphere around Him was to be provided by the liturgy. The liturgy, as many handbooks of the period actually say, was considered to be "the etiquette of the great King." The most obvious features of it were those embodying the external pomp, decorum and grandeur befitting so majestic a Prince. The lack of any intelligible meaning in so many rites and even in the sacred words themselves, was, therefore, praised as enhancing the impression of awe to be given to the dazzled multitude. So also, it would have seemed almost indecent to offer to the common people any opportunity to participate directly in so sublime a performance. They were, rather, only to admire it, dimly, from afar, as a scene of unapproachable magnificence.²

Some of this false notion of the liturgy as the external worship of the Church was carried into the nineteenth century, and has persisted even into the twentieth.

The Baroque Period led into the age of the Enlightenment, the age of rationalism, the age when the power of reason was exalted and the thinkers of the Enlightenment claimed freedom from the superstitions and traditions of the past. Voltaire, especially, promoted with irreverence a spirit of criticism and of resistance to the established powers of the Church, the absolutist monarchy, and the privileged nobility.

The pendulum in due course swung away from the emphasis on reason that marked the Enlightenment into the Romantic Era. As a strongly rational approach to life tends to restrain and restrict and suppress the feeling and emotional side of man's makeup, so feeling and emotion once again asserted themselves with the birth of the Romantic Movement. Rousseau was a major influence on Romanticism, and his dictum has become famous: "Man is born free; and everywhere he is in chains." He argued that the first state is the purest state, and so he promoted an interest in origins and sources. He wrote of the holy and innocent child and the noble savage--concepts that were very idealized.

At the time when the Romantic Movement was coming to birth, there was a rediscovery of the Middle Ages, of long-forgotten treasures of medieval romance and ballad poetry. The Romantic Movement did not owe its origin to this rediscovery, and Rousseau did not turn to the Middle Ages, but the discovery filled a need for an earlier, ideal world, different from the world in which men found themselves. The Waverley Novels of Sir Walter Scott were very influential, especially in Britain and Germany, in kindling interest in the Middle Ages. This return to and glorification of the medieval period would be an important influence on the thinking of those whose work in due course led to the modern liturgical movement.

The Romantic Movement in France tended to be a literary movement which began around 1830, and which was identified with the cry for liberty. In Germany, however, the movement expressed itself earlier and had a profound influence on certain theologians of the period, e.g., Sailer (1751-1832), Drey (1777-1853), and Möhler (1796-1838), who in turn exerted an influence on the later thinking of important figures in the liturgical movement such as Abbot Herwegen and Dom Odo Casel, as the latter has stated.³

The Romantic Movement in Germany gave to men like Sailer and M hler a new appreciation for tradition and for the communal life of the Church. Dom Olivier Rousseau remarks of Sailer that "it was noticeable how an appreciation for tradition and the Church and a love for the writings of the Fathers gradually pervaded his teaching."⁴ The preliminary work of Sailer was synthesized by Drey and then M hler, teachers in the Catholic faculty at Tubingen. M hler was critical and meditative by nature and he allowed his ideas time for gestation in his mind. He was profound and comprehensive in his thinking--catholic in the best sense of that word. He died in his early forties, but his work has continued to be influential into the twentieth century.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there were attempts at reform of the liturgy, and mention must be made in particular of the movement in France that came to be known as Jansenism, and which seriously threatened the unity of the French Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Jansenist controversy was carried on for a century between the followers of the Dutch theologian, Jansen, and the Jesuits. It is not necessary for its theological aspects to be gone into here; it is sufficient to mention that the so-called Jansenists sought reform and laid emphasis

on the return to the Bible, on the practice of the early Church and the writings of the Fathers, and agitated for the vernacular in the services and the use of missals. Jubé, the parish priest of Asnières, made an attempt to return to simple, primitive liturgical practice; he is well known because Dom Guéranger (who will be spoken of later) took such exception to his reforms.⁵

Following along the same path, Bishop Scipio Ricci of Pistoia in Italy called a Synod in 1786 which sought to reform the Church along Jansenist principles. The Synod was condemned by Pope Pius VI in 1794 in the Bull Auctorem fidei.

In Germany, Febronianism was a movement parallel to Jansenism, and protested the interference of the Pope in the life of the German Church. The Emperor Joseph II was a figure in this movement and interested himself in ecclesiastical affairs, or meddled as some would say, to the extent that the word, "Josephinism," was coined for him. He inspired liturgical reform, and the name of professor K.A. Winter (1754-1814), who taught at the Universities of Ingolstadt and Landshut, is best known among those who attempted to improve the liturgy. Mention must also be made of Hirscher (1788-1865), who was a professor of pastoral theology at Tübingen, and who made many practical proposals for change in the

liturgy. He was somewhat like a German Jubé; some of his proposals were good, but he is also tarred with the Jansenist brush for others. Sailer too, in addition to his purely theological work, saw the importance of the liturgy in the common life of the Church, and he proposed modest ways in which the people could participate more fully in the Mass.

It is true that these were local reforms, and that they did not have the approval of the Pope for the life of the Church as a whole. The criticism of Jansenism is also made that it was antiquarian and considered that the only satisfactory practice of the Church had to be found in the first five centuries.⁶ But it is recognized by liturgists in the Roman Catholic Church today that many of the reforms desired by the Jansenists were good and healthy in themselves.

Some brief mention must be made at this point of the political situation in Europe in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. The French Revolution erupted in 1789 and was to have a profound influence not only in France but in all of Europe. The Revolution marked the beginning of the displacement of an old and long-established order of society by a new and different order. The Revolution was followed by twenty-five years of upheaval and overthrow--the Napoleonic Era--and the Church was not immune from the

disruption that affected life in general. The revolutionary spirit was anti-clericalist, but after the fall of Napoleon there was also a very marked reaction to the excesses that revolution brought. Men longed once more for stability and peace. Napoleon had signed the famous Concordat with the Papacy in 1801, an alliance which he made to serve his own ends, but it was also an alliance which showed that the Catholic religion was still a power to be reckoned with.

In addition to the adversity which the Church suffered as a result of the political situation, its intellectual strength was at a low ebb at the end of the eighteenth century. But in this sphere also a regeneration began. In 1802, Chateaubriand published Le Génie du Christianisme, a glorification of Roman Catholicism. Chateaubriand's arguments for and defence of the Catholic Faith are not regarded with approval today, but his romanticism did initiate a revivifying influence on the intellectual life of the Church. Vidler writes: "The appeal of an apologetic of this kind was immense to a generation which valued sentiment above reason. It is in effect an appeal to believe in Catholicism, not because it is true, but because it is beautiful, mysterious and charming."⁷

Together with Chateaubriand, mention must be made of Joseph de Maistre (1754-1821), the original exponent of ultramontaniam. He had lived through the Revolution and believed that a new order of society had to be built and that a strong and absolute centre of authority was needed to serve as its basis. He believed that the papacy was the only institution capable of serving this purpose and that it was divinely intended to do so. His most important book, Du Pape, was published in 1817.

Another important name in this period is that of Félicité de Lamennais (1782-1854). He was the founder of the liberal Catholic movement which attempted to ally Catholicism with liberalism and the principles of the Revolution. His book, Des progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'Église, was published in 1829. He was as ultramontane as de Maistre in the first phase of his career, and believed in the power of the papacy to regenerate society, but disillusioned by the rejection of his efforts by Pope Gregory XVI, Lamennais was eventually to forsake the Church. But he was a prominent upholder of that ultramontaniam which would deeply influence those whose work led to the liturgical movement.

Consideration must now be given to the work and influence of the outstanding figure in the nineteenth century

from a liturgical point of view--Dom Prosper Guéranger, Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery at Solesmes.

Dom Rousseau has written:

The "Liturgical Movement", with all its directives, ideals, and accomplishments, goes back to Dom Guéranger. What this great monk did for the liturgy in the middle of the nineteenth century was remarkable. It was quite distinct from anything that had been hitherto attempted, and it governs almost everything that has since been done. And yet the great influence of Dom Guéranger upon the religious thought of his time went beyond the liturgy. His aim, above all, was to understand the great mystery of the Church, and he heard the voice of the Church especially in the liturgy.⁸

Dom Guéranger was born at Sablé, in the Sarthe département in France, in 1805, not far from the deserted priory of Solesmes. As a boy he often walked to the ancient priory and must have seen in imagination its glorious religious past. He was ordained as a secular priest and served first as personal secretary to the aged Bishop of Mans.

The period of his growing up, training and ordination was an exciting period in that reconstruction in the life of the French Church was a prime necessity. There was at this time, in reaction to the revolutionary upheaval and disruption, a profound looking back to the past, and this deeply influenced Guéranger's thinking. Reference has already been made to the Romantic Movement and the way in which the Middle Ages became regarded as the ideal Christian period.

Guéranger shared the nostalgia for the Middle Ages. As he looked back through romantic eyes, he saw the world as a Christian world then, and the Church's influence present in the whole of society. This ideal he committed himself to restore. And so Gothic architecture and Gothic vestments and Gothic decoration had to be restored as well. The worship of the Middle Ages in its splendour had to be recreated. His romantic soul saw the liturgy as belonging to poetry; "et que c'est pour cela même que le chant en est le complément."⁹

Great emphasis came to be placed at this time on tradition, and on continuity with the past. Indeed Seasoltz writes: "Furthermore the conservative traditionalism which had characterized the baroque period developed during the romantic period into a full-blown philosophy of Catholicism which took traditionalism as its root principle."¹⁰

Dom Rousseau writes that Guéranger's traditionalism was "essentially 'ecclesiastical', . . . his polemics and doctrine were entirely theological in character and set forth a teaching as old as the Church."¹¹ He goes on to state (quoting Dom Guépin) that it was "the study of Church history and of the Fathers that had given him a love for antiquity and an understanding of the language of the ancient Church."¹² Of course, it was not the modern historical-scientific approach

to the Scriptures that would have appealed to Guéranger and that he found in the Fathers, but rather the allegorical, mystical approach. He saw the Church as the preserver and guardian of tradition, and of course for him the authority of the Church was focused in the Pope.

The young Guéranger became an associate and ardent follower of Lamennais. Lamennais' chief concern was a political and social restoration in which he saw religion playing an important part, and reference has already been made to his ultramontanism, but he was not a "man of the Church" as Guéranger was. Guéranger's thinking and inclinations led him to restoration by way of monasticism and the liturgical life of the Church. He decided to re-establish the Benedictine Order in France and in 1832 refounded the monastery at Solesmes. Looking back to his beloved Middle Ages, he wished to see monasteries again as centres of learning and influence, wombs which would produce men for the great and responsible tasks in the world.

He turned to monasticism, too, because liturgical worship is the first obligation of the monk and he saw the liturgy as the place where pre-eminently the tradition of the Church is preserved and expressed. As Dom Rousseau writes: "In the liturgy he found their [the Church's traditions]

fullest expression."¹³ "Dom Guéranger looked upon contact with the liturgy as the principal means of restoring to men the lost sense of tradition. The monks of Solesmes were not only to give an example of the liturgical life; but they were, above all, to be wholly filled with it in mind and heart."¹⁴

It is required in the Benedictine Order that the liturgical worship of the monastery be sung, and so, along with Dom Guéranger's restoration of the Order at Solesmes, there went a restoration of the ancient Gregorian chant. Innovations and abuses had become prevalent in the music of the liturgy. Especially in Italy, polyphonic music, theatrical performances and the use of different musical instruments had become commonplace in the churches. Gregorian chant, too, had become corrupted. Guéranger spoke of the chant as "l'âme d'une église catholique".¹⁵ The chant is a means for the expression of the word in the liturgy, and Gregorian chant, sung as it is in unison, does have a peculiar power for uniting people and expressing their oneness as they participate in liturgical worship. Dom Rousseau speaks of how in the nineteenth century liturgists "developed from ancient authors a theology, even a 'mystique' of chant. To them the psalmody held a place of prime importance, essentially related as it is to the praise of the angelic choirs."¹⁶

The work of restoring the authentic Gregorian chant was a long and painstaking task which was not without controversy as different factions emerged. At Solesmes, in 1856, Dom Guéranger encouraged Dom Paul Jausions to undertake a serious research into this matter, a task which he pursued with Dom Joseph Pothier as his assistant. The work undertaken at Solesmes--in large part that of Dom Pothier--was in due course to be honoured by the Brief Nos quidem of 17 May 1901, addressed to the Abbot of Solesmes by Pope Leo XIII. This Brief undoubtedly exercised some influence on the publication by Pope Pius X of his famous Motu Proprio, Tra le sollecitudini, in 1903.

Dom Guéranger was a man of action and pursued his ends with great force and vigour. He published two major liturgical works, Institutions liturgiques and L'Année liturgique.

The original plan for the Institutions was very extensive. He wrote:

Nous avons voulu, dans ce livre, donner, comme l'indique son titre, un enseignement général de toutes les matières qui concernent la science liturgique, et voici les objets que nous nous sommes proposé de traiter. D'abord, l'histoire étant le fondement et le cadre de tout enseignement ecclésiastique, nous avons pris la tâche difficile, et non encore tentée avant nous, de donner l'histoire générale de la Liturgie. Nous la conduisons dans ce

premier volume jusqu'à l'ouverture du XVII^e siècle.
 . . . A la suite des notions nécessaires sur les livres de la Liturgie, sur le calendrier, sur le partage du temps et ses mystères dans la Liturgie, nous passons à l'explication des traditions et des symboles contenus tant dans la partie mobile de l'année ecclésiastique que dans la partie immobile de ce cycle merveilleux.

Le sacrifice chrétien est ensuite traité avec tous les détails qui peuvent contribuer à bien faire connaître ce centre divin de toute la Liturgie. Nous venons, après cela, aux traditions qui concernent les Sacrements, . . . L'ensemble imposant de Sacramentaux attire ensuite notre attention, et nous fournit l'occasion de montrer la réhabilitation universelle de l'oeuvre de Dieu par la vertu de la Croix, d'où découle le divin pouvoir de l'Église. Une dernière partie comprend les Actes et Fonctions liturgiques qui ne se rangent pas sous les divisions que nous venons d'indiquer.

Après avoir développé en détail toutes les parties de cette Somme, nous la faisons suivre de plusieurs traités spéciaux dans lesquels nous examinons: 1. les règles de la symbolique en matière de Liturgie; 2. la langue et le style de la Liturgie; 3. le droit de la Liturgie; 4. l'autorité de la Liturgie, comme moyen d'enseignement dans l'Église, et nous terminons cette dernière subdivision de notre sujet par un petit travail dans lequel, sous le titre de Theologica liturgica, nous avons rangé par ordre de matières tout ce que la Liturgie, telle que Rome la promulgue aujourd'hui, renferme de secours pour l'éclaircissement du dogme et de la morale catholiques.¹⁷

The second volume is devoted to French liturgical history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and deals with the neo-Gallican liturgies. The third volume is devoted to the history of the liturgical books. His original plan was not completed, although after Dom Guéranger's death Dom Guépin published a second edition of this work, to

which he added a fourth volume containing various memoirs and replies of Guéranger to his critics.

L'Année liturgique is a work of fifteen volumes, of which Guéranger produced the first ten. The remaining ones were the work of his monks, especially Dom Lucien Fromage. It has had a wide success, having been translated into most of the European languages, and within sixty years of the first edition, five hundred thousand copies had been sold. It has recently been republished--one hundred years after its first issue.¹⁸

Guéranger dedicated L'Année liturgique to Monseigneur Denis-Auguste Affre, Archbishop of Paris, as: "Un ouvrage entrepris dans le but d'aider les enfants de l'Église catholique à pénétrer les intentions de leur Mère, dans le divin Service qu'elle offre à son céleste Époux, devait paraître sous le patronage de quelqu'un des premiers Pasteurs de cette Sainte Église."¹⁹ He also states in the Introduction:

Assez longtemps, pour remédier à un malaise vaguement senti, on a cherché l'esprit de prière et la prière elle-même dans des méthodes, dans des livres qui renferment, il est vrai, des pensées louables, pieuses même, mais des pensées humaines. Cette nourriture est vide; car elle n'initie pas à la prière de l'Église: elle isole au lieu d'unir.²⁰

His wish was to give people once again an understanding of the liturgy with all its riches, and the work is thus

a very full and comprehensive commentary. In addition to the explanation of the liturgy for all the regular Sundays, for the feasts and festivals, and for saints days, Guéranger deals extensively in Volume X with the cult of the Blessed Sacrament and of the Sacred Heart--devotions of comparatively recent origin. He intended to write a third work, Institutions canoniques, but he died without realizing this aim.

Dom Guéranger wrote for edification, but also to promote the principles that he saw to be necessary for the programme of reconstruction that faced the French Church. He entered, too, with great gusto into the polemics into which his writings often led him. The fact has already been noted that he was much influenced by Lamennais. They shared the same view on the Church's unity. As Dom Rousseau writes: "From his very first contact with Lamennais the ideas of these two men were in perfect accord; they looked upon the Church as being centered around the throne of Peter."²¹ Guéranger held steadfastly to his ultramontanism, and undoubtedly helped pave the way for the definition of the Vatican Council in 1870 on papal infallibility.²² He did not hesitate to enter into controversy with his superiors like the Archbishop of Toulouse and the Bishop of Orléans when they did not agree

with him, and it has to be admitted that his defence of the papacy did win his work papal approval.

There is also found in his work an inordinate fear of Jansenism. This was not simply a negative reaction to a movement that had been condemned, but was related to his understanding of the liturgy in the life of the Church. The Jansenists had promoted the use, for instance, of translations of the Bible and of the vernacular in the liturgy. These Dom Guéranger opposed. "He felt that the sacred character of the liturgy preserved in a 'sacred' tongue was a traditional tenet to which we must cling regardless of consequences."²³ For him there had to be a mysterious element in worship, and this was preserved by the use of a language that was not generally understood. He, therefore, would never translate the Canon of the Mass, although it is true that he did translate in L'Année liturgique most of the liturgical prayers.

He also strenuously opposed the neo-Gallican liturgies. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there had been a long struggle on the part of the French Church in its defence of its liberties against the encroachments of papal power, and the neo-Gallican liturgies in use in many dioceses were a part of this struggle. It is true that the Missale Romanum was issued by Pius V in 1570 as an outcome of the

Council of Trent, but its introduction into different countries was gradual, and the Roman rite had never become the sole rite in use in France. Guéranger asserted the pre-eminence of the Roman rite over the Gallican ones and in due course succeeded in having them suppressed. He considered that no one had any authority to use a liturgy that was not authorized by the Church herself--and so by the Pope--or to make any change in her formulas and rites.

What assessment, then, can be made of Dom Guéranger and his work? The first thing that must be said is that there was an uncritical acceptance on his part of the Middle Ages. Bouyer has pointed out that the romantic reaction to the baroque period was largely a superficial one. "It was only against the most superficial features of the Baroque period", he writes, "that Romanticism reacted, that is against the Neo-Classicism of its decoration, and, in particular, against its use and abuse of mythology."²⁴ The careful scholarship since Guéranger's time of men like Abbot Herwegen and Jungmann has shown that in the Medieval Period liturgical decay had set in. It was during that period that a disproportionate emphasis began to be placed on the real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist rather than on the sacrificial Action, and, in Bouyer's words, "a very sentimental notion of that

Presence."²⁵ The people became spectators at a priestly ceremony which would culminate in the elevation of the consecrated Host, a moment that was the high point of devotion. It is not difficult to see how, out of this practice and understanding, attendance at Mass became an act of individual piety, and one in which people occupied themselves with their personal devotions. Bouyer also mentions Abbot Herwegen's contention that in the Middle Ages there was a turning from an objective kind of piety to a subjective one--an antithesis which Bouyer thinks is too sharply drawn.²⁶

In addition to this, Edmund Bishop, the English liturgist, shows in his highly regarded essay on the Roman Rite that there are a number of foreign elements which "may be called to a large extent French, and, for the most part, made their appearance in the Roman mass only in the later middle ages."²⁷ He remarks later:

In fact, I think it would not be untrue to say that what is considered most picturesque, or attractive, or devout, or affective--in a word, what is most "interesting", as the saying is, in the services of our religion, just those things indeed which in the popular mind are considered distinctive of "Romanism", and which go to make up, in the main, what some people call the "sensuousness of the Roman Catholic ritual", form precisely that element in it which is not originally Roman at all, but has been gradually borrowed, imported, adopted, in the course of ages.²⁸

Against this background it is possible for the shortcomings of the liturgical revival that Dom Guéranger initiated at Solesmes to be understood. It is readily admitted by liturgists today that Solesmian worship was superior to that of the baroque period, but it was infected with the mistakes of the Middle Ages. The worship of Solesmes was carried out beautifully and correctly, with careful observance of the rubrics and every detail of ceremonial, but it was worship in which the important person was seen to be the priest, rather than the assembly, the People of God as a whole. Bouyer points out, too, that at Solesmes it was not the community Mass which was the high point of worship--at this no one received Holy Communion and the lay brothers were not even present--but rather Benediction, "when the whole community is assembled and the height both of personal devotion and public ceremonial is actually attained."²⁹

Furthermore, Guéranger's recreation of the worship of the Middle Ages was a hot-house plant, one that could not readily be transplanted to the average parish. It was possible in a monastery and it was a remarkable achievement, but it nevertheless involved the transplanting of one age into another that was vastly different. Is this how the Christian Faith can be made meaningful to men at any particular point

in time? It is true, of course, that Guéranger saw the supernatural beyond the natural, whereas the liturgical movement today is trying to express the belief that the supernatural is present in the natural.

With regard to Guéranger's publications, some scholars have been harshly critical of them. Edmund Bishop, for instance, has written: "Those [books] of Dom Guéranger, who has not merely left behind him a heap of ruins, but has also (speaking from the ground of liturgical science) carefully led those who were pleased to follow him out into an arid desert where the oases are only mirages."³⁰ Bouyer speaks of the "incredible weakness" of the liturgical scholarship that emanated from Solesmes. He adds: "The most significant production of that sham scholarship is Les Institutions liturgiques . . ., while in L'Année liturgique its logical consequences are carried to almost unbelievable extremes."³¹ Even Dom Rousseau has to admit that in the Institutions the master "does not hesitate to make rapid and one-sided deductions."³²

In spite of these criticisms, however, which are made from the vantage point of the more complete study and scholarly work that has been carried out since Guéranger's time, it must be said to his credit that he did wish to help people

understand the riches of the Church's liturgical heritage. It is true that not every French parishioner would have had the educational background to make use of L'Année liturgique, and the weaknesses inherent in his understanding of the liturgy and in his scholarship have been noted, but he did make a beginning.

Following on this, too, is the fact that he initiated a return to study at a time when it had become seriously neglected in France. Dom Cabrol writes: "Comme liturgiste il eut le grand mérite de ramener l'attention sur ces études qui étaient à peu près complètement abandonnées en France depuis la Révolution."³³

It is readily admitted today that Guéranger was ruthless in his ultramontanism and in his suppression of the Gallican rites, and that his work thus led to the imposition of a uniformity and consequent impoverishment in the life of the French Church. But it can also be argued on the other hand that the shambles left by the Revolution demanded that a decisive programme be set forward. This Guéranger did in the way that he believed to be right.

Shepherd has given the following carefully considered assessment of Guéranger:

Nonetheless Dom Guéranger laid such foundations that without his pioneering the work of twentieth-century reformers would be impossible. One must remember that, however romantically conceived, however pressed into service for an ultramontanist program, his concern to restore the Roman rite in the purity of its text, ceremony, and chant was an essential starting point for any progressive work of reform. In particular, the glory of Solesmes has been its laborious and painstaking scholarship in the restoration of the ancient Gregorian chant. This work has been far more than an enrichment of our appreciation of the Western Church's cultural heritage. It has provided a fundamental insight into the true nature of liturgical song.³⁴

Dom Guéranger's monastic revival, and so the influence of his thinking and work, began to spread in Europe. It might be said that the Benedictine Order acted as a fertilizer in the soil in which the twentieth century liturgical movement would flower.

Two foundations were made from Solesmes before Dom Guéranger's death in 1875--that of the Abbey of Ligugé, near Poitiers, in 1853, and one at Marseilles in 1865.

In Germany, two priests of the Diocese of Cologne, Dom Maurus and Dom Placidus Wolter, who became Benedictines, refounded the Abbey at Beuron in 1863. There developed a very close relationship between Beuron and Solesmes. Each of the Wolter brothers paid a visit of several months to Solesmes, and the first novices at Beuron were prepared at Solesmes for their monastic life. Dom Rousseau writes: "The first

years of Beuron were but a reproduction of life at Solesmes. The same spirit was to be found in the two communities, and, for a long time, they were united by the closest ties."³⁵

In 1880 the Abbey of Emmaus in Prague was refounded as an off-shoot of Beuron, and then in 1883 some monks from Emmaus took possession of the ancient abbey at Seckau in Austria.

In 1864, the year after monastic life began again at Beuron, the German Church celebrated the six hundredth anniversary of the birth of St. Gertrude the Great of Helfta, and Dom Maurus published a translation of her Spiritual Exercises. In his introduction, he was able to write of the place that the liturgy should have in the lives of Christians, and of the monastic and liturgical revival that was taking place in France under Dom Guéranger's leadership. Then in 1865 a small book called, Plain Chant and the Liturgy, was published by "a German Benedictine." In later editions this work was under the authorship of Dom Benedict Sauter, but it is considered that Dom Maurus helped in the preparation of the first edition. It emphasized the riches of liturgical prayer and, with the Spiritual Exercises, served to introduce in Germany the liturgical revival that was taking place.

Dom Maurus also wrote a five-volume commentary on the Psalms, Psallite Sapienter, and Praecipua Ordinis Monastici

Elementa, both of which draw on the works of the Fathers. The work of Dom Maurus and his followers was a counterpart to the earlier theological work of men like Sailer and MÖhler, and the union of these two streams would bear fruit in the German liturgical movement in the twentieth century.

Two other publications should be mentioned at this point: the Messbuch, a German-Latin Missal for people's use published in 1884, and the Vesperbuch, published in 1893, both of which were the work of Dom Anselm Schott of Beuron. They both owed much to Dom Guéranger's L'Année liturgique, and their aim was to help people recover understanding of the liturgy.

When we turn to Belgium, we find that Benedictine activity was taking place there too. In 1872 a foundation was made at Maredsous by some monks from Beuron. Here a new abbey was built. From Maredsous, in 1899, another foundation took place--that of the Abbey of Mont-César at Louvain, a monastery which was to become a vital centre of the Belgian liturgical movement.

A monk of this abbey, Dom Gerard van Caloen, who had known Dom Guéranger personally, published a French-Latin Mis-
sel des Fidèles in 1882--two years before the publication of Dom Schott's Messbuch. This Missal was much dependent on and

borrowed extensively from L'Année liturgique. In the following year, 1883, at the Eucharistic Congress of Liège, Dom van Caloen made what was then a startling suggestion: that there should be Communion during the Mass. (The normal practice at the time was for Communion to be administered before or after the Mass.) This suggestion aroused objection and was the cause of controversy, but it had the advantage of bringing the liturgy into public discussion and debate. At about this time, too, Dom van Caloen began publication of a liturgical periodical, Le Messager des fidèles. In 1887 he was called to undertake a monastic restoration in Brazil and in this connection opened a centre near Bruges. This centre in due course became the Abbey of Saint-André. The publication of Le Messager des fidèles had to pass to other hands. In due course, this periodical became the Revue Bénédictine and its purpose and content were changed. It served now as a learned journal devoted to scientific study of liturgy.

Dom Germain Morin and Dom Ursmer Berlière were the two monks who established the Revue Bénédictine as an erudite and critical periodical, and to emphasize the work of study and scholarship and its importance in this seminal period, it can be noted that they both passed through the hands of Dom Boniface Wolff, who had studied under the famous theologian of

Cologne, Scheeben, and who was the Master of Novices at Maredsous from 1879-1886.

In the area of critical and scientific study, brief mention must be made of Duchesne and of Batiffol, two scholars whose work dates from the latter part of the nineteenth century. Dom Rousseau says of the former: "No one did more for the restoration of ecclesiastical studies in France than Msgr. Louis Duchesne."³⁶ His work on the Liber Pontificalis was published in 1877, and he is famous for his study, Les origines du culte chrétien. Batiffol published his Histoire du Bréviaire Romain in 1893 and his Leçons sur la Messe followed soon after. It is to be lamented that the Modernist Crisis in the Roman Catholic Church which was precipitated especially by Loisy's application of critical, scientific methods to the study of the Bible, and which resulted in the condemnation of the Modernist Movement by the encyclical Pascendi (8 September 1907) of Pope Pius X, dealt a severe setback to modern critical methods of study, and placed scholars like Duchesne and Batiffol under a cloud. Some of the works of both men were placed on the Index. The dread aroused by Pascendi, however, would in due course abate, and the observation may simply be made at this point that the liturgical movement as it developed

would continue to make use of historical-scientific methods of study.

Pope Pius X became Pope on 4 August 1903. At once, he was plunged into the problems presented by Modernism, in the light of which he quickly showed himself to be conservative. Yet, it is a curious fact that it was he who was the first Pope to give papal authority to the liturgical renewal. The Motu Proprio on Sacred Music, published on 22 November 1903, only three months after he became Pope, has become something of a charter of the liturgical movement.

It is a little difficult in the case of one who has been beatified to separate biography from hagiography, but some of the brief facts of Pius' life are that he was ordained priest in 1858. He served first for nine years as curate at Tombolo, where he worked to introduce Gregorian chant and sacred music, and to give new life to public worship. He next served for twelve years as pastor at Salzano. Dom Rousseau has written that his love for ceremonies and chant was not an end in itself. Rather:

To revive the "community spirit" in parish life (the fundamental unity of Christian life); to reawaken the people's fervor through active participation in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; to bring them to appreciate the riches of the great feasts, the value of the Sacraments and sacramentals;

to give to the faithful a love for the mysteries of faith; to retemper them in the spirit of the ages of faith and thus put them in full contact with all the channels of grace; such were the main objectives of his apostolate.³⁷

From Salzano he went to Treviso as Canon, and then became Bishop of Mantua in 1884. He became Patriarch of Venice in 1892, and it is to be noted that in 1895 he published his pastoral letter on the chant and music of the Church. It is significant, too, that his whole experience as priest and bishop was pastoral.

Certain passages from the Motu Proprio are quoted in almost every book that deals with the liturgical movement, but this is only because they are essential for understanding of later developments --and so must be quoted again. At the beginning the Pope states:

Chief among the anxieties of the pastoral office, not only of this Supreme Chair, . . . but of every local church, is without doubt that of maintaining and promoting the decorum of the house of God where the august mysteries of religion are celebrated, and where the Christian people assemble to receive the grace of the sacraments, to be present at the holy sacrifice of the altar, to adore the august sacrament of the Lord's Body and to join in the common prayer of the Church in the public and solemn liturgical offices.³⁸

He then speaks of abuse that exists in connection with sacred chant and music. He gives recognition, however, to the large amount of good done in this respect during the last

decades in Rome and in many Italian churches, "but in a more especial way among some nations in which excellent men, full of zeal for the worship of God, have, with the approval of this Holy See and under the direction of the bishops, united in flourishing societies and restored sacred music to the fullest honor in nearly all their churches and chapels."³⁹ There is little doubt that reference is here made to abbeys like that at Solesmes.

Then follows the passage that is the most famous of all:

It being our ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit restored in every respect and be preserved by all the faithful, we deem it necessary to provide before everything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for the object of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is the active participation in the holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church.⁴⁰

The Motu Proprio then deals specifically with "Instruction on Sacred Music", detailed under the following headings:

(1) General Principles; (2) The Kinds of Sacred Music;

(3) The Liturgical Text; (4) External Form of the Sacred Compositions; (5) The Singers; (6) Organ and Instruments;

(7) The Length of the Liturgical Chant; (8) Principal Means; and finally, (9) Conclusion.⁴¹

The Pope speaks of sacred music as an integral part of the solemn liturgy, and of the pre-eminence of the Gregorian chant. "Efforts must especially be made to restore the use of the Gregorian chant by the people, so that the faithful may again take a more active part in the ecclesiastical offices, as they were wont to do in ancient times."⁴² He stresses that Latin as the language of the Roman Church must alone be used in solemn liturgical functions; that singers in church have a real liturgical office, and therefore women, "as being incapable of exercising such an office, cannot be admitted to form part of the choir or of the musical chapel";⁴³ and that music proper to the Church is purely vocal music--the parts of the celebrant and other ministers of the altar must be purely vocal--but that organ accompaniment is permitted. Finally, each bishop must appoint a commission in his diocese to promote the restoration of sacred music.

Following the Motu Proprio, a decree on daily Communion, Sacra Tridentina Synodus, was issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Council on 22 December 1905. Both of these were very important efforts to implement the restoration of the liturgy as the centre of the Christian life. It is true that the publication of these directives meant that the task of explaining

and putting them into practice then had to be carried out--a work that would take a long time, that would meet with varying success, and that would even take new directions and find new emphases as the liturgical movement progressed, but the work of Pius X provided strong roots to feed the liturgical movement that now would grow.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Priests of St. Severin (Paris) and St. Joseph (Nice), What is the Liturgical Movement? (London: Burns and Oates, 1964), p. 132.
2. Louis Bouyer, Life and Liturgy (London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), p. 4.
3. Cf. Dom Olivier Rousseau, The Progress of the Liturgy: An Historical Sketch from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the Pontificate of Pius X (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1951), p. 51: "But, as Dom Casel has rightly pointed out, the works of Sailer, Moehler, and other theologians of the first half of the nineteenth century served as a remote preparation for this magnificent movement." Footnote refers to: Liturgische Bewegung, in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, III, 1699.
4. Ibid., pp. 59-60.
5. Cf. Dom Prosper Guéranger, Institutions Liturgiques (2e éd.; Paris: Société Générale de Librairie Catholique, 1878-85), II, 202-03.
6. Cf. Bouyer, op. cit., p. 54.
7. A.R. Vidler, The Modernist Movement in the Roman Catholic Church (Cambridge: The University Press, 1934), p. 19.
8. Op. cit., p. 3.
9. Op. cit., IV, 305.
10. R. Kevin Seasoltz, The New Liturgy: A Documentation 1903-1965 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), p. xxiv.
11. Op. cit., p. 7.

12. Ibid., p. 9, quoting Institutions, I, xxix.
13. Ibid., p. 6.
14. Ibid., pp. 36-37.
15. Op. cit., II, 630.
16. Op. cit., p. 114.
17. Op. cit., I, lxxii-lxxiv.
18. Cf. Priests of St. Severin and St. Joseph, op. cit., p. 12.
19. Dom Prosper Guéranger, L'Année liturgique (Tours: Maison Alfred Mame et Fils, 1920), I, i.
20. Ibid., I, xiv-xv.
21. Op. cit., p. 18.
22. Cf. Rousseau, op. cit., p. 18: "His struggles in favour of the Roman liturgy and his defense of pontifical rights were guided by that central idea, later to be set forth in the dogmatic definition of papal infallibility."
23. Ibid., p. 32.
24. Op. cit., p. 10.
25. Ibid., p. 16.
26. Cf. ibid., pp. 16-17.
27. Edmund Bishop, Liturgica Historica (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1918), p. 6.
28. Ibid., p. 12.
29. Op. cit., p. 13.
30. Op. cit., p. 120.

31. Op. cit., p. 13.
32. Op. cit., p. 8.
33. Dom Fernand Cabrol, "Guéranger," Dom F. Cabrol and Dom Henri Leclercq, Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie, VI, 2e partie (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1925), col. 1875.
34. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The History of the Liturgical Renewal," The Liturgical Renewal of the Church, ed. Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. 25.
35. Op. cit., p. 71.
36. Ibid., p. 44.
37. Ibid., pp. 151-52.
38. Seasoltz, op. cit., p. 3.
39. Ibid., p. 4.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., pp. 4-9.
42. Ibid., p. 5.
43. Ibid., p. 8.

CHAPTER II

DOM LAMBERT BEAUDUIN AND THE CONGRESS OF MALINES

It is almost certain that Pius X, when he wrote his Motu Proprio, Tra le Sollecitudini (1903), did not contemplate or foresee a liturgical renewal such as has taken place in the Roman Catholic Church in the twentieth century. He expressed a desire of which intuitively, with his pastoral background, he was aware, but it fell to a young Benedictine monk, Dom Lambert Beauduin, of the Monastery of Mont-César at Louvain, to be the person who would give the movement its shape, and who would establish in the consciousness of the Church in Europe, and elsewhere, as a summons to renewal, words of the Pope expressed in the Motu Proprio.

Octave Beauduin was born at Rosoux-lès-Waremme in Belgium on 5 August 1873, the fifth of eight children. His family had been landowners in that region since the sixteenth century, and some of his uncles had launched themselves in commercial enterprises. His family background provided the soil in which he developed an independence and originality of outlook.

When he had completed his humanités at the Little Seminary of Saint-Trond, it seems that not only the priesthood but also monasticism attracted him, but a stay at the Cistercian monastery at La Trappe dispelled the monastic vocation temporarily.

He then entered the Grand Seminary at Liège and was ordained a priest on 25 April 1897. Following his ordination, he returned to Saint-Trond where he served for two years as a supervisor. These were the years preceding the Modernist Crisis, but it appears that his main concern at the time lay with Social Catholicism and with the problem of the dechristianized masses. This concern had been fostered by his professor of Moral Theology, Abbé Pottier.

The famous encyclical of Leo XIII, Rerum Novarum (1891), appeared at the time when Octave Beauduin entered the seminary, and was warmly welcomed by the Bishop of Liège, Mgr Doutreloux. Canon Pottier, for his part, and his disciples were convinced that Social Catholicism must rid itself of its paternalistic approach. "L'école du chanoine Pottier y ferait donc scandale par la façon dont elle affirmerait la nécessité d'associations d'ouvriers prenant en main eux-mêmes la résolution de leurs problèmes économiques propres."¹ They saw that the workers would have to be helped

to take a responsible place in society, and so they welcomed Bishop Doutreloux's move to establish a society of aumôniers du travail.

Père Reyn, a priest of the Sacred Heart at Issoudun, was the originator of the idea for this society of industrial chaplains who would live among the workers in the hostels provided for those who were separated from their families. He not only received the Bishop's support for his idea, but also help from Canon Pottier. The group was officially constituted in 1895 and Octave Beauduin joined it in 1899. Belgian Catholics generally, however, were not ready for the advanced ideas that were given expression in the formation of the group of aumôniers, and when Bishop Doutreloux died in 1901, a reaction set in. Lacking support, the society of chaplains had to be disbanded. Bouyer contends, however, that the external circumstances alone did not decide a new direction for Octave Beauduin.

Si importante que lui parût une action sociale appuyant l'action chrétienne, elle ne pouvait entièrement le satisfaire. Si sensible qu'il fût à la nécessité, comme on dit aujourd'hui, d'incarner le christianisme dans l'humain, il était non moins intimement persuadé de la valeur absolue comme du pouvoir de rayonnement immédiat de l'évangile et de la vie sacerdotale.²

He could not be content with indirect evangelisation. He felt that a life wholly consecrated to Christ must engage in direct evangelisation. This led him to consider joining the Dominican Order, but the manteau des prêcheurs did not fit.

The advice of Canon Laminne who had been his superior at Saint-Trond and who had become in 1904 a professor at the University of Louvain, led Octave Beauduin to enter Mont-César in 1906. Bouyer affirms that the young postulant possessed the most monastic as well as the most Benedictine of virtues--docility.

La docilité bénédictine, comme l'implique la notion du monastère "école du service divin", c'est, dans la plus pure tradition monastique originelle, la disposition à se laisser instruire par ceux, quels qu'ils soient, qui en savent plus long que vous, et en particulier à s'assimiler l'expérience spirituelle de ceux qui l'ont acquise à grand prix.³

The great masters in the monastic tradition had always taught that this obedience would lead in due course to the identification of one's will with the divine will, that one would lose one's will only to find it.

Dom Lambert (as Octave became) used to say, "Quand je vins au monastère, je ne savais rien, rien. Tu entends? Rien."⁴ But there were men to influence and instruct him: in particular, Dom Robert de Kerchove, the Abbot, and Dom Columba

Marmion, the Master of Novices. It may also be noted that he brought to the monastery the influence of the priests of the Sacred Heart, some of his fellow aumôniers, and Bouyer repeats his humorous remark: "Dom Lambert garderait donc quelque temps la piété fortement 'cardiolâtre', comme il dirait plus tard, du Père Octave."⁵

But the life of the monastery and his studies worked their influence upon him. He was in particular enchanted by the liturgical life of the monastery, and he could not but note the contrast between it and the perfunctory Catholicism that he had experienced before. With his humbleness of outlook and his humanity, he felt that this wealth should not be reserved to a privileged few, but that it should be the possession of the whole Church.

Un mot qui lui échapperait paraîtrait révélateur, aux yeux de ses nouveaux confrères, du missionnaire pas encore déclassé de son ouvriérisme: "Quel dommage que cette piété demeure l'apanage d'une élite; nous sommes les aristocrates de la liturgie; il faudrait que tout le monde puisse s'en nourrir, même les gens les plus simples; il faudrait démocratiser la liturgie."⁶

It is worth noting, too, that he saw the monastic life not as a specialty, but as the Christian life lived with the fullest commitment possible.

This was a very formative period in Dom Lambert's life. Shortly after he entered Mont-César, the task of teaching the course on the Church was laid upon him. Instead of making use of a current manual, he began what became a lifelong habit: he went to the great masters of positive theology such as Petau and Thomassin. They in turn led him to the study of the sources in which a theology of the Church was elaborated--the history of the councils in general, and in particular the expansion of the schemas of the first Vatican Council. These were available in the Collectio Lacensis, but its pages were little studied at that time.

It was at the Conventual Mass one day that he saw intuitively how the Church is expressed and takes form in her liturgical life, focused as this is in the Mass.

C'est dans la messe, telle que la liturgie en exprime le mystère, que l'Église prend corps. Réciproquement, c'est seulement la théologie la plus profonde de l'Église qui peut livrer le sens de la messe. Ainsi la liturgie ne serait-elle plus pour lui juste une piété si belle et si profonde qu'il faille la démocratiser: il découvrirait qu'elle est la piété de l'Église. Du même coup, dans cette panégyrie dont parle l'épître aux Hébreux, dans cette "assemblée de fête" de tout le peuple de Dieu qu'est la réunion eucharistique, il trouvait enfin le "lieu théologique" de l'Église qu'il eût vainement cherché dans les manuels classiques.⁷

Dom Olivier Rousseau, one of Dom Lambert's pupils at the time, tells how his intuition had to be shared with his pupils:

Some of his pupils still remember the day when the young professor, deeply impressed by this apparently simple discovery, shared it with his class. A new liturgical movement was in the making. Pastors must once more instruct their people about the riches of parish life; they must utilize the Sunday gathering of their people around the altar; they must make the faithful love their church, its baptismal fonts, its ceremonies, its sacred rites. They must let their people participate in these sacred rites through congregational singing and through an understanding of the liturgical prayers. Parish communities, thus restrengthened, would advance wonderfully in the Christian life.⁸

These insights that Dom Lambert was recovering would have repercussions on the life of his monastery and on monastic life in general. For he felt that the light and warmth of Christian life as experienced in the monastery should be shared with and communicated to others. And so he found himself taking practical steps towards implementing the convictions that more and more strongly possessed him.

It must be observed, however, that Dom Lambert was not alone in recognizing the need for liturgical renewal. Undoubtedly he had the force to make proposals and to follow these with a practical programme; there is no question that he was ready for and grasped the opportune moment; but others, too, were drawing attention to the fact that the liturgy was no longer understood and lived by the faithful. Dom Robeyns tells of how in 1907 Canon Callewaert founded "le Cercle

liturgique, petite académie intime, où le distingué professeur de liturgie tâcha de raviver l'intérêt pour les études et la piété liturgiques."⁹

Then, in the Revue pratique d'Apologétique of 15 April 1909, there was a note entitled, Pour la vie liturgique, in connection with the publication by the parish priest of Saint-Honoré-d'Eylau in Paris, M. Marbeau (who became Bishop of Meaux the following year), of a Paroissial des fidèles. M. Marbeau wrote the note himself, and it is interesting to see how closely his analysis of the situation and his awareness of the place that the liturgy should have in the lives of the faithful are paralleled by the views of Dom Lambert.

On a raison d'attribuer, pour une grande part, le fléchissement de la foi à la diminution de la vie religieuse. Mais on ne réfléchit pas assez que la vie religieuse n'a tant baissé que parce que la vie liturgique est presque totalement supprimée. La liturgie est le culte créé par l'Église. Tout y a été réglé avec décence, dignité, esprit de foi. C'est trop peu dire: tout y est agencé de façon que le fidèle, au lieu d'être livré à son inspiration privée, chante et prie en union avec le prêtre et avec toute l'assemblée chrétienne. Or la liturgie s'en va de plus en plus: les Vêpres ne comptent plus en beaucoup de lieux; on leur substitue le salut du Saint-Sacrement; la grand'messe est remplacée par la messe basse; durant cette messe, les fidèles, s'ils ne restent pas inoccupés, usent de livres religieux étrangers à la messe elle-même. La conséquence est que les fidèles, s'ils prient encore à l'église, y prient seuls,

et non pas en union avec leurs frères et avec le prêtre. Ils prient devant un prêtre qui fait son office; mais il n'y a pas communion de prières entre le célébrant et les assistants. De la sorte, la religion des fidèles n'est pas soutenue: ou bien elle se développe en dehors de la pensée de l'Église, ou bien elle tombe peu à peu. Elle est en effet tombée en beaucoup de catholiques, qui ont éprouvé de l'ennui, du dégoût, un sentiment d'inutilité, dans des offices qui n'étaient plus liturgiques. Aussi ne saurait-on trop faire effort pour que reflourisse la vie liturgique, pour donner aux offices solennels plus d'éclat, pour y associer les fidèles. Même lorsqu'ils assistent à la messe basse, il faut que les fidèles prennent part à l'action du prêtre, en nourrissant leur piété des prières mêmes que le prêtre récite à l'autel.¹⁰

Reference was made to this note and to the Paroissial in the first issue of the monthly supplement to La vie liturgique (November 1909, pp. 3-4).¹¹

Further, Dom Vandeur (to whom reference will be made later)¹² addressed the Eucharistic Congress at Cologne (August 1909) as follows:

Les fidèles ne comprennent plus la messe, ils ont cessé de s'unir au sacrifice, ils n'entendent plus la messe. La fausse dévotion moderne a tué la vraie dévotion. Il reste, en conséquence, une seule chose à faire: leur réapprendre à assister à la messe, à l'entendre.¹³

Dom Lambert, for his part, was engaged in drawing his concerns to the attention of others, and unwittingly in preparing to present them to a wider audience at the Congress of Malines. In an essay in Les Questions liturgiques et

paroissiales, André Haquin gives some detailed background to Dom Lambert's address.¹⁴ His thesis is that there were three important milestones on the way to Malines and the address there: The Missal Review "La Vie Liturgique"; the Report "De Promovenda Sacra Liturgia"; and the Letter of 6 July to Cardinal Mercier.

Around January 1909 a review was proposed which would give "le texte complet de la messe avec traduction et chants pour faciliter l'assistance fructueuse à la grand-messe paroissiale."¹⁵ This project was attributed to a young monk, Dom F. Mercenier, of Maredsous. It appeared to be premature and was provisionally abandoned.

During the summer, Dom Lambert submitted his plan to several young confrères:

Chaque livraison fournirait des leçons liturgiques, la traduction intégrale de la messe et des vêpres dominicales. De plus le projet envisageait pour les prêtres une partie supplémentaire destinée à la formation doctrinale et qui ne devait paraître qu'après un an.¹⁶

Haquin adds: "Dom Lambert Beauduin n'a peut-être pas la paternité du premier projet, mais il semble se l'être approprié et en avoir doté son abbaye. . . ." ¹⁷

He informed his Abbot, Dom Robert de Kerchove, of his project on 20 August 1909 and received his approval. He drafted

a circular letter that same day to a hundred Belgians of varied standing, explaining his project and asking their comments. He is reported to have received seventy-five replies, of which only three or four were not in favour. "Dom Beauduin attendait plus de ce referendum que 'des discussions superficielles du Congrès'."18

He submitted a later text to his Abbot (in all probability in the early days of September) in which in typical manner he states: "Une rénovation liturgique se prépare. Les Bénédictins doivent en être l'âme. Le Mont-César est prédestiné à cette mission."19

On 27 May 1909, he sent a personal report dealing with the liturgy to the 8th Chapter of Beuron, called to meet from 5-16 July. (The Belgian Congregation of the Benedictine Order had not yet been established, and so the Belgian monasteries were still attached to Beuron.) In this report he described the necessary stages of the renewal in the Benedictine Order:

La connaissance de la liturgie permettra le ressourcement de la vie spirituelle et débouchera sur l'apostolat liturgique. La science n'est pas envisagée sans ses prolongements, ni la vie spirituelle sans son expression, le zèle apostolique. La réforme vise à la fois l'ordre bénédictin et le peuple chrétien. Le moine bénédictin se doit d'étudier l'histoire de la liturgie et d'inventorier les trésors de doctrine et de piété contenus dans le culte chrétien. Il doit hâter le renouveau de la vie chrétienne par la diffusion de la liturgie.20

The problem that would be given wider exposure at the Congress of Malines, and the practical steps for its solution, were already being delineated by Dom Lambert. The problem was a pastoral one: the restoration of the Church's liturgical life, understood and fully participated in, as the essential element in the Christian life; the practical steps envisaged a programme of education, or re-education, in which he saw the Benedictine Order as playing a major role. The report foresaw the difficulty that would be encountered in attempting to shift the focus of attention of the worshipper at Mass from his private devotions to the Mass itself, for engaging in private devotions at Mass had become a firmly established practice. But there had to be a return to what was essential. He knew that in many of the recently founded religious orders devotions had an integral and even preponderant role, but without making an issue of this, he simply asserted that in the Benedictine Order their place must be peripheral. His conviction was (in Haquin's words) that "la liturgie a une place hors de pair, que les exercices ne peuvent usurper."²¹

How, then, did the members of the Chapter welcome his proposals? As might be expected, there was not a wildly enthusiastic acceptance of Dom Lambert's report, and yet there was a qualified acceptance.

Selon le Protokoll, le Chapitre affirme que la vie liturgique fut de tout temps le but de la congrégation et qu'elle va porter son attention sur les mesures à prendre pour intensifier l'étude de la liturgie. Il envisage des prédications liturgiques pour le peuple, la publication de brochures et peut-être des cours liturgiques pour prêtres et laïques. Désormais dom Lambert n'est plus un inconnu dans son Ordre.²²

The third milestone was a letter to Cardinal Mercier. The Abbot, Dom Robert de Kerchove, and Dom Columba Marmion left around 2 July for Beuron, where they would learn of Dom Lambert's report. About the same time, Dom Lambert wrote what seems to have been his first letter to Cardinal Mercier. It was a long letter of fourteen pages and Haquin says that it seems to have been unknown to liturgical historians. He was able to have access to it at the Archbishop's Palace at Malines.²³

Dom Lambert had the greatest respect for Cardinal Mercier and saw him as the providential instrument of a thorough-going restoration of the religious life of Belgium.

En rétablissant la vie liturgique parmi les fidèles, il me semble, Eminence, que vous avez entrepris l'action la plus efficace de restauration religieuse. Par sa liturgie, expression sanctifiante du Christ à travers les siècles, sous les multiples aspects de tout un cycle, l'Église infuse par infiltrations mesurées et continues toute la doctrine et toute la vie du Christ: que reste-t-il de cette vertu éducatrice?

Par sa liturgie, elle veut fusionner dans une communion intime de vie religieuse toute la famille chrétienne: que reste-t-il de cette âme collective dans nos assemblées chrétiennes?

Par sa liturgie, l'Eglise veut prolonger ici-bas l'adoration et la prière unanime, sensible, populaire, vivante et facile; comme elle: une, sainte, catholique et apostolique; hélas! la grande-messe paroissiale et les vêpres ont fait place à la prière individuelle, intérieure, sans vertu sociale, sans prise sur tant d'âmes toutes pesantes des choses de la terre. C'est l'oubli du vieux principe "Nihil in intellectu quod non fuerit prius in sensu", que l'on pourrait traduire sans parti pris: la vie religieuse n'a tant baissé que parce que la vie liturgique est presque totalement supprimée.²⁴

Dom Lambert then proceeded to list seven concrete proposals concerning: dialogue Mass, parochial liturgical missions conducted by Benedictine Fathers, the use of Compline as evening prayer in the seminaries, the liturgy at the next Malines Congress, a metropolitan academy of theological studies, the modification of the legal situation of the Church in Belgium in the direction of a more effective separation (of Church and State), and finally the re-establishment of the Provincial Council.

Furthermore, and quite undaunted, Dom Lambert suggested to the Cardinal that he write three different letters: one to the Sacred Congregation of Rites requesting permission for dialogue Mass, another addressed to the clergy of the

Diocese of Malines on the value of the liturgical life, and a third to extol the parochial ministry.

It may be noted that Dom Lambert, in suggesting parochial liturgical missions conducted by Benedictine Fathers, used the phrase "le mouvement liturgique": "De la sorte le mouvement liturgique serait imprimé à la paroisse et le premier pas qui effraie plusieurs prêtres laissés à eux-mêmes, serait fait."²⁵ He went on to express his conviction that the clergy did not live by the liturgy as they ought: "Mais surtout, Eminence, le clergé ne vit pas de la liturgie. . . . Pour beaucoup l'aliment substantiel de leur vie intérieure et apostolique n'est pas là."²⁶ He made the suggestion regarding Compline in the seminaries because he felt that in this way the Divine Office would begin to find the place again it once held in the lives of Christians.

Dom Lambert's proposal with regard to the liturgy at the Malines Congress was inserted in the letter on page 8a. His proposal was worded as follows:

Et pour fixer l'attention des catholiques sur la piété liturgique dont beaucoup éprouvent le vague besoin, ne pourrait-on pas pour les trois jours du Congrès des catholiques à Malines imprimer un petit opuscule dans lequel tous trouveraient les messes de ces trois jours avec chants, traductions et quelques explications très substantielles et très courtes; et ensuite l'office de complies, également avec

psalmodie, chants et traductions. Il y aurait à la métropole grand-messe tous les jours vers sept heures et demie ou huit heures et le soir complies chantées par tous les fidèles. Cette messe et ces complies ne revêtiraient pas un caractère officiel et obligatoire, mais ce serait une occasion fournie à tous ceux qui assistent quotidiennement à la messe et à la visite au saint sacrement, de le faire liturgiquement en prenant une part active par le chant à la messe et aux complies. Quel congrès vraiment catholique, Eminence, qui ferait revivre entre catholiques quelque chose des grands âges de foi.²⁷

Dom Lambert also spoke at length of two emphases he had observed in the Cardinal's writings: the greatness of the office of parish priest, and the need for study among the clergy. It was to meet this need for continuing study that he proposed the creation of "une académie métropolitaine des sciences théologiques".²⁸

What place did this letter have in the selection of Dom Lambert to speak on the liturgy? Haquin mentions that according to the recollections of a confrère of Dom Lambert, at Cardinal Mercier's request the Primate of the Order, Dom Hildebrand de Hemptinne, suggested the name of Dom Vandeur of Maredsous. But on Dom Marmion's advice, Dom Lambert's name replaced the former. It would certainly appear on the surface that the letter must have been influential, and Haquin concludes: "La réalité est peut-être plus simple encore, mais nous ne sommes pas à même de trancher."²⁹

The Congress at Malines in September 1909 was entitled, "Congrès national des Oeuvres Catholiques de Malines". Dom Lambert's paper, "La vraie prière de l'Eglise", was presented under the subsection, "Liturgie et Musique religieuse". Many years later, in a taped message from the Priory of Chevetogne (where he was living out his days) to the commemorative meeting held on 23 July 1959 at Mont-César celebrating the 50th anniversary of the liturgical movement, Dom Lambert told humorously of the difficulty he experienced in finding a place on the agenda for his address:

Ses premiers pas dans la vie ont été hésitants: il a fallu d'abord lui gagner une place au soleil. J'ai tenté en vain plusieurs efforts: d'abord classer le rapport liturgique dans la section doctrinale, la première du Congrès de Malines, en septembre 1909. Refus catégorique du président de cette section, qui voyait le rapport comme la Cendrillon de la fable. Une seconde démarche, à la section morale, subit le même sort. La troisième, à la section de la piété fut plus mal reçue encore: on considérait la liturgie comme une **piété fantaisiste** qui ne pouvait pas prendre place dans la spiritualité. Enfin sur le conseil d'un architecte, je n'ai pu me loger que comme rapporteur dans la section d'art, où elle fit figure d'étrangère!³⁰

Clearly Dom Lambert's address was regarded as being suspect, or at least insignificant, and so in order to strengthen his insecure position, he encouraged Godefroid Kurth, the historian, who he knew was sympathetic to his ideas, to

emphasize as eloquently as possible in his opening address "l'importance du retour à la vie liturgique pour le peuple chrétien."³¹ Kurth did this, not at the first session, but at the inaugural meeting at which Cardinal Mercier, M. Cooreman, Speaker of the Assembly, and M. Simonis, President of the Senate, were speakers.

On the following day (27 September 1909), Le Patriote, the large Belgian Catholic daily, quoted Kurth as follows:

L'Eglise nous enseigne aussi le langage qu'il faut parler à Dieu; c'est dans la liturgie que se trouve toute la magnificence du Verbe divin. La liturgie, voilà la somme suprême de la poésie et de la pensée. Elle dit à Dieu les besoins et la misère infinie de l'homme. S'il est une chose qui explique la désertion de nombre de nos églises par beaucoup de chrétiens, c'est bien certainement l'insuffisance des prières qui se sont substituées à l'ancienne, belle et traditionnelle liturgie. Le jour où le Saint Missel cessera d'être pour beaucoup un grimoire inintelligible, le jour où tous retrouveront là la clé de ce que le prêtre dit à Dieu, à l'autel, un grand nombre de ceux qui ont déserté les temples y retourneront.
(Applaudissements)³²

Needless to say, the fact that Kurth's remarks were given publicity in the press drew attention to the liturgy and to Dom Lambert's address when it was delivered. Rousseau goes so far as to say: "L'intervention de Kurth fut marquante; elle fut relevée par la presse et cela suffit pour assurer un départ autorisé au mouvement liturgique."³³

In view of the significance historically of Dom Lambert's address, it is necessary to quote from it in some detail. There is first an introductory section in which he states his purpose quite simply:

Ce rapport a pour but: 1. de rappeler la nécessité de la prière liturgique; 2. de proposer quelques moyens de la vulgariser.

Pour développer le premier point, s'appuyant sur les paroles du Souverain Pontife que "la source première et indispensable du véritable esprit chrétien est dans la participation des fidèles au culte public", le rapporteur démontre que la liturgie est la vraie prière des chrétiens, qu'elle est le lien d'une union très étroite de tous les fidèles avec leurs prêtres et entre eux, et que, enfin, elle est le grand moyen par lequel l'Eglise, avec un art pédagogique consommé, exerce son ministère doctrinal.

Il formule ensuite quelques moyens pratiques dans les voeux suivants:

1. Répandre le missel, avec traduction, comme le vrai livre de prière, ou tout au moins populariser le texte intégral de la messe et des vêpres de chaque dimanche, avec traduction dans les deux langues, et amener tous les fidèles à renoncer, pendant les offices divins, à la récitation des prières privées;

2. Rendre toute notre piété plus liturgique, spécialement par la récitation de Complies comme prières du soir, l'assistance à la grand'messe paroissiale et aux vêpres, la préparation et l'action de grâces à la communion en participant aux prières de la messe, et la restauration dans notre foyer des anciennes traditions liturgiques.³⁴

Having stated briefly thus the substance of his address, Dom Lambert then proceeds to deal in more detail with the two main concerns that he has just expressed. He states at once the words of the Motu Proprio: "La source première et indispensable du véritable esprit chrétien se trouve dans la participation active des fidèles à la liturgie de l'Eglise."³⁵ This, he says, is the truth that Pius X developed in his first pontifical act, and he emphasized two means for achieving this result: understanding of the liturgical texts, and the collective chant of the faithful. Dom Lambert points out that he will concern himself only with the first.

He then proceeds to examine the reasons why this liturgical renewal is necessary:

Le peuple chrétien ne puise plus dans la liturgie l'expression authentique de son adoration et de sa prière et l'élément substantiel de sa vie spirituelle. Pour quelques-uns même, cette désertion et la prédominance de méthodes spirituelles privées, marquent une heureuse évolution de la piété.

Le culte public offre encore pour beaucoup un intérêt de curiosité et une valeur d'art dont bénéficie le sentiment religieux; à leurs yeux, il est à la vie religieuse ce que l'art est à la vie sociale. Mais qu'il soit un élément essentiel de vie chrétienne, "sa source première et indispensable", incontestablement cette doctrine rappelée par Pie X heurte de front des préjugés et des habitudes profondément invétérés.

Le travail de rénovation liturgique sera ardu: il est bon de s'en persuader; les foules ont mis des siècles à désapprendre les traditions liturgiques; puissent-elles être moins lentes à les réapprendre!

Vraie prière des fidèles,
Puissant lien d'union,
Enseignement religieux complet,
La liturgie est tout cela. De là sa nécessité.³⁶

These three assertions of what the liturgy is that he has just made are now expanded. He states first that the perfect divine worship is expressed in heaven. But Christ has made it possible for us on earth to join in the heavenly chorus. It is this heavenly language, taught on earth by Christ, that has been committed to the Church's care and that She speaks unceasingly. She has developed and enriched it under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and it is this that is liturgical prayer. This leads him to speak of the slow and careful development of the liturgical canon:

Et dire que faute de réapprendre cette langue divine, tant d'âmes, même pieuses, vivent en dehors de ce courant continu de grâces! Elles ne soupçonnent pas l'excellence et la suavité que trouverait leur piété dans cette association à la grande prière de l'Eglise, tandis que, loin d'elle, elles s'efforcent péniblement d'aller à Dieu par des voies isolées et des méthodes privées. Non, Messieurs, nous ne savons pas prier; l'Eglise est pour nous la grande école de la prière.³⁷

Then, secondly, the liturgy is a powerful bond of union. The unity of God has been made real for His people not only by an interior bond, but also by "un lien visible de sa communion extérieure: l'Eglise est essentiellement une, elle est essentiellement visible."³⁸ The Christian is by definition a member of a body and his point of contact with this body must be "sensible".³⁹ The common prayer of the Church is the expression of a spiritual reality, it is the flowering and the becoming real of the desire for unity that our Lord expressed so insistently in his High Priestly Prayer. He charges that modern piety suffers from two opposing ills: Christian assemblies lose more and more the collective spirit; the faithful leave the priest to celebrate in secret. And so he observes:

Est-il étonnant, dès lors, que beaucoup s'ennuient à l'église, y vont par corvée, ont hâte d'en sortir; et si leur corps est présent, il est aisé de s'apercevoir, à leur air contraint, au mort de leur physionomie, que leur âme est ailleurs.⁴⁰

The liturgy, thirdly, is a thorough instruction in the Faith:

L'Eglise a fait passer dans son culte tout son dogme; avec un art pédagogique consommé, elle exerce par lui son magistère doctrinal. Comme les disciples fidèles à suivre Jésus au cours de sa vie terrestre recueillaient chaque jour son enseignement et se pénétraient

insensiblement de son esprit, de même les chrétiens, attachés aux pas de l'Eglise dans le cours toujours renouvelé de l'année liturgique, s'enrichissent de tous les trésors de sa vérité et de sa vie, et lui disent, comme les disciples à Jésus: "A qui irions-nous? Vous avez les paroles de la vie éternelle."⁴¹

And so, Dom Lambert concludes, is it not clear that this liturgical renewal of which he has been speaking could bring the following happy results:

Une piété plus éclairée et plus hiérarchique; un besoin moins grand de dévotions nouvelles; un usage plus naturel et, partant, plus bienfaisant de la Sainte Eucharistie; une connaissance plus complète des saints évangiles et surtout une voie plus facile, plus accessible et plus populaire pour aller au Christ?⁴²

With regard to practical measures that will have to be taken, he states that the liturgical texts must be made accessible to all the faithful by means of literal translations into the two languages (French and Flemish). Private devotions--good in themselves, but untimely and out of place in the liturgy--must at all costs be discontinued by worshippers during the liturgical offices. This can be achieved by putting in people's hands an inexpensive popular publication, easy to handle, whereby the people can follow the entire office. "Le missel popularisé doit devenir le livre de prière de tous."⁴³

Furthermore, he says, all the prayer of the faithful must take its inspiration from and be sustained by the Church's liturgy. To this end, he expresses the wish that the faithful might share with the clergy in the praying of the Breviary, by means of the use of Compline in place of private evening prayers.

He then concludes his address by moving the adoption as two motions of the practical measures that he delineated in his introduction.

Dom Lambert was not satisfied to speak only about renewal: he must also act. Indeed he was already prepared for action. And so in the next chapter the promotion and implementing (prior to the First World War) of his ideas for renewal, especially through publications and through the liturgical weeks, will be examined. There will also be some assessment of his thought, personality, and achievement. Finally, there will be a brief survey of the progress of the liturgical movement in Belgium from around 1920 until 1950.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Louis Bouyer, Dom Lambert Beauduin: Un homme d'Eglise (Tournai: Casterman, 1964), p. 16.
2. Ibid., p. 19.
3. Ibid., pp. 24-25.
4. Ibid., p. 29.
5. Ibid., p. 30.
6. Ibid., p. 31.
7. Ibid., p. 33.
8. Dom Olivier Rousseau, The Progress of the Liturgy, p. 164.
9. Dom A. Robeyns, "Les débuts du mouvement liturgique," Les Questions liturgiques et paroissiales, XIX (1934), 287.
10. Quoted by Dom Olivier Rousseau, "Autour du jubilé du mouvement liturgique, 1909-1959," QLP, XL (1959), 205.
11. Cf. ibid., pp. 205-06.
12. Cf. above, p. 46.
13. Robeyns, op. cit., pp. 287-88, quoting La sainte Messe entendue pour communier souvent et même tous les jours, XXe Internationaler Eucharistischer Kongress in Cöln vom 4 bis 8 August 1909. Amtlicher Bericht., pp. 689-693.
14. André Haquin, "La Préparation du mouvement liturgique de 1909--Dom Lambert Beauduin et l'abbaye du Mont César," QLP, XLVII (1966), 232-47.

15. Ibid., p. 234, quoting Rapport sur la fondation de la revue "La Vie Liturgique," Abbaye de Maredsous.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid., p. 235, quoting Projet de publication de missel-revue "La Vie Liturgique," Monastère de Chevetogne.

19. Ibid., p. 236.

20. Ibid., p. 237.

21. Ibid., p. 238.

22. Ibid., p. 239. Haquin in footnote 27 (p. 239) quotes the following extract from the Protokoll der Sitzungen des VIII. Generalkapitels der Beuroner Congregation zu Beuron (5-16 juillet 1909): "Unter vollständiger Anerkennung der in diesem Schriftstück ausgesprochenen Gründe und Gedanken, weist das General Kapitel darauf in dass dies von jeher das Streben unserer Congregation war, und wird in Erwägung ziehen, in welcher Weise das Studium der Liturgie bei unsern Clerikern gefördert werden könne. Es wird angeregt, dem Volk durch Predigten über die heilige Liturgie, eventuel auch durch kurze gedruckte Anweisungen, dieselbe näher zu bringen und in Erwägung gezogen, ob nicht vielleicht besondere liturgische Kurse für Priester und Laien eingerichtet werden könnten."

23. Ibid., p. 240, n. 28.

24. Ibid., p. 241, quoting letter, pp. 4-5.

25. Ibid., p. 242, quoting letter, pp. 5-7.

26. Ibid., quoting letter, pp. 7-8.

27. Ibid., p. 243, quoting letter, p. 8bis.

28. Ibid., p. 244, quoting letter, pp. 9-10.

29. Ibid., p. 246.

30. QLP, XL (1959), 200.
31. Rousseau, op. cit., p. 204.
32. Ibid., n. 5.
33. Ibid., p. 204.
34. La Vraie Prière de l'Eglise. Résumé du rapport de Dom Lambert Beauduin au Congrès de Malines, QLP, XL (1959), 218.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid., pp. 218-19.
37. Ibid., p. 219.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid., p. 220.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., p. 221.
43. Ibid.

CHAPTER III

THE PROGRESS OF THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN BELGIUM

The renewal that Dom Lambert Beauduin had proposed at the Congress of Malines now had to be set in motion, and as has been mentioned, he was prepared to implement his proposals. It was not long before Mont-César became the main centre for liturgical renewal in Belgium, with its influence extending as well to France and Holland.

A short two months after the Congress, the first instalment (for Advent Sunday 1909) of the booklet, La Vie liturgique, went out. Each instalment consisted of a part which remained fixed for the year, whereas the parts of the Mass that changed for each Sunday were issued periodically under a cover bearing the liturgical colour of the season. The Mass for each Sunday was printed with translation and commentary, and the booklets could easily be handed out at the church door.

La Vie liturgique was an immediate success. The printing of 50,000 copies of the first instalment was quickly

exhausted.¹ In Les Questions liturgiques (1911-1912), the following information about La Vie liturgique is given:

La Vie liturgique, avec ses 15 éditions mensuelles (. . .), poursuit toujours vaillamment en Belgique et en Hollande son oeuvre de première initiation au Missel complet. Sa mission est celle d'un précurseur: oportet illum crescere me autem minui, dit-elle avec saint Jean. Réussira-t-elle à se faire oublier un jour? Dans les pensionnats et les collèges, espérons-le; car la formation chrétienne est incomplète si elle ne nous familiarise pas avec le Missel. Mais le nombre d'abonnés individuels augmente toujours. Le Missel, avec son volume et ses renvois effraie beaucoup de chrétiens, de messieurs surtout, d'autant plus que la liturgie dominicale leur suffit. L'avenir montrera s'il faut indéfiniment favoriser cette piété plus portative.²

The Abbey at Afflighem was given responsibility for the Flemish edition, and needless to say, the assistance of many of Dom Lambert's fellow monastics was required for the preparing and the despatching of this publication.

A disadvantage of La Vie liturgique was that because of the arrangement of the liturgical calendar, it had to be issued year by year. The Bull, Divino Afflatu, however, of 11 November 1911, which was concerned with the reform of the Church calendar and of the manner in which the Psalms were appointed to be read in the Breviary, effected a most helpful change. The revised calendar gave full importance to each Sunday's liturgy and thus, except in the case of observances

like the Transfiguration, prevented it from being suppressed by more recent feasts.

The revised calendar came into effect in January 1913, and this made possible the publication of "un Missel dominical définitif, très simple, de prix modique, de volume très réduit, qui pourra servir toutes les années."³ This Missel pour tous in time would make the continued publication of La Vie liturgique no longer necessary.

In November 1909, there also appeared the first issue of the Monthly Supplement to La Vie liturgique. This was intended for the clergy and the first issue opened thus:

Cette publication n'a pas en vue de propager l'une ou l'autre dévotion particulière, quelque recommandable qu'elle soit: les revues pieuses et les livres de prières existants suffisent, semble-t-il, à cette vulgarisation. Son unique but est de répandre parmi les fidèles la grande dévotion, la vraie prière officielle et universelle du livre de piété de notre Mère la Sainte Eglise, la vie liturgique, en un mot, de la faire connaître, de la faire aimer et d'apporter ainsi son faible concours à cette rénovation liturgique dont S. S. le Pape Pie X poursuit la réalisation. On s'est proposé d'atteindre un double résultat: 1. vulgariser simultanément les textes et les explications; 2. restaurer le dimanche liturgique.⁴

During the liturgical year 1909-1910, twelve issues of this Supplément mensuel were issued. At the end of this year, it became a more substantial review entitled, Les Questions

liturgiques, which appeared eight times per year in accordance with the different liturgical seasons: Advent, Christmas, Septuagesima, Lent, Easter, Pentecost, Ascension, and All Saints. The July issue of 1914 was the last of that year, and because of the War it was not published again until 1919.

The cover of the first issue of Les Questions liturgiques states: "Revue Réservée au Clergé et aux Religieux". The first page then begins: "La présente publication, destinée à remplacer le supplément de La Vie liturgique, s'adresse à une catégorie bien déterminée de lecteurs."⁵ The editorial goes on to say that at first sight this exclusiveness must appear strange in the light of the attempt to secure the active participation of the laity in the liturgy. But it explains that liturgical action must develop under the clergy's direction. It continues:

Si la collaboration des hommes d'oeuvres est grandement désirable, c'est à condition d'éviter toute imixtion indiscrete dans les choses du culte, de maintenir une séparation bien nette entre le sanctuaire et la nef. Or, une publication qui se préoccupe de restauration liturgique est amenée infailliblement à signaler des abus, à proposer des réformes, à discuter des méthodes sur lesquels les promoteurs d'un mouvement doivent se concerter, mais qu'il est préférable de ne pas poser devant le public.⁶

The editorial mentions in a footnote that members of the laity so desirous may subscribe to a review intended for them, Messenger de Saint-Benoit, published by the Abbey of Maredsous.⁷

Les Questions also enjoyed immediate popularity. Again the Abbey of Afflighem was responsible for the Flemish edition, entitled, Liturgisch Tijdschrift. A report in Les Questions for 1911-1912 states: "Ces différents organes [Les Questions liturgiques, Liturgisch Tijdschrift, and Revue Liturgique et Bénédictine] comptent ensemble, à la fin de cette première année d'existence, 6,400 abonnés en Belgique, en France et en Hollande."⁸ The final issue (No. 8) for that year reported: "Nous comptons aujourd'hui 5,000 lecteurs exclusivement ecclésiastiques ou religieux."⁹ A note printed inside the front cover of No. 4 of the same year (1911-1912) mentions that many requests for all the issues for the previous year are received; these, however, cannot be supplied as only isolated numbers remain.

As well as filling a need felt by its readers, the review obviously provided a needed and creative outlet for all who contributed to it. The final issue for 1911-1912 mentions that at the beginning of the year 8 numbers of 48 pages each, that is, 384 pages, were announced. The note continues:

L'abondance des matières et surtout la publication de la Bulle Divino afflatu et de toutes les études qui s'y rapportent nous ont entraînés forcément à 544 pages, malgré les proportions très restreintes données au présent numéro. Nous dépassons donc de 160 pages le chiffre fixé.¹⁰

Many of the articles were first delivered as addresses at the liturgical weeks, but a selection of articles and authors from the first two years alone, 1910-1912, reflects the ferment that was taking place and the heady wine that was being produced: Abbé Brabant, "Rénovation liturgique dans les paroisses" (I, 80-89); Chanoine Callewaert, "La Messe centre de la liturgie" (I, 214-220); Dom Placide De Meester, "La participation active des fidèles aux Messes basses" (I, 474-487); Mgr Raoul Harscouët, "Les dévotions traditionnelles" (I, 456-473); R.P. Lintelo, S.J., "La communion pendant la Messe" (I, 430-433); Abbé Rutten, "La liturgie de la Messe et la communion fréquente" (I, 40-49); Dom Lambert Beauduin, "L'esprit paroissial autrefois et aujourd'hui": 1. "La paroisse du I^{er} au V^e siècle" (II, 16-26), 2. "La paroisse du V^e au X^{IV}^e siècle" (II, 80-90), 3. "Période de décadence à partir du X^V^e siècle" (II, 305-311); "La communion des fidèles au moment liturgique" (II, 115-125); Mgr Bouquet, "Le dimanche chrétien" (II, 331-334); Chanoine Callewaert, "Sanctification du jour par le bréviaire" (II, 264-271).

Not only did the review provide knowledge through articles, and information about books, conferences and the liturgical renewal generally, but its correspondence columns also made it possible for parish priests to ask their questions and to feel a part of debate and discussion.

Along with publications, the other important means of propaganda for the liturgy was the liturgical weeks. Dom Lambert's primary concern was a pastoral one, but he quickly realized that unless the clergy were won to the cause of liturgical renewal and were possessed by zeal for it, nothing could be accomplished at the parish level. And so the liturgical weeks were devised as a means of reaching the clergy not only on the intellectual level, but also on the level of experience through participation in the liturgical life of the monastery.

The advertisement for the liturgical week to be held at Maredsous, 19-23 August 1912, describes a liturgical week as follows:

Une "Semaine" liturgique n'est pas un congrès. Moins bruyante qu'un congrès, elle vise à faire oeuvre plus féconde. C'est une semaine de véritable initiation, d'étude. S'adressant à un public volontairement restreint et choisi, elle comprend, en majeure partie, des cours, ou conférences proprement dits; la discussion n'est admise, après certains rapports, que dans la mesure où elle éclaire les points exposés ou précise les notions données.

La "Semaine liturgique" tire un caractère religieux non seulement de la nature des matières exposées, mais encore du fait que les adhérents participent, dans une très large mesure, à la vie monastique (assistance aux Offices divins: Grand'Messe, Vêpres et Complies, aux repas dans le réfectoire des moines, etc.).¹¹

The first two liturgical weeks (French and Flemish) were held at Mont-César in the summer holidays of 1910. Among those taking part were Dom Besse of the Abbey of Ligugé (Chevetogne), who spoke on "Le rôle éminemment social de la liturgie",¹² Chanoine Stimart, Professor of Liturgy at Tournai, on "La liturgie du baptême des adultes", and Dom Vandeur on "Le saint sacrifice de la Messe."¹³ As a new endeavour, these first two Weeks appear to have had a limited support and success. They may have been organized hurriedly, because they were arranged following a very well-received liturgical meeting held at Mont-César on 7-8 June of the same year and attended by about 250 Belgians together with a number of visitors, especially from Holland.

The issue for October 1911, however, of Les Questions liturgiques is devoted almost entirely to the Liturgical Weeks of the previous summer and gives the following very happy report:

Tous ceux qui s'intéressent au mouvement de restauration liturgique apprendront avec joie le succès complet des trois semaines, française (du 6 au 11 août),

grégorienne (du 21 au 25 août) et flamande (du 4 au 8 septembre), organisées à l'Abbaye du Mont César à Louvain. Les prêtres et laïcs qui les ont suivies, au nombre de 340 (130 à la 1re semaine, 85 à la 2de, 125 à la 3e, sans compter les auditeurs d'occasion) ont senti grandir en eux l'estime et l'amour de la liturgie et nous ont quittés avec la résolution d'alimenter à cette source toujours jaillissante leur vie surnaturelle et leur apostolat paroissial.

"Ces jours compteront parmi les meilleurs de mon existence, disait au nom de toute l'assemblée à la séance de clôture, un curé d'une importante paroisse industrielle. Je quitte cette chère abbaye l'âme débordant de gratitude et de consolation. Des horizons nouveaux se sont ouverts devant moi; le missel, le bréviaire, le rituel, ces grands trésors du prêtre, de sa vie intérieure comme de son apostolat: quelle révélation, faite hélas! après 37 ans de vie sacerdotale. Cette semaine me vaut plus que toutes les retraites faites jusqu'ici. Dans l'ambiance liturgique de ce monastère, mon âme s'est pénétrée comme à son insu, de ce sentiment de respect et de révérence pour Dieu, du zèle de sa Maison, du désir de sa gloire, de l'amour de la Sainte Église, en même temps qu'elle subissait puissamment le charme religieux de cette fraternité chrétienne des âges de foi que les fils de Saint Benoît tiennent de leur lointaine origine. Jusqu'ici ma piété a été exclusivement individualiste, isolée, protestante: à partir d'aujourd'hui elle sera avant tout collective, sociale, catholique."¹⁴

Many prominent figures in the Church in Belgium attended the Weeks held in 1911.¹⁵ An astonishing number of speakers, too, took part at each of the liturgical weeks in the first few years after they were begun.¹⁶

Dom Lambert was not satisfied to rest with the publications and the liturgical weeks; he also had in mind the establishment of a liturgical school. On 2 July 1910 he sent,

with the support of a letter from the Abbot of Mont-César, a second report to Beuron--this time to the Abbot Superior. In this report he stated again three points that he had made (in a slightly different form) to his own Abbot the previous year: "1. il faut une rénovation liturgique; 2. les bénédictins doivent la diriger; 3. le Mont César semble en devoir être le centre."¹⁷ The review and the liturgical weeks were launched, and so he now proposed a liturgical school.

In his mind he forewaw a monastic school, but one that would welcome strangers to the Order. His plan envisioned a staff of five members, with specialists being brought in for special courses. He even included with his report a list of possible professors! With the school there would be a library and a liturgical museum.

The Order jibbed at establishing such a school, and the University of Louvain was not interested either. Rousseau comments:

Malheureusement cette école ne pût être mise sur pied. L'Université de Louvain, sollicitée un peu plus tard dans le même sens, refusa, à la grande déception de dom Beauduin. Ce ne fut que plus de vingt-cinq ans après que quelque chose put être organisé, sous l'abbatiat de dom Capelle.¹⁸

In this connection, Bouyer mentions that it would not be until after World War II (as was the case with Mont-César's school)

that the Institut catholique de Paris would bring into being, under the direction of Dom Botte, the first liturgical institute on the university plan.¹⁹

It was inevitable, of course, that as the renewal that had been set in motion was promoted, it would encounter opposition. Bouyer amusingly comments on the reaction on the part of many to the claim of papal support for the liturgical renewal expressed in the first issue of the Monthly Supplement to La Vie liturgique:²⁰

Plus d'un lecteur dut se frotter les yeux et se demander où et quand Pie X avait entrepris la rénovation en question. Dom Lambert, dès lors, avait mis la main sur la fameuse phrase du motu proprio, à laquelle il avait fait faire une inlassable propagande et dont plus d'un ecclésiastique grincheux ne se gênerait pas pour dire qu'il en avait tiré son mouvement liturgique comme un prestidigitateur tire un lapin d'un chapeau.²¹

The first outburst of disapproval in public came in September 1912, shortly after the Liturgical Week at Maredsous, when the big Belgian Catholic daily, Le Patriote, published on its front page a series of three long anonymous articles on the liturgical movement. In his reply to this attack entitled, "Griefs contre le mouvement liturgique," Dom Lambert lists the four major objections that were advanced:

PREMIER GRIEF. Ils sont jeunes, imprudents, exagérés; l'auteur les compare "aux jeunes zélotes

qu'aimait saint Jean et auquel il écrivait." Il manque donc un Mentor au mouvement liturgique; de là ces offres de service dans trois insertions en première page.

.
 DEUXIEME GRIEF. Il faut un travail lent, une initiation graduelle; les chefs du mouvement veulent tout réformer d'un coup.

.
 TROISIEME GRIEF. Les chefs liturgistes exagèrent l'importance de la liturgie et la présentent comme "une panacée universelle."

.
 QUATRIEME GRIEF. Le mouvement liturgique actuel veut "jeter par-dessus bord les dévotions chères au peuple chrétien et ne plus s'inquiéter que de la Messe et des Vêpres."²²

Dom Robeyns says that the author's identity became known to Dom Lambert the day after publication. This came about because he had earlier approached the editor of another paper who was a close friend of Dom Lambert. Dom Lambert, unperturbed, replied patiently and at considerable length. His opponent later regretted his unfortunate foray, "et continue, aujourd'hui encore [1934], malgré son âge avancé, de témoigner à la cause liturgique sa bienveillante sympathie."²³

Dom Lambert was soon to find an ally in a particularly learned colleague, Dom Maurice Festugière. In the Revue de philosophie²⁴ of May-June 1913, Dom Festugière published a long article, La liturgie catholique, essai de synthèse. In

this article, without entering into controversy, he nevertheless exposed the religious individualism, neither Catholic nor Christian, which he saw as the cause of apathy towards the Church and the liturgy.

Dom Lambert knew that battle would have to be joined with those who were critical of and unsympathetic to the liturgical renewal. In the All Saints, 1913, issue of Les Questions he published an appreciative review of Dom Festugière's essay. He ended this very slyly by referring to a recent article by Père Dudon, S.J., in the Etudes (the Jesuit journal) in praise of Père Léonard Cros, S.J., who had promoted forty years before, against great opposition, a campaign in favour of frequent communion. He wrote:

Malgré ses intentions pacifiques, l'auteur [Dom Festugière] n'évitera pas la polémique. La restauration liturgique heurte de front trop de préjugés pour qu'il en soit autrement. Instructives et réconfortantes sont, à ce point de vue, les pages si sincères que publiait, dans les Études, le Père Dudon, S.J. sur l'Apostolat eucharistique du P. Léonard Cros, S.J. (†1913). Il y a quarante ans, ce précurseur entreprit une inlassable campagne en faveur de la Communion quotidienne et précoce: il rencontra dans la Compagnie de Jésus et en dehors une opposition tenace et presque officielle. Avant de mourir, il a vu Pie X consacrer et dépasser encore les idées pour lesquelles il avait vaillamment combattu.²⁵

On 20 November 1913, the Etudes published a lengthy reply to Dom Festugière, L'Apostolat liturgique et la Piété personnelle, in which the whole Mont-César movement was attacked. The author of this article was Père Jean-Joseph Navatel, who had been chosen to be the Jesuit champion. In the course of his article he wrote: "Cependant, prise dans son sens le plus usuel, la liturgie signifie, pour tout le monde, la partie sensible, cérémonielle et décorative du culte catholique."²⁶ This definition has become well known and has no doubt won itself many a smile for being so immune to the infection for a living, rather than a decorative liturgy, that Dom Lambert and others were trying so hard to communicate.

To this article, Dom Lambert in turn wrote a long reply, towards the end of which in a very personal way he described his own experience.

On me pardonnera d'être franc: mais le missel a été pour moi un livre fermé et scellé. Et cette ignorance s'étendait non seulement à la partie variable dont je viens de parler et qui donne chaque jour à l'Eucharistie une vie nouvelle, mais même à ce fonds immuable et principalement au Canon, fixé depuis tant de siècles et tout chargé de la piété eucharistique des premiers âges. Aussi les grandes notions d'Acte parfait de latrie, but principal de la messe, de participation au sacrifice par la manducation de la Victime, de l'union des frères dans la communion au Corps du Seigneur, de l'offrande spirituelle de nos bonnes oeuvres à faire à l'autel; bref, de

toutes les grandes réalités que la liturgie eucharistique met constamment en oeuvre, ne dominaient pas ma piété eucharistique. Le culte de la Sainte Réserve appelé visite au Saint Sacrement avait un rôle plus vital dans ma piété que l'acte même du Sacrifice.

Ce qui est vrai du missel l'est aussi du bréviaire et du cycle liturgique. Je n'ai pas souvenance d'avoir récité mon bréviaire avec intelligence et amour; les psaumes, les lectures, les oraisons étaient sans écho dans mon âme. Les saisons liturgiques n'exerçaient aucune action sur ma dévotion; bref, les actes liturgiques proprement dits étaient pour moi une formalité cultuelle qui n'avait aucune influence appréciable dans l'économie de ma piété. Aussi bien, dans les retraites faites annuellement, n'était-il pas question de cela; seuls, la méditation, l'examen, la recollection; toute une ascèse en marge de la liturgie et séparée par une cloison étanche, importaient.²⁷

If Dom Lambert had been trying to bring about superficial change in the Church's worship, it is easy to understand that the weakness of his efforts would quickly have been recognized and exposed. But he was well aware that underpinning any liturgical renewal that was proposed, there had to be a sound theological base. It can be said that he first became aware of the malaise in the life of the Church when he worked as an industrial chaplain, and that only subsequently did he come to a theological awareness of where the illness lay. But he never made proposals for renewal apart from sound theology.

Already in the Christmas number (No. 2) of Volume 3 (1912-1913) of Les Questions he had begun a long essay, Essai de manuel fondamental de liturgie, which would be printed in nine instalments over a period of some ten years, and of which only the résumé of the Second Part appeared. (Première Partie. L'Élément "Culte". Deuxième Partie. L'Élément "Église".) This essay begins:

Si la théologie est la science de Dieu et des choses divines, on comprend aisément que la liturgie appartienne pleinement au cycle de cette science....
L'aspect fondamental de la science liturgique sera donc l'aspect théologique.²⁸

In the preliminary chapter there are two divisions: "La Liturgie tributaire du Dogme", and "Le Dogme tributaire de la Liturgie". The latter division begins:

A son tour, la liturgie rend au dogme deux services importants dans la vie de la sainte Eglise: elle rend témoignage du dogme et sa déposition est sans appel; elle vulgarise le dogme en le faisant passer dans l'esprit, dans le coeur, dans l'âme des fidèles avec un art pédagogique consommé; on l'a dit, c'est la théologie du peuple.²⁹

The summary of Part Two begins:

L'acte du culte, si parfait soit-il, reste privé jusqu'au moment où l'autorité religieuse en a fait un acte de toute l'Eglise, l'expression authentique de la religion de tous ses membres. Dans ce cas, c'est l'Eglise qui adore, loue, rend grâces, prie: nous sommes en présence du culte liturgique.³⁰

These few brief quotations are given in order to show that Dom Lambert's practical proposals for renewal never

existed without the support of theological principles. It is in a small book, however, La Piété de l'Eglise, published in 1914 shortly after l'affaire Navatel, that in a very clear and simple, and yet profound way, he presented an apologia of the liturgical renewal that was in process. It was reprinted several times and exerted a wide influence. Many of the aims of the liturgical renewal in 1914 have, of course, long since been realized, but La Piété de l'Eglise remains something of a classic.

Chapter i is entitled, "The Fundamental Principle," and Dom Lambert states at once:

The superabundant source of all supernatural life is the sacerdotal power of the High Priest of the New Covenant.

But this sanctifying power Jesus Christ does not exercise here below except through the ministry of a visible sacerdotal hierarchy.

Hence the close union with this hierarchy in the exercise of its priesthood is for every Christian and Catholic soul the authentic mode of union with the priesthood of Jesus Christ, and consequently the primary and indispensable source of the supernatural life.³¹

Therefore, he concludes, every soul that desires to live under the sanctifying power of Christ will maintain a close and intimate relation with the priestly acts of this visible hierarchy.

And so he then asks:

What are these priestly and hierarchical acts, the primary and indispensable source of the Christian life?

From what has been said above, the answer should be readily found. It is the sanctifying mission of the Catholic hierarchy (munus ministerii--the mission of the ministry) to make of us living and holy oblations, offered daily unto the glory of the Father, in union with the unique sacrifice of Jesus Christ--a mission that is destined to extend all the divine energies of the eternal priesthood unto all generations.³²

The hierarchy has, therefore, organized a group of sacred functions in which Christ's priesthood finds full expression.

This group of functions embraces every priestly act of the visible hierarchy--it is, in a word, the liturgy. . . . To designate it more exactly still, it is the totality of acts performed at the instance of the priests according to the fixed formulas of the liturgical books.

The traditional language of the Church expresses it by one word: the liturgy.³³

It follows from this, in his argument, that every Christian will associate himself closely and frequently with the manifestations of the hierarchical priestly life, this being "the normal and infallible path to a solid piety."³⁴ He does not hesitate to state that liturgical piety derives its transcendent character above all from its hierarchical character:

The liturgical piety then derives its transcendent character above all from what we can call its

hierarchical character. It procures the full sanctifying influence of the visible priesthood of the mystical body of Jesus Christ for the members of this body. The life of God is in Christ; the life of Christ is in the hierarchy of the Church. The hierarchy realizes this life in the souls by its priestly power; and this priestly power is exercised in the authentic acts performed according to the liturgical books: Missal, Breviary, Ritual, Ceremonial of the Bishops, Pontifical, Martyrology. These acts are therefore the primary and indispensable source of true Catholic piety.³⁵

Chapter ii, "The Present Condition: Nature of the Evil", need not be examined in detail, but it must be noted that Dom Lambert emphasizes that the work of liturgical restoration has to go beyond and deeper than mere knowledge of ritual formulas and ceremonies, dogmatic and symbolical meanings, and their historical origin. He states:

The piety of the Christian people, and hence their actions and life, are not grounded sufficiently in the fundamental truths that constitute the soul of the liturgy; that is, the destiny of all things unto the glory of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the necessary and universal contemplation of Jesus Christ; the central place of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Christian life; the mission of the hierarchy in regard to our union with God; the visible realization of the Communion of the Saints. All these truths, which find expression in every liturgical act, are asleep in men's souls; the faithful have lost consciousness of them. Let us change the routine and monotonous assistance at acts of worship into an active and intelligent participation; let us teach the faithful to pray and confess these truths in a body: and the liturgy thus practiced will insensibly arouse a slumbering faith and give a new efficacy, both in prayer and action, to the latent energies of the baptized souls: "the true Christian spirit will flourish again and maintain itself among the faithful".³⁶

It can be said that there is a link here between Dom Lambert's thought and that of Dom Odo Casel in Germany that would emerge a little later, for Dom Odo would probe into the fundamental truths that constitute the soul of the liturgy.

Dom Lambert speaks, in Chapter iii, of the sad consequences of the present condition, namely, individualism, abandonment of prayer (i.e., corporate, liturgical prayer), deviations of piety ("devotion" and "devotionalism" are confused in the minds of the faithful), the secular spirit, and finally, lack of hierarchical life.

In Chapter iv, he proceeds to delineate the advantages of a liturgical piety under the headings of: The Christian a Member of the Church (he shows that the essential elements of the Church are also those of the liturgy; the Church is universal, social, founded by Christ, sanctifying, and for men); Attachment to the Church of Rome; Social Sense of Catholicism; Realization of the Sacramental Riches; Methods of Instruction; Social Influence; and last, Apologetic Value.

"The Liturgical Movement" is the title of Chapter v, and it is fitting to quote in its entirety the programme of the liturgical movement as Dom Lambert saw it in 1914, and with which the chapter ends.

The Acts of the Worship. In this field, the members of the liturgical movement desire to contribute with all their strength to the attainment of the following aims:

1) The active participation of the Christian people in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass by means of understanding and following the liturgical rites and texts.

2) Emphasis of the importance of High Mass and of the Sunday parish services, and assistance at the restoration of the collective liturgical singing in the official gatherings of the faithful.

3) Seconding of all efforts to preserve or to reestablish the Vespers and the Compline of the Sunday, and to give to these services a place second only to that of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

4) Acquaintance with and active association with the rites of the sacraments received or assisted at, and the spread of this knowledge among others.

5) Fostering a great respect for, and confidence in, the blessings of our Mother Church.

6) Restoration of the Liturgy of the Dead to a place of honor, observance of the customs of Vigils, and Lauds, giving greater solemnity to the funeral services, and getting the faithful to assist thereat, thus efficaciously combating the dechristianizing of the cult of the dead.

Liturgical Activity outside of cultural acts. In this field there are four ways in which the members can assist at the furtherance of the liturgical movement:

A. Piety. 1) Restoration to a place of honor among Christians of the traditional liturgical seasons: Advent, Christmas Time, Lent, Easter Time, Octaves of feasts, feasts of the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, the great missionary saints of our religion.

2) The basing of our daily private devotions, meditation, reading, etc., on the daily instructions of the liturgy, the Psalms, the other liturgical books, the fundamental dogmas of the Catholic worship.

3) Reanimating and sublimation of the devotions dear to the people by nourishing them at the source of the liturgy.

B. Study. 1) Promotion of the scientific study of the Catholic liturgy.

2) Popularization of the scientific knowledge in special reviews and publications.

3) Promotion of the study and, above all, the practice of liturgical prayers in educational institutions.

4) Aiming to give regular liturgical education to circles, associations, etc., and to employ all the customary methods of popularization to this end.

C. Arts. 1) Aiming to have the artists that are called to exercise a sacred art, architecture, painting, sculpture, etc., receive an education that will give them an understanding of the spirit and the rules of the liturgy of the Church.

2) Making known to artists and writers the fruitful inspiration to art that the Church offers in her liturgy.

D. Propaganda. 1) Using all means to spread popular liturgical publications that show the import of the principal part of the liturgy: Sunday Mass, Vespers, Sacraments, Liturgy of the Dead, etc.

2) Reawakening the old liturgical traditions in the home, that link domestic joys with the calendar of the Church; and using for this end especially the musical works composed for such purposes.

To all Catholics we address a burning appeal in favor of the activities that aim to realize as far as possible the program³⁷ of liturgical restoration which we have here outlined.

The second part of La Piété de l'Eglise is titled: "Secondary Missions of the Liturgy", and Chapter vi deals with "The Liturgy and Asceticism", Chapter vii, "The Liturgy and Prayer", Chapter viii, "The Liturgy and Preaching", and Chapter ix, "The Liturgy and the Science of Theology". Already in these early years, it may be noted, Dom Lambert was pointing to the importance of preaching and the fact that it has its rightful place in the liturgical action:

The same commandment that gathers the faithful around the altar every Sunday for the eucharistic liturgy groups them by that very fact around the chair of instruction. . . .

In passing from the altar to the pulpit of truth the priest does not interrupt the liturgical action. He there appears endowed with all the prestige of the sacrificial priest, vested in the liturgical garments.³⁸

To move now to an analysis of Dom Lambert's thought, a first observation that can be made is that he was expressing a very orthodox position in giving the hierarchy the place in the life of the Church that he did. He says in effect that the hierarchy can exist without the faithful, whereas the faithful certainly need the priests. There is the implication, too, that the faithful must be the docile faithful, fed by the hierarchy. It is interesting that he does not see the concentration of power, of decision-making, of teaching, indeed of the liturgy, in the hands of the hierarchy--with the result that the Church had become priest-dominated and the people were not expected to be anything else but docile--as one of the main reasons why the priest celebrated Mass at the altar and the people pursued their private devotions in the nave.

His solution for the problem, namely to promote greater participation on the part of the faithful was sound, but he could not have foreseen in the early days of the liturgical

movement that a logical consequence of this must be the reform of a Church so dominated by its hierarchy in all of its life. One of the reasons why the Roman Catholic Church, sixty years after Malines, is going through a period of such strain is that the laity, whether directly, or by disaffection indirectly, is demanding a greater say and role in the life of the Church. This demand is being met slowly and with hesitancy, and as in any period of change, adjusting to change is difficult; for there are those who wish change and promote it, and there are those who desire no change at all.

Christian thought in more recent years has focused much attention on the concept of the Church as the People of God. Clergy and people together constitute the People of God and share the responsibility of being God's people in the world. The orthodox and very hierarchical view that Dom Lambert accepted and expressed is too extreme, too heavily weighted on one side; but how the life of the People of God is to be ordered, and how the relationship between clergy and people is to be shared, is a problem that the Roman Catholic Church is wrestling with, and probably will continue to wrestle with for a long time to come.

A conclusion that can be drawn from Dom Lambert's quite orthodox description of the hierarchy as holding and

dispensing Christ's life and grace is that these operate externally. The relationship between a person and the Church is an external one in that in so far as he receives priestly ministrations, his relationship is a sound and wholesome one. Looked at in this way, the state of his heart and the quality of life that he lives are not of primary significance. Undoubtedly Dom Lambert would have said that this would be a misunderstanding; that a man should live as a member of the Church and receive the ministrations of the hierarchy in order that Christ's life and grace might work in him, and that he might be changed into Christ's likeness; but the fact remains that this teaching has been understood in this way by many of the faithful, and probably was so understood in Dom Lambert's day. Again, his programme of renewal was soundly conceived in that one of its aims was that by intelligent participation on the part of the faithful, the ministrations of the hierarchy should be received inwardly as well as externally.

The life of the Church began in the sphere of relationships--between persons and God, between persons and persons--and only in course of time did structures for the ordering of those relationships grow up. But then the structures

became of prime importance and sometimes they became a shell enclosing no relationship at all. In the life of the Church it is relationship that must come first; it is persons' growth as Christians, and so as persons, that should be taking place. Within his hierarchical view Dom Lambert would have agreed with this.

It follows from what has been said above that the Christian life was often seen as the religious compartment in a man's life. The men among whom Dom Lambert worked as an industrial chaplain when he was first ordained probably saw little connection between attendance at Sunday Mass and their daily work. Attendance at Mass was necessary for ensuring their good standing with the God of the life to come, but it is unlikely that they thought of Him as the Living God, concerned for them as workers, for the quality of their work, for their working conditions.

If questioned on the point, Dom Lambert would no doubt have contended that a man's life in the Church should transform him, that its benefits should find expression in his daily life, but it is nevertheless true to say that his understanding of the Christian Faith was very much oriented towards the supernatural. This is not to say that he was not concerned about the here and now, because it is clear

that he was, but where the focus in his thought and commitment was upon the supernatural, for some, at any rate, in the Roman Catholic Church today the focus of concern and commitment is on life in the present moment. This can be illustrated in his conviction that the monastic life, as was mentioned earlier,³⁹ is the Christian life lived with the fullest commitment possible, whereas many in the Church today would prefer to say that the Christian life can be lived with the fullest commitment in factory, in office, or in monastery.

With regard to Dom Lambert's personality and character, some indication has already been given as to what he was like, but a more complete picture can now be attempted. He was a very human person, one who loved and cared about other human beings; it was as a pastor that he gave himself to the liturgical movement. Bouyer tells about how he built up around the review and the liturgical weeks a great fraternity of secular priests, "sans autre lien que l'influence exercée sur eux par l'activité et la personnalité de l'infatigable religieux."⁴⁰ He was a monk, and yet he always had a profound awareness of the parochial situation, so that secular clergy found in him one who understood their pastoral and personal problems.

Il restait pourtant moine jusqu'au bout des ongles, mais il avait le secret de leur rendre assimilable l'essence de la tradition spirituelle du monachisme. Ceci provenait de ce qu'il avait retrouvé le sens d'abord pleinement ecclésiastique de la liturgie. Mais la verdeur et la cordialité de sa personnalité incarnaient cette intuition de telle manière qu'il la rendait communicative comme nul autre n'aurait su le faire.⁴¹

He was a man of humour, of vision, of independent outlook and of daring, the last sometimes most subtly disguised in flattery or praise. He took to himself a cause to which he was committed to the point of possessiveness, but it must also be added that he had great energy and tenacity of purpose in promoting a cause. He was a man of intuition; Rousseau remarks: "Les intuitions de dom Lambert Beauduin resteront sans doute la principale caractéristique de son génie";⁴² and Haquin says that he had "le sens du moment opportun."⁴³ His intuitions and his independence of outlook meant that he arrived at conclusions and convictions before others did, and he was often charged with being restless and an agitator. After World War I and various adventures, he found himself again at Mont-César, a return that Bouyer describes thus:

Le premier effet de son emballement sur ses confrères, sauf sur quelques-uns, surtout parmi les jeunes, ne devait, hélas, qu'être la confirmation

d'une opinion prête à se cristalliser. Il n'était décidément qu'un perpétuel agité, pour ne pas dire inguérissable toqué.⁴⁴

At the core of his being was that interior life which as a monk he developed and which gave him that detachment from the buffets and harassments and pressures of daily life which is a mark of great spiritual personalities, and which also was the source of his influence.

Dom Lambert never confused liturgical renewal with liturgical reformation, as Bouyer points out,⁴⁵ and some words of Srawley, printed in 1954 and applied in general to the promoters of the liturgical renewal, certainly hold true for Dom Lambert:

Their remedy is not the supercession of the forms of worship inherited from the past, but the endeavour to recover from them and to set into relief by teaching and propaganda the cardinal principles enshrined in them and to bring them to living expression.⁴⁶

Dom Lambert was not a reformer who violently opposed the orthodox positions or thought of the Church. He stood squarely orthodox in his theology. But he loved the Church and he loved her children, and he wished to see their life renewed and made strong and vital again. He was not alone in recognizing the need for renewal, but once he became con-

vinced of the direction that this renewal should take, he worked indefatigably to promote it.

The first years of the movement in Belgium have been dealt with in considerable detail because they were years when the ship was launched and set sail. The intense activity, however, that marked those first years was brought almost to a halt with the outbreak of the First World War. The return of Dom Lambert to Mont-César after the War created some difficulty, and so when a pressing request came from the Abbot Superior of the Benedictine Order for a professor of dogmatics to teach at the College of Saint-Anselm in Rome, it was agreed that Dom Lambert would go to fill this need. He was quite willing to see the task of promoting the movement pass to younger men.

There were many others who were ready to see that the ship held to its course, but the movement in Belgium did not recover the thrust of those early, exciting years. This is partly explained by Dom Lambert's departure, but much more significantly by the fact that Germany and Austria now came to the forefront with the work of renewal that had been started there.

It has been emphasized that Dom Lambert, in promoting liturgical renewal, was concerned for the people of the Church.

But in the period between the Wars, generally speaking, the renewal was more clergy-centred than parish-centred. It was inevitable and necessary that this should be so. It seems that sometimes there was greater interest by clergy in periodicals intended for the laity than by lay people themselves.

Cardinal Mercier from the beginning gave his ardent and enthusiastic support to the movement, and this was a favourable influence upon the clergy. The Cardinal gave his support to a "Union liturgique pour Prêtres" that was proposed a few years after the War,⁴⁷ and a liturgical congress was held at Malines in 1924 to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. This was attended by over 700 people from Belgium and many other countries.⁴⁸

In 1928, the Belgian bishops set up "Le Comité Interdiocésain d'Action Liturgique et Paroissiale" (C.I.A.L.P.). Apparently the programme of this committee was set forth by the bishops when they met at Malines in 1920, and in due course approved by the Holy See, but it was not implemented immediately. The purpose of this committee was to co-ordinate the work of liturgical renewal with Catholic Action.⁴⁹

The liturgical weeks were started again after the War, and in due course a policy was instituted of holding each year one at Mont-César and the other in one of the provincial cities.

After the Second World War the movement reached a stage when it was decided to discontinue the liturgical weeks and the last was held at Mont-César in 1949.

The First International Liturgical Congress was held at Antwerp in 1930.

Reference was made earlier to the liturgical school on the university plan that was founded at Mont-César after the Second War.⁵⁰ In 1948, a Centre de documentation et d'information liturgiques was opened there also, and there was a similar one at Saint-André for Bible and Liturgy.

Belgium continued after the First War to be very active in the field of liturgical publications. The Abbey of Saint-André-les-Bruges in 1919 began a periodical called, Bulletin paroissial liturgique. At the end of World War II this became Paroisse et liturgie. Priests of St. Severin and St. Joseph say that this "represents the most clearly defined pastoral trend among liturgical reviews in French."⁵¹ There was also published by Saint-André, La Vie et les Arts liturgiques, at one time under the direction of Dom Fernand Cabrol. After World War II Saint-André published Art d'Église, a successor to the pre-war Artisan liturgique.

Liturgisch Tijdschrift came to an end in 1914, and in 1919 the Abbey at Affligem began Tijdschrift voor Liturgie.

The Abbey of Steenbrugge-lez-Bruges began publication of Liturgisch parochieblad in 1919. In 1923 La Vie Liturgique began to be issued from Liège.

After the Second War, in the area of catechetical teaching, Notre Catéchèse was published as a supplement to Paroisse et liturgie. There was also Croisade Liturgique à l'École, directed by Dom Gaspard Lefebvre of Saint-André. There were other reviews also, such as Lumen Vitae, which gave much space to liturgy.

Last but by no means least, Les Questions liturgiques et paroissiales continued to make a most valuable contribution. Dom Vandebroucke could write at the time of the jubilee of the movement:

En bref, l'évolution se résumerait en deux mots: les Questions ont passé du combat juvénile dans l'enthousiasme à la réflexion attentive et documentée. Les Questions se présentent ainsi, de plus en plus, comme un instrument de travail réfléchi, à la fois sur le plan de l'action pastorale et sur celui de la pensée théologique qui est soustendue par cette action.⁵²

It must also be noted at this point that Belgium was well known for the publication of good missals for congregational use. Dom Maertens writes:

La Belgique fut longtemps la terre d'élection des missels. Si on lui adjoint le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, on peut dire que, jusqu'à la guerre de 1940,

tous les missels classiques en toutes les langues
(à l'exception de l'allemand) étaient édités en
Belgique.⁵³

The work of renewal in Belgium may not have been as dramatic after the First War as it was before, but it was solid work built on sound foundations. It is an indication of the progress of the movement in Belgium that the bishops of that country were the first to be granted permission by the Holy See, in January 1947 (initially for one year), for the celebration of evening Masses on Sundays and holy days.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Rousseau, "Autour du jubilé . . .," QLP, XL (1959), 206, n. 12, writes: "On peut se rendre compte du succès de la publication par les quelques phrases du début de la 'Chronique de l'Oeuvre,' insérée dans le Supplément no. 3, janvier 1910, de La Vie liturgique: 'La Vie liturgique vient de traverser une crise que rien ne faisait prévoir et que, habituellement, les publications de ce genre ne connaissent pas. Avant de réaliser ce voeu du Congrès de Malines, nous en avons écrit à plusieurs personnes bien placées pour nous renseigner. Le questionnaire joint à la lettre portait entre autres: "Y a-t-il lieu d'espérer une grande diffusion d'une pareille publication?" Les approbations les plus enthousiastes trahissaient ici un léger scepticisme et les réponses jusqu'ici catégoriques s'embarassaient de "si" et de "mais," qui ressemblaient fort à la sourdine que doit souvent mettre le sens pratique à des projets trop utopistes ...

On fit une première commande de 50,000 . . . tout est épuisé..."

Robeyns, "Les débuts . . .," QLP, XIX (1934), 290, writes: "Un seul chiffre suffira pour en juger: la première brochure de la Vie liturgique pour l'Avent fut tirée à 150,000 exemplaires; l'immense stock était écoulé en moins de quinze jours," but Rousseau does not mention the larger number.

2. QL, II (1911-1912), 2.

3. Ibid., p. 514.

4. Quoted by Rousseau, op. cit., p. 207.

5. QL, I (1910-1911), 1.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., n. 1; "En attendant, les laïcs désireux d'études liturgiques peuvent s'abonner au Messager de Saint-Benoit, revue liturgique et monastique publiée à l'abbaye de Maredsous."

This publication was later called, Revue liturgique et monastique.

8. QL, II (1911-1912), 2.

9. Ibid., p. 513.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid., p. 440.

12. QL, I (1910-1911), 53.

13. Ibid., pp. 98-99.

14. Ibid., p. 439.

15. Cf. ibid., p. 440.

16. Cf. QL. II (1911-1912), 441-49.

17. Rousseau, op. cit., p. 209. Cf. above p. 47.

18. Ibid., p. 210.

19. Cf. Bouyer, Dom Lambert Beauduin, p. 47.

20. Cf. above p. 66.

21. Op. cit., p. 45.

22. QL, II (1911-1912), 529-33.

23. Robeyns, op. cit., p. 294.

24. QL, III (1912-1913), 391, has a note which says that Revue de Philosophie was a monthly published in Paris. It was founded in 1900, "dirigée par l'abbé Peillaube, professeur de psychologie à l'institut catholique de Paris."

25. Ibid., p. 394.

26. Etudes, CXXXVII, 20 Nov. 1913, 452. Etudes was a review founded in 1856 by the Jesuit Fathers.

27. QL, IV (1913-1914), 99-100. Dom Lambert's article was entitled: "Mise au point nécessaire. Réponse au R. P. Navatel," pp. 83-104.

As a happy sequel to the encounter with Père Navatel, an article appeared in the issue of Etudes for 5 July 1921 (pp. 60-65) by Fr. Paul Doncoeur, S.J., in praise of the liturgical apostolate. Dom Lambert was pleased to report this (QLP, VI (1921), 232). There was another article in the issue of 20 June 1922 (pp. 690-705), entitled, "Bulletin de Liturgie pratique." Fr. Doncoeur made a notable contribution to the liturgical renewal in France.

28. Dom Lambert Beauquin, Mélanges liturgiques (Louvain: Centre Liturgique, Abbaye du Mont César, 1954), p. 36.

29. Ibid., p. 40.

30. Ibid., p. 117.

31. Dom Lambert Beauquin, Liturgy the Life of the Church (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1926), p. 1.

32. Ibid., p. 2.

33. Ibid., pp. 2-4.

34. Ibid., p. 4.

35. Ibid., p. 7.

36. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

37. Ibid., pp. 44-46.

38. Ibid., p. 79.

39. Cf. above p. 41.

40. Op. cit., p. 47.
41. Ibid., p. 48.
42. Op. cit., p. 210.
43. André Haquin, "La Préparation du mouvement liturgique . . .," p. 244.
44. Op. cit., p. 109.
45. Life and Liturgy, p. 62.
46. J.H. Srawley, The Liturgical Movement: Its Origin and Growth (London: A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., for The Alcuin Club, 1954), p. 9.
47. Cf. QLP, VII (1922), 130. The Cardinal's letter of support and approval was dated 26 April 1922.
48. Cf. QLP, IX (1924), 129-68.
49. Cf. QLP, XIII (1928), 225-32, for the programme. Cf. also p. 272.
50. Cf. above p. 73.
51. What is the Liturgical Movement?, p. 15.
52. QLP, XL (1959), 4.
53. Dom Thierry Maertens, "Belgique," in "Le Mouvement Liturgique en Divers Pays," Lumen Vitae, X, No. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1955), 415.

CHAPTER IV

LEADING FIGURES IN THE GERMAN-SPEAKING LANDS AND THEIR INFLUENCE UPON THE LITURGICAL RENEWAL

Within the Benedictine Order, and so at the monasteries of Beuron and Maria Laach in Germany, and Seckau in Austria, it was known that work towards liturgical renewal had been initiated by the Benedictines in Belgium. But the Belgian movement did not exert a direct influence on the liturgical renewal that came into being in the German-speaking lands. As was mentioned, the outbreak of the First World War brought the work in Belgium to a virtual standstill, but it is from the period of the War that renewal began to take place in Germany. Far from being influenced by Belgium, the renewal in Germany and Austria took its own course and indeed made an immense contribution to the liturgical movement within the Church as a whole. Heitz goes so far as to say:

Dom Rousseau marque les étapes de cette histoire au siècle dernier: Moehler, Scheeben, Guéranger, les foyers liturgiques ouverts à Solesmes, puis à Beuron, l'activité de Dom Lambert Beauduin à Louvain, le

renouveau de l'ecclésiologie à partir des réalités du corps mystique. Il nous semble que ces efforts, pour si vigoureux et si réussis qu'ils aient été, n'ont cependant constitué que des amorces. Il appartenait à la théologie liturgique de l'école de Maria-Laach de leur faire porter leurs derniers fruits et de donner au mouvement liturgique en Europe une nouvelle vigueur en le plongeant dans les eaux nourricières et fécondes de la grande tradition patristique.¹

Briefly to pick up the threads with Chapter i, it was noted there that the work of theologians such as Sailer, Drey and Mähler in the first part of the nineteenth century constituted a remote preparation for the liturgical renewal that began in Germany in the twentieth century.² Stress was laid there on the importance in the thinking of Mähler, for example, of the Church as an organism, as a Body, a community. His thinking owed much to his study of the Fathers.

The first great figure to emerge in the German renewal of the twentieth century is that of Abbot Ildefons Herwegen (1874-1946). He became Abbot of the monastery of Maria Laach in the Rhineland in 1913 and held that position until his death. He is somewhat overlooked because of the profound and penetrating work of Dom Casel, but he was himself a thinker and a great leader, and he inspired the outstanding contribution made by Maria Laach in the field of liturgical scholarship.

Abbot Herwegen was influenced both mentally and spiritually by the Romantic Movement, and Dom Michels records that: "His fundamental views on the life of the Church as expressed in her liturgy were formed through an intensive study of the works of the famous Rhenish theologian, Matthias Jos. Scheeben."³ (The thought of the Tubingen theologians of the first part of the nineteenth century was given further development by Scheeben (1835-1888), one of whose works has been translated into English as, The Mysteries of Christianity⁴).

Abbot Ildefons was first a monk. He saw the monastic life as a higher stage of Christian life than that of the ordinary Christian in the world, in the sense that the monk committed himself without reserve to the religious life. But he would no doubt have added that this also meant a greater degree of responsibility laid upon the monk. For the Benedictine Order, the first obligation was the Choir Office, and Dom Ildefons wished his monks to centre their whole spiritual life on the liturgy of the Church. As Dom Michels has written:

The fulness of spiritual life should flow from the total devotion of the monk to the cult-mysteries of the Church. Hence the so-called "Mysterientheologie" which Abbot Herwegen and Dom Odo Casel again "discovered" in the treasures of genuine Catholic tradition.

Hence the accent laid upon the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ as the theological foundation, theoretically and practically, of all liturgical life.⁵

The liturgy had to be lived, and secondly, it had to be studied. He gave every encouragement and his own example to his monks in the applying of their studies to promoting a deeper knowledge and understanding of the liturgy.

This suggests that Maria Laach did not concern itself with the world outside, and the charge has sometimes been made that the work of Maria Laach was too academic in its emphasis. It is true that the monastery was a child of Solesmes in the respect that its worship could not readily be transferred into a parish. Jungmann points out, for instance, how Maria Laach began somewhat like Solesmes--the liturgy was given perfect realization there.⁶ But it is distorting the picture somewhat to say that the work of the monastery was too academic. Dom Hammenstede, Prioer of Maria Laach, could report to the first International Liturgical Congress held at Antwerp in 1930:

Non, Messieurs, nous voulons plutôt étaler devant les fidèles les richesses de la grâce, qui sont renfermées dans la liturgie; afin que les fidèles se sentent ainsi stimulés, à puiser l'eau salubre pour leur vie surnaturelle à ces sources, qui, en comparaison avec d'autres, sont plus originales et plus pures.⁷

And he goes on to say:

Voyons donc, Messieurs, quel est notre procédé à Maria Laach! Nous distinguons deux choses. D'abord l'étude de ce qui est d'origine plus ou moins humaine dans la liturgie, c'est-à-dire sa forme extérieure. Elle requiert un examen minutieux des textes et rites au moyen des différentes méthodes de la science. La seconde, qui nous intéresse, c'est de savoir en quel sens les choses divines sont actuellement présentes sous les formes extérieures des rites et comment il nous est possible d'entrer en relations avec elles.⁸

In fact, it can be stated that Maria Laach appears on the stage of liturgical renewal when, in 1914, a group of laymen, university teachers, doctors and lawyers approached Abbot Herwegen to ask him about ways in which to promote the more active participation of the faithful in the Mass. This led to the holding in Holy Week of that year of the first Liturgical Week for laymen at Maria Laach. It was on this occasion that the dialogue Mass was introduced in Germany.

A more balanced assessment would be that in the field of scholarship where Guéranger had been weak, Maria Laach strove to be strong. The work of liturgical study was pursued in as open, objective, and scientific a manner as possible. Undoubtedly the greater part of the work produced by the monastery was scholarly, but this does not mean that there was a lack of concern for the good of the Church as a

whole. A debt is owed by the Church to Maria Laach for the sound scholarship that was fostered there.

It might further be objected that those who attended the first Liturgical Week at Maria Laach constituted an intellectual élite, which is true, but was this not a useful stage in bringing principles of renewal to the parish level?

In addition to guiding his monks, Abbot Herwegen wrote, spoke, and led many conferences, in order that the life of the Church might be deepened through knowledge and understanding of the liturgy. In 1931, he founded at Maria Laach the Benedictine Academy for Liturgical and Monastic Research (since 1948 the Abt-Herwegen-Institut), a centre open to religious, parish priests, and any others who wished to deepen their knowledge of the liturgy.

In 1918, he began the publication of Ecclesia Orans, a series of monographs which made available to intelligent readers the thinking of men who were in the forefront of the liturgical renewal. The purpose of Ecclesia Orans was described as:

Promouvoir et approfondir dans les larges sphères du clergé, de l'enseignement et aussi des simples laïques cultivés, au moyen de l'interprétation des idées, des gestes et des textes, la connaissance et la compréhension de la liturgie.⁹

Then in 1921, he gave his ready support to Dom Odo Casel in the launching of the first volume of the Jahrbuch fur Liturgiewissenschaft, which contained learned articles in the field of liturgical research with a very exhaustive bibliography of published work. Dom Odo edited the Jahrbuch until 1941 (Volume XV), when wartime restrictions halted publication. This work has been started again under the title, Archiv fur Liturgiewissenschaft, which first appeared in 1950. The Benedictine Abbeys in Germany and Austria also collaborated in the publication of the series, Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, for the editing of ancient liturgical texts and the production of scientific monographs on historical liturgical subjects. This series first appeared in 1918.

The first monograph to appear in the Ecclesia Orans series was Vom Geist der Liturgie (English translation: The Spirit of the Liturgy) by Romano Guardini. He was a most cultivated priest who taught at the University of Berlin. He exercised a notable influence upon students, and through his writings, on the Church generally. Count Robert d'Harcourt has written:

L'influence que Guardini sut prendre sur la jeunesse catholique intellectuelle d'Allemagne fut immense. S'il en fallait résumer d'un mot le secret,

il faudrait sans doute nommer en première ligne la modernité de Guardini. Ce très jeune écrivain, auquel une rare sensibilité d'antennes, un don exceptionnel de "sympathie", méritent le nom donné par la critique allemande de "maître de l'intuition psychologique", fut par toutes ses fibres de son époque. Il exerça sur ses contemporains cette influence qu'on ne prend sur son temps qu'en lui appartenant.¹⁰

Vom Geist der Liturgie is one of Guardini's early works, but it does give a clear expression of how he approached the liturgy, and his method of thought. He was content to take the liturgy as it was; he says, for instance, at the outset: "The Catholic liturgy is the supreme example of an objectively established rule of spiritual life."¹¹ What was of primary concern for him was that the Christian should share in it as a member of the Christian community, and so be exposed to the supernatural life expressed in it. He writes:

To it he must surrender his independence; pray with others, and not alone; obey, instead of freely disposing of himself; and stand in the ranks, instead of moving about at his own will and pleasure. It is, furthermore, the task of the individual to apprehend clearly the ideal world of the liturgy. He must shake off the narrow trammels of his own thought, and make his own a far more comprehensive world of ideas; he must go beyond his little personal aims and adopt the educative purpose of the great fellowship of the liturgy.¹²

Guardini departed from the familiar deductive, systematic method and, as Koenker mentions, employed "the inductive method of presentation."¹³ Robert d'Harcourt expresses it:

Le but dont le regard ne dévie jamais est celui-ci: comment amener une intelligence et une sensibilité modernes--il en connaît si bien tous les frémissements, les élans comme les défaillances!--à la compréhension et à l'amour de la liturgie!¹⁴

With regard to the way in which this supernatural life is expressed, Guardini's was a "romantic" understanding: man is lifted up to a higher plane through art as he participates in the liturgy, and he no doubt had the Mass in particular in mind in this connection. Liturgical thinking has since moved beyond this point to a greater emphasis upon intelligent participation, but Guardini does lay stress on the corporate aspect of the liturgy, and on the fact that the worshipper must be involved in it, rather than in his individual devotional exercises while the liturgy is in progress. (Guardini, who also taught at Munich University, later moved beyond his earlier thinking.¹⁵)

There were also other notable figures in the liturgical renewal in Germany. Dr. J. Pinski (1891-1957) was a chaplain to students in Berlin and latterly, parish priest of Notre Dame in Lankwitz (a suburb of Berlin). Through his books and the periodicals, Liturgische Zeitschrift and its successor, Liturgisches Leben, he exercised a wide influence. Liturgisches Leben was started in 1934, and at the time was the most outspoken journal of its kind in Germany. It brought

attention to the movement, together with support on the one hand and opposition on the other. There were the Oratorians at Leipzig, Fathers Gunkel, Guelden, Becker, and Tilmann, and in Austria there was Dr. Pius Parsch, of whom more will be said later.¹⁶

The most profound and creative mind in the German liturgical renewal was that of Dom Odo Casel. He was born at Koblenz-Lützel in 1886 and died at Herstelle-Weser in 1948. In 1905, he entered the monastery of Maria Laach. In 1913, he took his theological doctorate with a thesis on the eucharistic teaching of Justin Martyr. Then in 1919 he took at Bonn the degree of D.Phil. with a thesis entitled, De philosophorum Graecorum silentio mystico. In 1922, he became chaplain to the Abbey of Benedictine nuns at Herstelle in Westphalia and remained there until his death.

Dom Odo's thought has exerted an influence beyond Germany and beyond the Roman Catholic Church, so that it does not carry the same freshness today that it did when his ideas were first propounded, but this must not cause the greatness of his contribution to be overlooked. His thought centres on the mysterientheologie, his profound and probing recovery of St. Paul's teaching about the person and work of Christ, and how these are expressed in the Church, his mystical body; and his searching illumination of the meaning of the liturgy as

the mysteries of Christ and his Church. For Dom Odo, Christ's act of salvation is made present in the ritual and sacramental deed of the Church.

As a starting point for an attempt to give an exposition of Dom Odo's thought, it should be noted that he was concerned to counteract modern errors in the understanding of the Christian Faith, and of the worship of the Church. In line with Abbot Herwegen, he wished to restore the wholeness and depth of Christian life. And in his thinking the worship of the Church was an integral part of this. He says, for instance, of the liturgical renewal:

The Catholic church has done something miraculous by holding fast to the cosmos of God's values in the midst of general chaos and by keeping for us, in the mystery of worship, symbols full of God's true power and presence. The liturgical renewal in our day is nothing but a new recognition and stress upon these values in the church, and an attempt to make them once more the common property of all the faithful.¹⁷

He saw man-centredness and individualism as prime reasons for the spiritual malaise of the world, and in contrast he exalted the objective life of the Church, given by God and filled with His Spirit. For him the individualism and collectivism of the modern world were in direct contrast to the God-given norm, the objective consciousness of community possessed by the Church.

Mention has already been made of the return to the Fathers by men such as MÖhler, and of their attempt to restore depth and wholeness to the doctrine of the Church. There were other currents as well in the theological thought-world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, such as liberal protestantism in Germany and the scientific study of the Bible that was one of the features of the modernist movement in the Roman Church. Men such as Leitzmann, Bousset, Reitzenstein and Loisy studied the ancient mystery religions, and the conclusions that they came to tended to denigrate primitive Christianity. They found parallels between the pagan mysteries and Christianity which seemed to show that the Christian Faith was in no way unique, but simply a part of the ancient religious and cultural whole.

Bouyer remarks that "Bousset and Reitzenstein in particular described these mysteries in terms not at all proper to them, unaccountably attributing to them purely Christian notions."¹⁸ At any rate Dom Odo met them in their own camp and was able to show that a radically different interpretation could be placed on the material. He did this not so much by describing the mystery religions more accurately (for the more recent work of scholars in this field has shown

that he accepted too readily the reconstructions of men like Bousset and Reitzenstein), as by his illumination of the thought of St. Paul and of the Fathers.

Dom Odo, for instance, gives the following definition of the mystery in the mystery religions:

The mystery is a sacred ritual action in which a saving deed is made present through the rite: the congregation, by performing the rite, take part in the saving act, and thereby win salvation.¹⁹

Present-day knowledge of the mystery religions suggests that this is too generous a definition. To say that "a saving deed is made present through the rite", is to attribute more to the ancient mysteries than is justified.

Bouyer traces briefly the development of the mystery religions,²⁰ pointing out how they began among agrarian peoples. The gods were the spirits or powers present in the trees and other vegetation, and in particular in the corn and other crops. These apparently died when vegetation died and were reborn at the time of the new growth. And so primitive peoples tried to ensure the rebirth each year--and so their food--by imitative rituals of the death of vegetable life followed by its rebirth. In these rituals, sexual symbols were used, and an attempt was thus made to stimulate the latent energies and to bring to birth again what had lain dead.

mystères liturgiques de notre église ne sont autre chose que les équivalents ou même la continuation des mystères païens. Il est sûr que les saints mystères, que l'Homme-Dieu a institués pendant sa vie terrestre, sont absolument sans pareil et d'ordre surnaturel, il est tout aussi sûr que la Sainte Église, pour les expliquer, n'a pas besoin de consulter d'abord les doctrines païennes des Grecs ou des Égyptiens. Néanmoins la connaissance des mystères païens pourra être très utile, pour mieux comprendre la terminologie des anciens écrivains chrétiens, qui ont parlé des choses liturgiques en des termes qu'ils empruntaient aux cultes païens.²¹

Dom Odo saw the ancient mysteries as a providential preparation for the Christian dispensation. He states: "The best of the ancient world did service to Christendom."²² The mystery religions provided a form in which Christianity could meaningfully be expressed. The words of the mystery religions were ready at hand to be used by the early Church and the Fathers. "It was indeed the Greek Fathers, who had considered the depths of revelation with all the penetration of their Hellenic intellectual training, who were unafraid of applying the language of the mysteries to the wholly new realities and doctrines in God's revelation."²³ It can be noted, too, that Dom Odo gave fresh currency to words such as, mysterium, memoria, illuminatio.

It was when he turned to St. Paul and the Fathers that he was able to reconstruct the profound and comprehensive

The second stage of development was the result of invasion. In this stage, the element of mystery appears in the sense that the rituals were foreign to the invaders. It is possible, too, that although these rituals had been handed down, their origins were no longer clearly remembered or understood. And so there is also a change in what they signified. As the gods were gods of the earth and the under-earth, so it was felt that they could give to the dead (who go beneath the earth) a happy immortality.

In a third stage initiation became open not only to the invaders, but to people who flocked from everywhere to the primitive shrine. Various new interpretations of the ritual were given, but always the primitive form of the rite was jealously maintained. And so the "mystery" was always the rite, whose secrecy was carefully kept by those to whom it was entrusted.

In spite of what has been said, it must be emphasized that Dom Odo fully recognized the uniqueness of Christianity. Dom Hammenstede could state this quite distinctly in 1930:

Il [Casel] a montré que l'idée générale du Mystère du culte ou du Symbolisme sacramental est commune à tout le genre humain et se trouve chez les peuples de la plus haute antiquité. Il est bien possible, que cette idée descende de la première révélation. Mais rien ne serait plus faux, que de croire, que Dom Casel voulut dire, par là, que les saints

understanding of the Church and her worship that would be his great legacy. Dom Hammenstede says that St. Paul provides the foundation of Dom Odo's work: "Au fond, elle [die mysterientheologie] n'est autre chose que la dernière conséquence de la doctrine de saint Paul sur la Sainte Église, en tant que corps mystique de Jésus Christ."²⁴

What, then, was St. Paul's understanding of the mystery?

At the beginning of 1 Corinthians 2, St. Paul says that he did not come proclaiming the testimony (*μαρτύριον*), or mystery (*μυστήριον*) of God in lofty words of wisdom. He decided to know nothing among them but Jesus Christ crucified.

He goes on:

But we impart a secret and hidden wisdom of God (*ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν Θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ, τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην*), which God decreed before the ages for our glorification. None of the rulers of this age understood this; for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But, as it is written,

"What no eye has seen, nor ear heard,
nor the heart of man conceived,

what God has prepared for those who love him,"
God has revealed to us through the Spirit (*ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος*). For the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God. For what person knows a man's thoughts except the spirit of the man which is in him? So also no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God, that we might understand the gifts bestowed on us by God (vv.7-12, R.S.V.).

Bouyer shows very clearly that, far from appropriating the fundamental concepts of the mystery religions and as it were baptizing them into Christianity, the background of St. Paul's thought is thoroughly biblical.²⁵ Lying behind his understanding of the mystery are the concepts of wisdom and revelation, σοφία and ἀποκάλυψις.

Bouyer traces how wisdom was, to begin with, the practical art of leading and governing men which was associated with kingship in the ancient world, and which became a part of Hebrew thought with the establishment of kingship in Israel.

But then it underwent change. For in Israel the fear of Yahweh was to be the first obligation of the scribe or wise man. In due course, the thought developed that it was God alone who properly possessed wisdom, and after the exile and destruction of the Israelite kingship wisdom came to signify, not so much the governance of earthly affairs, as God's own mysterious governance of all kingdoms.

It was at this point that the transition in thought from wisdom to revelation took place. For man began to despair of arriving at true wisdom by his own efforts, even if he had God's help. Wisdom could only be attained if God Himself deigned to reveal it.

Bouyer points out that in the Book of Daniel there is a passage which strikingly contains the whole vocabulary that St. Paul uses in 1 Corinthians 2. In the second chapter, when Daniel has undertaken to interpret the dream of the king of Babylon, and in a vision of the night the meaning is made clear to him, he blesses God and says:

"Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever,
to whom belong wisdom and might.
He changes times and seasons;
he removes kings and sets up kings;
he gives wisdom to the wise
and knowledge to those who have understanding;
he reveals deep and mysterious things;
he knows what is in the darkness,
and the light dwells with him" (vv.20-22, R.S.V.).

Further on he says to the king: "To you, O king, as you lay in bed came thoughts of what would be hereafter, and he who reveals mysteries (LXX: *ὁ ἀνακαλύπτων μυστήρια*; Theodotion: *ὁ ἀποκαλύπτων μυστήρια*) made known to you what is to be" (v.29).

But this is not merely a similarity of vocabulary between the two passages; the whole frame of thought is the same. Both passages presuppose an opposition between the attempts of men to lead and make history and the way in which God does so, accomplishing his unchanging plan, and bringing to nothing all the little plans of men. As Bouyer says: "The Mystery is the clue to this secret way of God's, planned

in His own 'wisdom', and it is through His 'revelation' to man that something of His secret way can be known."²⁶

The mystery for St. Paul reaches its climax in the Cross. As he puts it:

For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God. For it is written,
 "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise,
 and the cleverness of the clever I will thwart."
 Where is the wise man? Where is the scribe?
 Where is the debater of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, it pleased God through the folly of what we preach to save those who believe. For Jews demand signs and Greeks seek wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling-block to Jews and folly to Gentiles, but to those who are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men (1 Corinthians 1:18-25, R.S.V.).

This same thinking about the mystery is expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians and that to the Ephesians (taking the latter as expressing Pauline thought, whether actually written by St. Paul or a disciple). In Colossians 2:2,3 he says: "that their hearts may be encouraged as they are knit together in love, to have all the riches of assured understanding and the knowledge of God's mystery, of Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Ephesians 1:9,10 states: "For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will, according to his

purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth."

In the Gospels, the word *μυστήριον* occurs only in the parallel passages in the Synoptics, Matthew 13:11 (*τὰ μυστήρια*), Mark 4:11 (*τὸ μυστήριον*), and Luke 8:10 (*τὰ μυστήρια*), where Jesus speaks of the mysteries (or mystery) of the kingdom of God. But this does not in any way weaken or nullify the magnificent contribution of St. Paul who, with his knowledge and insight, was able to give comprehensive expression to all that was signified for the whole of human history and for human life by the coming into the world of the Lord Jesus Christ.

And so Dom Odo could define St. Paul's understanding of the mystery as follows:

St. Paul thinks of Christianity, the good news, as a "mystery"; but not merely in the sense of a hidden, mysterious teaching about the things of God, a sense the word already bore in the philosophy of late antiquity. Rather for him mysterium means first of all a deed of God's, the execution of an everlasting plan of his through an act which proceeds from his eternity, realized in time and the world, and returning once more to him its goal in eternity. We can express the mystery, so conceived, by the one word "Christ" meaning by it the Saviour's person together with his mystical body, the church.²⁷

How then did Dom Odo define the mystery? He used the word, in the first place, to describe God in His being and action. There is, of course, always mystery attached to the being of God, but Dom Odo maintained that in Christ God has revealed His mystery. He has revealed it, however, only to those who have eyes to see. In this sense, it remains mystery, it is hidden from those whose eyes have not been opened. He writes:

The mystery means three things and one. First of all it is God considered in himself, as the infinitely distant, holy, unapproachable, to whom no man may draw near and live; . . . And this all-holy one reveals his mystery, comes down to his creatures and reveals himself to them; yet once again, in mysterio, that is to say, in a revelation by grace, to those whom he has chosen, the humble, the pure of heart, not to the proud and the self-important. Hence his revelation remains a mystery, because it is not open to the profane world, but hides itself, shows itself only to the believers, the ones whom he has chosen.

God's being, then, is infinitely above the world; yet by grace he dwells within his creatures, within mankind: he is at once transcendent and immanent. In essence he surpasses all he has made, yet penetrates it everywhere, by his presence and his action.²⁸

How then is this mystery made real in the life of the Church? Dom Odo's answer is that it is made real in the mysteries of worship. For him the mystery of Christ is a faith-relationship, it has to be lived, and because men live in space and time, so the mystery has to be lived in space and time also. He writes, therefore:

Thus the mysterium acquires a third sense, which, however, is most intimately connected with the first two; since Christ is no longer visible among us, in St. Leo the Great's words, "What was visible in the Lord has passed over into the mysteries." We meet his person, his saving deeds, the workings of his grace in the mysteries of his worship. St. Ambrose writes: "I find you in your mysteries."²⁹

The liturgy is an essential means for the expression of the faith-relationship between Christ and his people, the Church. He goes so far as to say that mystery (as mystery of worship) and liturgy can be regarded as meaning the same thing from two different points of view; mystery can be characterized as the action of the bridegroom, liturgy as that of the bride.

Mystery means the heart of the action, that is to say, the redeeming work of the risen Lord, through the sacred actions he has appointed: liturgy, corresponding to its original sense of "people's work", "service", means rather the action of the church in conjunction with this saving action of Christ's. We saw above, that Christ and the church work together inseparably in the mystery; but we can none the less characterize mystery as more the act of the bridegroom, and liturgy the act of the bride, without thereby making too great a division.³⁰

This action is present more especially in the Mass, but also in the other sacraments, in the sacramentals, in the Divine Office, in the liturgical year, and so in the whole Christian life.

Of course, the Cross of Jesus, as the climax of the making known of the mystery and as a historical event, took

place once and cannot be repeated. In what sense, then, is the mystery made real in worship? Dom Odo falls back on the use in the Fathers of the word, εἰκῶν, a term borrowed from Platonic philosophy. Plato used the concept of the idea as the real, the perfect, and the image as that which reflects the idea. But in patristic usage εἰκῶν was given richer meaning as sharing in the reality of the idea. The εἰκῶν, therefore, is not just a reflection; it is charged with the reality of which it is the reflection. And so he says:

The mystery of Christ which was completed in our Lord in all reality in time is, therefore, fulfilled; fulfilled on us first of all in representative, symbolic forms, not purely external ones, but rather images filled with the reality of the new life which is communicated to us through Christ. This special sharing in the life of Christ, both symbolic and real, is what the ancients called mystical; it is something mediate between a merely outward symbol and the purely real.³¹

Dom Odo thus was led to define the way in which Christ's redemptive act is represented (above all in the Mass as the core of the Church's worship), as a making present again--a sense of the word "represent" which has been restored to such wide currency in the thought of the Church through Dom Odo's work. This was not a new concept that he developed, but rather one that had become lost sight of and

which he restored. Dom Hammenstede speaks of the ancient use of "represent" as:

Rendre présent, rendre de nouveau présent. Si telle est la signification de "représenter" dans le langage des Pères, nous avons le droit et le devoir de proclamer que la liturgie représente, c'est-à-dire rend en vérité présents, les mystères du Christ, que ses rites signifient.³²

In speaking of how in the liturgical rites of sacrifice and sacrament the mystical making-present-again of the totum opus redemptionis takes place, Koenker goes on to say:

It is not an empty commemoration or pious meditation; neither is this action something psychological or ethical. It is rather ontological action, a signum efficax, a reality which efficaciously heightens man's natural existence through an activity in a higher sphere; as such, of course, it works ex opere operato. The symbol really and actually is in the supernatural-divine order what in its outward, natural appearance it signifies.³³

Such a definition points up the comprehensiveness and vitality of Dom Odo's thought. There are specific points of detail in his work with which there has been disagreement, but the freshness and the life that have been restored to the Church's understanding of the liturgy through his work are beyond question. Certainly the criticism can be made that he accepted the liturgy as he received it; he was not concerned with reform. Indeed, in some respects he was conservative as, for instance, in his support of the use of

Latin in the Mass.³⁴ But this does not mean that he was unconcerned about the relevance of the liturgy. It simply means that the focus of his labours was on digging up and uncovering the Church's treasures which, as it were, had inadvertently become buried in the earth.

The question, however, cannot be ignored as to whether or not the mysterienlehre can be grasped by the average parishioner or person. Obviously not in the thorough and scholarly way in which Dom Odo propounded it, although he expressed himself in a clear and deceptively simple style. But surely in its essence it can be translated into simple and understandable language. For is it not scripturally sound? Not, it might be argued, in the developed sacramental system of the Roman Catholic Church; and not in the sense of the word "re-present" that Dom Odo rehabilitated; but undoubtedly so in that essential part of the teaching which is the exegesis of St. Paul's understanding of the mystery. It can be remarked, too, that no matter what tag different groups within the Christian Church may apply to themselves, at the heart of the life and worship of all Christians there is some attempt to enter into relationship with the risen and ascended Christ.

A question that is more difficult to answer is whether or not, even if the mysterienlehre has been explained in a

simple way to modern man, he will find it relevant to his life and will respond to it. The question can be put in other words as: Will modern man respond to the Gospel through his participation in the liturgical life of the Church? As the question is put, the outcome would seem to hinge on modern man's acceptance or rejection, whereas surely the one thing that is essential is that the Church should live as fully as possible the life that she is called to live.

Of course, it is people, people of this twentieth century, who are members of the Church, and the life of the Church should be the soil out of which their everyday life in the world grows; it should be this rather than a visit every Sunday morning to an esoteric world whose links with the everyday world have become very vague and indistinct. And so there are conditions which the Church, in trying to live her life, must attempt to meet. The parish, for instance, must be a community in whose life and worship people are meaningfully involved and find relevance; there must be preaching of the Word of God and teaching; there must be a genuine attempt to express what the liturgical life of the parish means, in the everyday life of the world.

Surely in such a setting the mystery teaching, with its profound emphasis on grace, on the saving power of God made real in the worshipping community as it celebrates the mysteries, does express with wholeness, for the whole man, the mystery of the Gospel.

Far from the mysterientheologie being academic and esoteric, so practical a supporter of the liturgical renewal as Dr. Pius Parsch affirmed how much he owed to it.³⁵ To conclude this chapter, some assessment of Pius Parsch and his achievement will now be made.

In Pius Parsch, a priest is met who in many respects was an Austrian Dom Lambert. He was influenced by his contact with people, and his outstanding work was popular in the good sense that it was for the people of the Church.

Pius Parsch was born at Olmütz in Moravia in 1884. In 1904, he entered the monastery of the Augustinian Canons of Klosterneuburg near Vienna, and he was ordained a priest in 1909. He showed an interest in his studies in the Breviary and the Bible. Reference was made in Chapter i to Wolter's Psallite sapienter, a liturgical commentary on the Psalter in 5 volumes.³⁶ Parsch bought this by instalments and devoured it. At the time of his ordination he used his uncle's ordination gift to buy Guéranger's L'Année Liturgique,

and he tells us: "J'ai lu et étudié beaucoup cet ouvrage, il a peut-être formé la base de mes travaux liturgiques ultérieurs."³⁷

As a young priest he served for four years as assistant at Maria Treu in Vienna, during which time he worked for his doctoral degree in biblical theology. He then returned to the monastery and became professor of pastoral theology. He also had to train the novices. His old predilection for the liturgy returned, and in his work with the novices he concentrated on the Psalms and on explaining the Breviary.

When the First World War broke out he became an army chaplain. In May 1915, he became attached to a regiment with which he remained until the war ended. His experience with the troops constituted a very formative influence upon him.

He writes:

Je compris que l'homme a besoin d'une nourriture spirituelle plus forte que la piété souvent édulcorée et subjective de l'avant-guerre. Le terrain se trouva ainsi préparé pour les nouvelles idées qui puisent³⁸ à ces deux sources: la Bible et la Liturgie.

He began a study of a commentary on the Gospels when the regiment was bivouacked for the winter, and this made him deeply conscious of the sad lack of knowledge and understanding of Holy Scripture that there was on the part of clergy

and people. When the new weekly Psalter of Pius X (part of the reform of the Breviary announced in the Motu Proprio, Abhinc duos annos, of 23 October 1913) came into use, he began a commentary on this, an explanation of the Psalms for the different hours.

Parsch noted that the soldiers did not understand the Mass. On the other hand, in the Anatolian regions where the army was serving, he observed the active participation of the people in the offices of the Greek Rite. Already at this stage he was experimenting in trying to increase participation by having another priest celebrate the Mass, while he explained it under the form of prayers. At Kiev, Parsch had a conversation with P.W. Schmidt, the noted ethnologist, who told him of his plan when the war was over to edit instalments comprising the ordinary and propers of the Mass for Sundays and feasts, so that people might be helped better to understand and so to participate. Parsch felt that his later development owed much to this conversation.

He returned to the monastery in mid-November 1918, where his interest in the Bible and the liturgy continued to be expressed. Schmidt contacted him, and at Easter 1919 the first of the booklets for use at Mass appeared, but there was insufficient support on the part of the clergy for the project

at that time, and so it was discontinued. It was at this time that he began his biblical classes on the life of Jesus--not without the disapproval of some people: "Les uns se moquaient en disant que l'Histoire Sainte était pour le catéchisme, les autres regardaient mon initiative comme du protestantisme."³⁹

His classes were, however, well received, and during one year he concentrated all his time and efforts on biblical instruction. His group consisted of over one hundred members and constituted what he called "une communauté biblique."⁴⁰ The following year the members made the suggestion that he explain the Mass. This he did first in small groups, but he then began to give an instruction on the Mass each week along with the biblical one. During one year he explained the Mass in its essence and ceremonies, and this led his little community to desire further advance in its participation. Members of the group had the booklets containing the Sunday Masses, and a Latin-German prayer book, but these were not sufficient. He describes what developed:

Vers cette époque j'entendis parler d'une missa recitata que l'on célébrait dans les milieux d'étudiants. Je résolus de célébrer avec mon cercle la première messe de communauté. Ce fut à l'Ascension de 1922. La veille j'avais

réuni les membres du cercle à Sainte Gertrude, la chapelle qui devait devenir le berceau du mouvement liturgique populaire et j'expliquai les cérémonies et le sens de la messe chantée (nous appelions alors messe liturgique). A ce moment-là s'accomplit la séparation des esprits: maints catholiques à l'état d'esprit subjectif se séparèrent de notre cercle. Cette messe chantée était encore très primitive: le Kyrie, le Sanctus et l'Agnus Dei étaient chantés en allemand; le professeur Goller nous avait composé quelques mélodies chorales assez simples. Les répons, le Gloria, le Credo étaient récités par tous les assistants en chœur. Les leçons et les prières étaient dites par le président. Nous faisons une offrande et même le baiser de paix était indiqué par une poignée de main. Ce fut sans doute la première célébration de la messe dans l'esprit de la liturgie populaire en pays de langue allemande.⁴¹

The little church of St. Gertrude, close to the Abbey in Klosterneuburg, was restored and arranged for a community celebration. Parsch celebrated facing the people, there was an ambo for preaching, and a hall adjoining for the holding of "agapes". Charles Rauch, the parish priest of Ottersthal, describes how, "cette église permit à Pius Parsch la réalisation progressive et l'épanouissement de la participation active des fidèles à l'action liturgique, par la prière, le chant, les attitudes, et devint ainsi le centre de rayonnement de son apostolat liturgique."⁴² Thousands of visitors, both local and foreign, came to Klosterneuburg, attracted by what was taking place in St. Gertrude. It might be noted that in his well-known book, Liturgy and Society, first

published in 1935, A.G. Hebert quotes the village sermon (printed in the magazine, Lebe mit der Kirche) preached at Klosterneuburg on 21 August 1932.⁴³

Parsch's work expanded into Vienna, where twenty churches became involved, in particular, the parish of Gersthof. There the Sunday Parish Mass was celebrated as a dialogue Mass. During one year, Parsch gave an introduction every Saturday evening to the dialogue Mass of the next day. Schmidt's booklets had been discontinued, but Parsch's experience at Gersthof brought home to him again the necessity for there being a text in the hands of the people. He therefore printed a booklet of four pages comprising the variable parts of the Mass. This soon became a brochure of 8-16 pages containing the ordinary and the propers of the Mass.

A most important and successful means employed by Parsch in the promoting of his Volksliturgisches Apostolat, "Popular Liturgical Apostolate", as he called it, was the printing press and publishing house that he set up at the Abbey. Among his publications there was first a liturgical calendar in three volumes, augmented from year to year, "qui, de 1923 à 1938, en arriva à sa douzième édition et à un tirage d'environ quatre cent mille exemplaires, et fut

traduit successivement en français, italien, hollandais, hongrois et espagnol."⁴⁴

Of the little 16-page brochures containing the Sunday Masses, some twenty-five million copies were sold before 1940. Then there was the review, Bibel und Liturgie, which was issued bi-monthly when it was begun in 1926, but which later became a monthly publication, and which was an effective means of putting Parsch in touch with many priests and people. Along with this there was the weekly penny magazine, Lebe mit der Kirche, mentioned above, which first appeared in 1928, and which put within the reach of the average parishioner the riches for Christian life stored in the liturgy. Finally, one of his most meritorious successes was the issue of a German translation of the complete Bible at a very low price.

His emphasis on the place of the Bible and his labours towards making it once more a living book in the hands of the faithful were indeed one of the major contributions of Pius Parsch to the liturgical movement. His method was an exegetical one, aimed at knowledge and understanding of the text of the Bible. He relates that: "Dès le début, je fis les réunions non pas à l'église mais dans une salle. J'avais à ma disposition un tableau noir, une carte de la Palestine."⁴⁵

Everyone in his class had to have a Bible, and he describes how, when he began to give biblical instruction, he and his group first worked through a composite study of the life of Jesus, using the four Gospels, then they moved on to the Acts, and then to the Old Testament. When, many years later, priests of St. Severin and St. Joseph could write: "There is a very close connection between the renewal of biblical piety and the liturgical renewal",⁴⁶ they were expressing a debt on the part of the whole Church to the pioneer of Klosterneuburg, for in his work he gave expression to this insight.

His emphasis on the Bible led him naturally to place emphasis on preaching. He contended that liturgical preaching is not preaching about the liturgy, but rather preaching set within the liturgy. It must, therefore, be an integral part of the liturgy and infused with the liturgical spirit. But it remains preaching, the Word of God exposed through human words. In his own day many priests saw liturgical preaching as an aesthetic delicacy reserved for the few who might be interested in hearing abstruse explanations of liturgical matters, but Parsch was insistent that it must be a "grass roots" activity directed to all the people of God.

He set preaching and the Eucharist of the Body and Blood side by side: "Voilà les deux tables sur lesquelles se trouvent les deux grands trésors de l'Église: la table de la parole sainte et la table du saint sacrement."⁴⁷ Again he stated:

Les mots des lectures et de la prédication deviennent chair et sang dans le sacrifice. La prédication est baignée de la rosée de la grâce par l'eucharistie. La prédication unit la parole de Dieu au sacrifice et la transporte dans la vie; la prédication unit l'Écriture, l'eucharistie et la vie.⁴⁸

With regard to the strategy of parish work, Parsch used the method of encouraging and training a parish élite--a means that has received wide attention in recent years, though not as wide use. He described the Church as having become undernourished because for centuries she was deprived of an adequate diet of Eucharist and the Word of God. He saw her recovery coming, not through Christian society taken as a whole, but rather through a few strong and healthy individuals. "This means, practically speaking, that each pastor must devote himself to the spiritual development of the elite in his parish. Let us concentrate, not scatter, our efforts. In other words, let us not engage in extensive to the detriment of intensive work."⁴⁹

At the centre of Parsch's thinking and practice stood

the eucharistic celebration in which, with chants and actions (as described above), he tried to give the faithful the experience of participating. He used the name Betsingmesse to describe the Mass as he celebrated it at St. Gertrude, and this was widely imitated in the German-speaking lands. His hope was that this would lead to the restoration of the High Mass, the Choralamt, as the community celebration.

He saw the Bible and the liturgy, not as ends in themselves, but rather as the soil from which alone supernatural life can spring. Rauch expresses it:

La réalité de l'existence chrétienne, la vie du Christ en nous, est le trésor caché vers lequel la Bible et la Liturgie nous acheminent. Il appela cette réalité profonde Gnadenordnung, l'ordre de la grâce, toujours soucieux de s'exprimer en termes accessibles aux simples fidèles.⁵⁰

In attempting to make some assessment of Parsch's work, it can be noted that he was not a man of vision, not a great contemplative. He was rather a practical and energetic person, a man for whom life was a vivid experience. As a priest he wished Christian life to be a vivid experience for all who were members of the Church. He was not so much a daring person as one who saw no need to hesitate in putting into effect a course of action that he considered would make the Christian life more meaningful for Christian people.

He was quite content to leave research and the scientific study of liturgy in the hands of others, while he concentrated on building up Christian life around the liturgy. At the International Eucharistic Congress in Barcelona in 1952 (two years before his death in 1954), Parsch gave the address at the last of the four plenary sessions. He presented the aim of his labours at Klosterneuburg as follows:

Je suis Volksliturgiker et Volksbibliker (c'est-à-dire promoteur de la liturgie du peuple et propagateur de la Bible entre les mains du peuple). Voici le but de ma vie: réintégrer le peuple chrétien dans le culte de l'Église et refaire de la Bible le livre du peuple. Depuis des siècles ces grands trésors de la religion, la Liturgie et la Bible, sont devenus étrangers à la chrétienté. Je me suis proposé comme tâche de ma vie de rétablir la participation active des fidèles au culte. Or, l'Eucharistie étant le centre de ce culte, je m'efforce depuis plus de trente ans à rendre au peuple l'intelligence de la Sainte Messe et à propager la participation active à la messe.⁵¹

He laid no claim to originality where the liturgical renewal was concerned. Indeed, he saw himself as an exponent of the parish level of initiatives that were owed to others. As Rauch has written:

Certaines initiatives issues des abbayes bénédictines allemandes Maria-Laach et Beuron, avaient été assumées dès 1919 par les Bénédictins autrichiens à Vienne, Salzburg et Seckau, et dans les milieux universitaires et étudiants le renouveau liturgique s'épanouissait,

comme en Allemagne autour du Père Abbé Ildefons Herwegen de Maria-Laach, sous l'influence de Romano Guardini et dans les mouvements de la jeunesse catholique.⁵²

It has to be said to his great credit, however, that his was a remarkable gift for expressing such initiatives at the parish level and teaching ordinary people to share in their expression.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Alphonse Heitz, "Dernières étapes du renouveau liturgique allemand," La Maison-Dieu, VII (1946), 51.

2. Cf. above p. 4.

3. Dom Thomas Michels, "Abbot Ildefons Herwegen (1874-1946)," Orate Fratres, XXI (1946-1947), 2.

4. (St.Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946).

5. Op. cit., p. 3.

6. Cf. Joseph Jungmann, S.J., Liturgical Renewal in Retrospect and Prospect (London: Burns and Oates, 1965), p. 18.

7. Dom Albert Hammenstede, "Rapport sur le mouvement liturgique en Allemagne," QLP, XV (1930), 297.

8. Ibid., p. 300.

9. Quoted by Count Robert d'Harcourt in Introduction to his translation of Guardini's Vom Geist der Liturgie, L'Esprit de la Liturgie (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1929), p. 18.

10. Ibid., pp. 28-29.

11. Romano Guardini, The Church and the Catholic and The Spirit of the Liturgy, trans. Ada Lane (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940), p. 121.

12. Ibid., p. 143.

13. Ernest Benjamin Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 29.
14. Op. cit., p. 31.
15. Cf. below pp. 186-87.
16. Cf. below pp. 128-39.
17. Dom Odo Casel, The Mystery of Christian Worship (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press; London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962), p. 36.
18. Life and Liturgy, pp. 90-91.
19. Op. cit., p. 54.
20. Op. cit., pp. 91-93.
21. Op. cit., pp. 300-301.
22. Op. cit., p. 61.
23. Ibid., p. 106.
24. Op. cit., p. 303.
25. Cf. op. cit., pp. 93-97.
26. Op. cit., p. 95.
27. Op. cit., pp. 9-10.
28. Ibid., p. 5.
29. Ibid., p. 7.
30. Ibid., p. 40.
31. Ibid., p. 16.
32. Op. cit., p. 301.

33. Op. cit., p. 107.
34. Cf. op. cit., pp. 79-80.
35. Burkhard Neunheuser (ed.) in his Preface to Casel's The Mystery of Christian Worship, p. xiii, n. 3, refers to the preface to the liturgical calendar issued by Klosterneuburg for 1926, and the Jahr des Heiles, tenth edition, 1932.
36. Cf. above p. 25.
37. Pius Parsch, Le Renouveau liturgique au service de la paroisse, traduit sur la seconde édition par l'abbé Marcel Grandclaudon (Mulhouse: Editions Salvator, 1950), p. 8.
38. Ibid., p. 9.
39. Ibid., p. 11.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., p. 12.
42. Charles Rauch, "Un promoteur du mouvement liturgique: Pius Parsch (1884-1954)," La Maison-Dieu, XL bis (1955), 152.
43. (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1935), pp. 135-138.
44. Rauch, op. cit., p. 152.
45. Op. cit., p. 260.
46. What is the Liturgical Movement?, p. 54.
47. Op. cit., p. 245.
48. Ibid., p. 242.

CHAPTER V

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT COMES TO MATURITY

It is necessary now that some account be given of what effect the thought of the men discussed in the previous chapter had, and of the progress of the liturgical renewal in Germany and Austria.

In Chapter iv Maria Laach was defended against the charge of being too academic in its interest, on the ground that the first concern of men such as Abbot Herwegen and Dom Casel was for the health and welfare of the Church.¹ Nevertheless it is unquestionable that it was an educated élite that was first influenced by the thought emanating from Maria Laach. The first publications were addressed chiefly to academic circles. But a significant development took place when young people, including those at high schools, became aware of and enthused about new liturgical thinking through their participation in the many Catholic youth movements. Jungmann summarizes this early stage of development as follows:

49. Pius Parsch, "Intensive or Extensive Pastoral Care?," OF, XXI (1946-1947), 436.
50. Op. cit., p. 156.
51. Quoted ibid., pp. 150-51.
52. Ibid., pp. 153-54.

And so there arose a liturgical movement which affected primarily the young students and yet was also the affair of the cultured and learned. At this time, the archaeological and aesthetic interests were paramount. The liturgical movement looked as if it might remain limited to educated circles. This was one of the reasons why priests whose prime concern was the care of souls (and also the ecclesiastical authorities) regarded this new movement with a certain amount of suspicion, and thought it was just a fashion which, like the fashions of women's clothing, would soon pass away.²

Mention was also made in the previous chapter of the fact that the dialogue Mass was introduced in Germany when the first Liturgical Week for laymen was held at Maria Laach in Holy Week 1914.³ Once again, the youth movements were quick to become interested and began experiments with the dialogue Mass.

The question as to whether or not the Gemeinschafts-messe or missa dialogata was permissible was referred to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and in 1922 the Congregation issued its first Decree on this subject. As Jungmann remarks, it "typically expresses the situation and outlook of those days."⁴ It stated that for the people to answer the priest was not in itself unlawful; but because something is lawful, it does not follow that it is also useful. The Sacred Congregation felt that if the people answered the priest, some who did not like the practice might be upset, or priests celebrating

Mass at neighbouring altars might be disturbed. Hence it would be better to adhere to the usual custom.

The dialogue Mass was not, however, discontinued, for people were captured by the new sense of participation that it gave them.

The movement now began to move out of academic and youth circles and to be expressed at the parish level in places such as Klosterneuburg and Leipzig. The influence of the progressive ideas set forth in Pastor Pinsk's Liturgisches Leben, started in 1934 as a successor to Liturgische Zeitschrift, has already been spoken of.⁵ Dr. Johannes Wagner, speaking of the decade preceding the Second World War, says:

Le mouvement s'émancipe en effet de la tutelle bénédictine, franchit la clôture des monastères, se détache des groupes d'oblats ou des cercles académiques, se voit accueilli par le laïcat, particulièrement par la jeunesse catholique, et agit de plus en plus profondément sur les paroisses. Vers la fin de cette décennie, il ne se trouve guère de paroisse en Allemagne qui n'ait été touchée d'une façon ou d'une autre par le mouvement liturgique.⁶

The National Socialist Party came to power in Germany in 1933, and from 1936 the Church's activities other than the cult were progressively curtailed. People were thus driven to give attention to the Church's worship, and indeed to

discover new significance and power there. To quote Wagner again:

Que de messes célébrées à cette époque, messes solennelles ou messes basses, dont l'intensité demeurait inoubliable! La force qui en émanait permettait d'en vivre longtemps après. Célébrations dans des caves et des abris ou dans des casemates quelque part sur le front de Russie, n'importe où; on se souvient à présent de ces temps-là comme d'une époque héroïque.⁷

The political situation and the outbreak of the War were very disturbing influences in Germany and so in the life of the Church as well. Dismay and disquiet were reflected in the progress of the liturgical movement. There was a lack of unanimity, of order, and indeed of control over the ideas and the experiments through which the movement was expressing itself. The forces of disapproval gathered strength and in 1939 the sensational book by Fr. M. Kassiepe, OMI, Irrwege und Umwege der Frömmigkeitsleben der Gegenwart, attacking the liturgical movement, was published. (The second edition, published the following year, was more moderate.) Kassiepe's book defended prevailing devotional practices.

The movement in Germany had reached a crisis point, and indeed the difficult and uncertain situation would continue for some time. The immediate danger was that, as in

the case of the Modernist Movement, there might be an outright condemnation.

About this time Romano Guardini wrote a long letter to Mgr Stohr, the Bishop of Mainz. The letter does not mention Kassiepe's book by name but, speaking of critics of the movement as it does, it would seem that the book had been published.

Balanced and informed as the letter was in its assessment of the situation, it convinced the bishop of the necessity and value of what the movement was trying to achieve. It was published, together with the bishop's reply, and several years later La Maison-Dieu reprinted it in translation.⁸ (The letter as printed in La Maison-Dieu bears no date.)

It appears that the bishop had requested Guardini's counsel, for the letter begins: "Tu as souhaité un exposé des points de vue où l'on peut se placer pour porter un jugement sur les problèmes liturgiques dont on discute depuis quelque temps."⁹ Guardini in turn, towards the end of the letter, requested the bishop's help:

Mais permets-moi encore d'exprimer une crainte que font naître ces inquiétudes même: c'est que l'autorité ne fasse avorter tout le travail . . . C'est pourquoi, fort de la confiance que tu m'as accordée,

je te demande avec autant d'instance que de gravité d'aider à empêcher le danger que je viens de signaler de devenir réalité.¹⁰

The need for some authoritative oversight or direction of the liturgical movement was discussed at a private meeting held at Fulda in August 1939, called to draft a new edition of the Kirchengebet, the prayer book of the Jungmannerverband, the young people's association. At this meeting, it was decided that Mgr Landesdorfer, the Bishop of Passau (who was also a Benedictine), Prof. Josef Jungmann, Romano Guardini, Dr. Heinrich von Meurers, the Vicar-General of Trier, and Dr. Heinrich Kahlefeld, a Leipzig Oratorian, should be asked to be a liturgical committee. This group met for the first and only time in October 1939 at the Abbey of Schweielberg, because at Fulda in August 1940 the Bishops' Conference resolved to take control of liturgical matters.

The Conference appointed Mgr Stohr of Mainz (responsible for youth work) and Bishop Landesdorfer to report on liturgical matters. The two bishops thus constituted a Liturgisches Referat. They in turn appointed a Liturgische Kommission, made up of the group already mentioned, together with new appointees from Maria-Laach, Beuron, Klosterneuburg, Rothenfels, Altenberg, Leipzig, Trier, as well as certain

noted people and some other priests. This much enlarged Commission met twice a year for several days at a time. In the meanwhile, in 1941, another book hostile to the liturgical movement appeared: J. Dörner's, Sentire cum Ecclesia. This book was published even though it was refused the Imprimatur of Mainz and the Bishop disavowed it. It succeeded in influencing the Church, not only in Germany but beyond, against the liturgical movement. Heitz states: "Ce dernier volume fut surtout abondamment répandu en Italie. Il toucha des autorités hiérarchiques non averties du problème allemand, il remua profondément l'opinion."¹¹

In 1942, the Liturgisches Referat published an official guide to the arrangement of parochial religious services. These Richtlinien were the result of nearly ten years of discussion that had been taking place on the form of the dialogue Mass and most of the bishops put them into effect.

The regulations distinguished between the community Mass, the community Mass with chants, and the Missa recitata. (The last was intended for established religious communities in which Latin was understood, and was not used in parishes.) The two community Masses differed in that in the case of the first, a hymn in German was sung only at the beginning and at the end of the Mass, whereas in the case of the second, there

was singing at many points throughout the Service. Kolbe notes that:

Ce qui caractérise ces formes de célébration, c'est l'emploi presque exclusif de la langue vulgaire, c'est-à-dire que même à l'Oraison, la Préface et la Postcommunion, c'est la voix du lecteur récitant ces textes en allemand qui se fait entendre, et non celle du célébrant.¹²

With regard to High Mass, the directives upheld as the model the High Mass in Latin, with Gregorian chants, and with the active participation of the people. High Mass with polyphonic music was not encouraged. The German High Mass (Deutsches Hochamt) was given authorisation, "là où elle est célébrée en vertu d'un privilège."¹³

Faced with a liturgical movement in Germany that had led to conflict and to opposing factions being ranged against each other, the Holy See through Cardinal Bertram, the Archbishop of Breslau and chairman of the German Bishops' Conference, asked for a report on the situation in Germany. Cardinal Bertram's circular letter to the German bishops was dated 15 January 1943.¹⁴ It recommended to the bishops that all discussion on this subject be forbidden.

Archbishop Groeber of Freiburg wrote, at almost the same time (his letter was dated 18 January 1943), his famous seventeen-point Memorandum to the German hierarchy and to

Rome on the study of theology, the ecumenical movement, biblical interpretation, and the liturgical movement. The letter expressed a very reactionary point of view, and it is well to quote from it in some detail, for Mgr. Groeber's objections throw into sharp relief the thinking and, to a certain extent the practice, that were current in Germany at the time. It also provides important background to the issue of the two encyclicals, Mystici Corporis Christi (1943) and Mediator Dei (1947).

Mgr. Groeber was much disturbed to observe:

1. La scission spirituelle évidente au sein du clergé allemand.
 . . . [les "liturgistes"] considèrent ceux qui ne marchent pas avec eux comme des hommes d'hier, comme d'éternels retardataires. . . .
-
- III. Une nouvelle définition de la foi. [Qui n'est plus présente que comme un saisissement, une émotion, une intuition intérieure.]

- V. Le radicalisme d'une critique des formes et des institutions de la vie religieuse contemporaine. [On ne prône désormais que des formes tout à fait pures, et on n'admet comme seules normes, théoriques et pratiques, que les formes des temps primitifs.]

- IX. Une conception nouvelle de l'Église. [On ne voit plus en elle la societas perfecta, le Regnum Christi in terris auctoritate apostolica regendum, mais une espèce d'organisme biologique.]
- X. Un supranaturalisme sublime et mystique qui sévit dans la théologie et même dans la pratique pastorale.
- XI. Un épanouissement surprenant et terrifiant

de ce qu'on appelle maintenant la mystique du Christ (Christusmystik).

XII. L'interprétation fautive ou exagérée de la doctrine du Corps mystique du Christ.

XIII. L'accentuation exagérée du sacerdoce universel aux dépens du sacerdoce fonctionnel.

. . . Dans cette conception, c'est la paroisse (et non plus le seul clergé) qui devient l'élément essentiel du culte, comme chez les protestants. . . .

XIV. La communion des fidèles présentée comme partie intégrante du sacrifice de la messe.

XV. Une importance exagérée attachée à la liturgie.

. . . Après tout, les choses n'allaient pas si mal dans l'Eglise avant l'apparition du mouvement liturgique.

XVI. Le fait de vouloir rendre obligatoire par décisions épiscopales la messe communautaire sous ses différentes formes.

XVII. La tentative d'introduire la langue allemande non seulement dans l'administration des sacrements (ce qui nécessite d'ailleurs toujours l'autorisation de la Congrégation des rites), mais même dans la célébration de la sainte messe.

15

Mgr. Groeber's memorandum ended with an appeal for the intervention of the German episcopate and the Holy See.

The Archbishop's ill-concealed choler was perhaps somewhat mollified by the many replies that he received. One in particular from Cardinal Innitzer--it was sent to Rome also--was written with great equanimity on 24 February 1943 in the name of the Austrian bishops.¹⁶

Cardinal Bertram sent his report, in the name of the German bishops, to Rome on 10 April 1943. In his letter

he strongly supported the liturgical renewal and defended the community Mass, the community Mass with chants, and the German High Mass. He also requested a number of indulgences for the German Church, such as that the extenuation of the discipline of the eucharistic fast be continued after the war, there be a new Latin translation of the Psalter, an enrichment of the Ritual by the insertion of passages of Holy Scripture, and the transfer of the Holy Thursday and Good Friday ceremonies to the evening.

The encyclical, Mystici Corporis Christi, was issued on 29 June 1943, and undoubtedly the situation in Germany had prompted the issue of this letter to the Church. As was the case with Mediator Dei four years later, the Holy See was trying to channel the renewal that was being widely promoted, and to stamp out errors.

In Mystici Corporis, the Pope does recognize the organic nature of the Church in contrast to the canonical, juridical understanding that Mgr. Groeber's ninth thesis supports. At the same time the hierarchical nature of the Church is emphasized. It is stated, for instance:

That those who exercise sacred power in this Body are its first and chief members, must be maintained uncompromisingly. It is through them, by commission of the Divine Redeemer Himself, that Christ's apostolate as Teacher, King and Priest is to endure (17).¹⁷

Again, grace is defined in a static, hierarchical manner, rather than in a free, dynamic, interpersonal way. The Pope writes:

As He hung upon the Cross, Christ Jesus not only appeased the justice of the Eternal Father which had been violated, but He also won for us, His brethren, an ineffable flow of graces. It was possible for Him of Himself to impart these graces to mankind directly; but He willed to do so only through a visible Church made up of men, so that through her all might cooperate with Him in dispensing the graces of Redemption (12).

To put a conclusion negatively, the encyclical did not make it impossible for the liturgical renewal to proceed; indeed, with some degree of qualification, it gave it its support.

A second encyclical in 1943, Divino Afflante Spiritu, issued on 30 September, was devoted to Sacred Scripture. It gave greater freedom in the interpretation of Scripture and recognized the best original texts as being of greater authority than the Vulgate.

On 24 December 1943, Cardinal Maglione, Secretary of State, wrote to Cardinal Bertram informing him that on 11 November there had been a plenary session of the cardinals of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. The good in the liturgical movement was praised, but experimentation was

condemned and public discussion forbidden. Permission for dialogue Mass was granted and the Deutsches Hochamt, the German High Mass, was sympathetically tolerated, even though it was contrary to the rubrics in that the faithful were singing in the vernacular during the Mass. (This practice had existed in Germany for centuries.) It is interesting to note that Cardinal Bertram, when he in turn wrote to the German bishops, and presumably relaying what was said by Cardinal Maglione, mentions that the more extreme members of the liturgical movement in attempting to re-establish the usage of the primitive Church, oppose certain forms of solemn devotion approved by the Church: devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the holy Rosary, the confession of devotion, the practice of distributing Communion outside of Mass. These aberrations, he stated, could not be tolerated.

It is clear that in the German Church there was too great haste and perhaps irresponsibility on the part of some; on the part of others ignorance and misinformation, with their consequence, suspicion. At the same time in the Church generally there were those who were promoting the need for change, whereas others were opposed to it. At the centre the Holy See, not noted for being adventurous, had to try to act wisely in an unsettled situation. It must be said

in praise of the German Liturgical Commission that it did not enter into controversy, but tried to act as constructively as possible.

In 1947 the Liturgical Institute at Trier was founded under the direction of Dr. Johannes Wagner, secretary of the German Liturgical Commission. (In the same year a chair of Liturgy was founded in the Faculty of Theology at Trier, with Professor Balthasar Fischer as its first occupant.) In June 1950 the Institute organized the first German Liturgical Congress, which dealt with the Sunday celebration of the Eucharist.

What, it must now be asked, was happening in France? At the beginning of this study considerable importance was attached to the remote preparation provided by Dom Guéranger and the Abbey of Solesmes for the bringing to birth of the liturgical renewal. But the twentieth century renewal did not become a full part of the life of the Church in France until the period immediately after the Second World War. This is not to say that France was completely isolated from what was happening in other parts of Europe, for there was contact with the Belgian movement and in a more limited degree with the German. (Robert d'Harcourt's translation of and long introduction to Gardini's Vom Geist der Liturgie,

was published in 1929.) But this contact was in the main on an intellectual level, and there was no widespread and concerted movement in the Church in France.

The manifesto of the Centre de Pastorale liturgique (founded in 1943) states that the movement has continued to make progress in France over the past twenty years, due in particular to the use of Missals and the spread of Gregorian chant. But it notes "sans pessimisme exagéré", that the movement has not reached full development. It continues:

C'est dire que chez nous, le mouvement liturgique est resté limité, qu'il a atteint des individus et peut-être transformé leur vie intérieure, mais qu'il n'a pas pénétré pratiquement la masse du peuple fidèle. Qu'on entre dans une de nos églises, un dimanche, au hasard; sauf de très rares exceptions, on n'aura pas l'impression que le renouveau liturgique soit sorti du domaine de l'écrit ou de la pensée pour entrer dans celui des moeurs.¹⁸

The seriousness of the religious situation in France was brought home in 1942 with the publication of the book, La France, pays de mission?, by Fathers H. Godin and Y. Daniel. There were others priests, too, who in their own parishes attempted to tackle the problem presented by de-Christianized homes and industrial centres, notably Fr. Michonneau in Paris and Fr. Remillieux in Lyons. Fr. Michonneau continued to work within the concept of the parish as a

geographical area,¹⁹ whereas others felt that the parish concept was no longer viable, and favoured rather the idea of the gathered community. But at any rate, it was such men who recognized the value of and need for liturgical renewal. The Jesuit, Fr. Paul Doncoeur, had given his support to the liturgical movement many years before, and he did much to popularize the liturgy among French youth.

In 1942, also, a series of pamphlets on the liturgy, La Clarté-Dieu, began to be issued at Lyons, and an attempt was made to establish contact with the German movement. Important works by men such as Casel, Pinski, and Parsch were translated and circulated. This activity culminated in the founding on 20 May 1943 of the Centre de Pastorale Liturgique.

The situation in France with regard to the liturgy at this time was getting out of hand--as had been the case in Germany shortly before. Experimentation was taking place and unauthorized freedoms were being exercised. Canon Martimort says: "On peut dire que le C.P.L. est né à un moment de confusion extrême."²⁰

The Centre was founded by two Dominicans, Fathers P. Duployé and A.-M. Roguet, with the help of Canon

Martimort, O.P., the Benedictines and also the Jesuits. Dom Lambert Beauduin, living in France at the time, was able to be of service and made a valuable contribution to the founding of the Centre. Canon Martimort says of the importance of the step that was taken:

La nouveauté apportée par le C.P.L., s'il faut parler de nouveauté, a été double: d'une part réunir en un faisceau toutes ces bonnes volontés, ces compétences, et ces tendances diverses, être un organe de regroupement, de contact, d'information mutuelle, d'autre part d'affirmer le caractère pastoral de la liturgie. Ce n'est pas un centre de pastorale et de liturgie comme on l'a dit parfois avec inexactitude; c'est un centre de pastorale liturgique. Nouveauté bien relative d'ailleurs, puisque cet aspect pastoral de la liturgie avait été vigoureusement mis en lumière par le mouvement belge dès 1910 et par le mouvement liturgique allemand entre les deux guerres.²¹

The Centre set about its work in a most wise and perceptive manner. Its directors recognized the need for the pastoral problems of the liturgy to be clearly perceived and understood, before solutions could be worked out. The opinions, therefore, and feelings of pastors and people, especially "des fidèles 'engagés,'"²² had to be heard. The great variety and variation among these because of sociological and geographical differences had to be taken cognizance of. In cases where information in depth was needed, pastoral and sociological studies had to be made.

It was also recognized that any renewal that the Centre promoted had to be on the basis of sound principles. And so it was necessary that permanent dialogue between pastors and scholars be maintained. "On peut dire que ce dialogue est l'essentiel de la méthode de travail du C.P.L."²³ At least once a year, and sometimes more often, study sessions were held which brought together parish priests, chaplains, and other workers in the field, with specialists in liturgical history, patristics, biblical studies, and canon law. Canon Martimort could report in the early 1950's that bit by bit the essential outlines of the liturgical structure were emerging. These he described as:

Par quelque côté qu'on l'aborde on se trouve toujours ramené à l'essentiel: le mystère paschal, mort et résurrection du Christ, --l'Église, --l'assemblée. Et toujours aussi on revient nécessairement à l'Écriture sainte, à laquelle la liturgie est tellement liée qu'il ne peut y avoir de renouveau liturgique sans un renouveau biblique et réciproquement.²⁴

The C.P.L. was not under the direct authority of the hierarchy, and in this respect was in a somewhat anomalous position. But it was felt from the beginning that freedom of research and initiative were needed and would be safeguarded, if it could operate independently, in an unofficial capacity. Of course, proper contact was maintained with the hierarchy, and Canon Martimort notes:

. . . aussi a-t-il bénéficié, depuis ses débuts, de la présence d'évêques dans les réunions de son comité directeur et dans ses sessions d'études, présence qui n'était pas une simple manifestation de sympathie, mais une participation effective au travail.²⁵

It is worth quoting an early assessment of the work of the C.P.L. by Fr. Ives Congar:

Une chose qui distingue sans doute l'effort du Centre de Pastorale liturgique de tout autre effort parallèle et qui reflète bien l'esprit de l'équipe dominicaine qui l'anime, c'est une sorte d'atmosphère laïque, je veux dire pas close, pas confinée, mais large, ouverte, franche; c'est une mise en rapports des problèmes proprement d'Église avec la vérité humaine de la vie: avec l'art, l'histoire, la sociologie, la psychologie. C'est une sorte de sympathie et de confiance envers l'oeuvre des hommes coopérant à celle de Dieu. C'est une note, aujourd'hui si rare, de joie.²⁶

Following the example of the Belgian movement, the C.P.L. promoted its work through study sessions and conferences and through its publications. Its first official gathering was held at Vanves in January 1944, and the first National Congress of Pastoral Liturgy was held at Saint-Flour from 30 August - 2 September 1945, to discuss the topic: La messe paroissiale du dimanche. At the latter about two hundred people were expected--eight hundred came. Every year since then the Centre has organized study meetings at Vanves and Versailles.

Shortly after its founding, the C.P.L. began to issue excellent publications. There was first a series called Lex Orandi, similar to Maria Laach's Ecclesia Orans. This provided monographs which brought the thought of the liturgical movement to educated French readers. The first titles in the series were: Études de pastorale liturgique, Le Mémorial du Seigneur by Casel, and Rousseau's Histoire du mouvement liturgique. Number 6 was another of Casel's works: Le Mystère du culte dans le christianisme.²⁷

Then in 1945, when the first two numbers of Lex Orandi had already appeared, an excellent periodical, La Maison-Dieu, made its début. It was (and has continued to be) issued quarterly. It was stated in the first issue: "La Maison-Dieu est une expression abondante et explicite des principes, des buts, de l'atmosphère du C.P.L. Elle se présente par son existence. Elle n'a pas à se présenter elle-même reduplicative."²⁸ Among liturgical publications La Maison-Dieu has won international recognition for itself. Two other publications soon followed La Maison-Dieu: L'Art Sacré, a bi-monthly devoted to liturgical art, and Fêtes et Saisons, a popular illustrated periodical for the general public enjoying a high circulation.

If the movement in France was slow to become a widespread movement in the French Church, this tardiness was quickly overcome, and developments,²⁹ greatly assisted as has been shown by the work of the C.P.L., took place rapidly. On 28 November 1947 (Mediator Dei was issued on 20 November), a bilingual ritual was approved for use in France. The texts were simply translations of the Rituale Romanum without any emendations or additions, but this was a step forward, and in due course similar rituals were published in the major modern languages for general use throughout the Church.

After Belgium, Germany and Austria, and up to 1950, France is the last country in which the liturgical movement had assumed major proportions in the life of the Church nationally, and where influence on the life of the Church generally had resulted. The force of the movement was being felt in other countries in Europe also, but in some as ripples, some as isolated currents, others as a swell, rather than as a full tide. It will suffice for a brief glance to be turned now to Holland, Spain and Portugal, and Italy.

It is interesting to note that the Dutch Church, which in recent years has been considered to be one of the most avant-garde in Europe, was until around 1930 very

conscious of its "Roman" Catholicism and strong in what would now be considered conservative tendencies. This was a consequence of the fact that for a long time in Holland Roman Catholics were an oppressed minority.

As a neighbour of Belgium, Holland of course was affected by the Belgian movement. Fr. Brinkhoff states: "Le berceau de notre mouvement est vraiment situé en Belgique et c'est de là qu'il a tiré tout son aliment spirituel (Louvain, Affligem)." ³⁰ He goes on to describe, however, that as there were no Benedictine monasteries in Holland, the local movement had a different orientation--it began with parish clergy. And so from the outset it was parochial and pastoral in emphasis, and did not markedly evolve towards "une pastorale liturgique" as the movement did in some other countries. At the same time, it appears that there was a less spontaneous growth of the movement in Holland than, for instance, in Belgium. The approval and permission of the hierarchy--not in a restrictive sense--appear to have accompanied the movement's progress.

In all the dioceses liturgical societies, mainly for the clergy, came into being, and as early as 1915 these were linked in a "Federation of Dutch diocesan liturgical societies."

There was a very even and gradual development. In 1930 booklets with the Sunday Mass began to be distributed on a large scale, and in 1933 several religious orders undertook the holding of Mass and sacraments weeks.

In 1944 an episcopal liturgical directory was published. Fr. Brinkhoff comments on this:

Actuellement, il est un peu vieilli, il nous semble quelquefois trop rubrical, mais il a l'avantage d'avoir officiellement reconnu et sanctionné l'apostolat liturgique, et il a donné de ce fait une forte impulsion au mouvement.³¹

A major international congress was planned to be held at Maastricht in August 1946. Post-war conditions made this impossible, however, and a much smaller congress was held instead. This congress was attended by Frs. Doncoeur, Duployé, and Roguet from France, and it was on this occasion that contact between the French and Dutch movements was established. Fr. Doncoeur's words regarding the post-war religious situation were new and disturbing to most of those attending the congress.

In 1947, the review, Tijdschrift voor Liturgie, of the Benedictine Abbey at Affligem became the official review of the Dutch Federation.

The liturgical movement has made slow progress in Spain and Portugal. Fr. Floristan credits the Benedictines

with laying the foundation of the renewal in Spain. He writes: "En Espagne, comme dans presque tous les autres pays, le renouveau liturgique a pris son origine dans les monastères bénédictins. L'influence des abbayes espagnoles de Silos (Castille) et de Montserrat (Catalogne) est incontestable."³² The Spanish Civil War convulsed the country and the Church was grievously affected. Nearly seven thousand priests and over fifteen bishops were executed, so that a long recovery was necessary, and it is understandable that liturgical renewal has been slow. In the major liturgical periodicals only occasionally does an item concerning renewal in Portugal appear.

Italy, too, within the period of this study, presents a largely indifferent picture. Mention was made in Chapter i of the musical excesses and abuses prevalent in the churches in Italy and to counteract which Pope Pius X issued his Motu Proprio on Sacred Music in 1903.³³ Seasoltz says that "The Italian liturgical renewal was considered from the start under the aspect of sacred music, . . ."³⁴ and Fr. Falsini states: "Pourtant le réveil liturgique, sous forme du mouvement grégorien, remonte aux dernières années du 19e siècle."³⁵

The Italian people tend to be traditionalist, and devotions play an important part in the practice of their religion; Italy became a single nation in comparatively recent times; the literacy rate has been well below the level of that of some other European countries; and the life of the Church has been static for a long period--all factors that make renewal a difficult task.

The Benedictines are again praised as the pioneers and promoters of renewal. To quote Fr. Falsini once more:

1914 peut être considéré comme l'année de la naissance officielle du mouvement liturgique italien, avec la publication de la Rivista Liturgica par les Pères Bénédictins de Finalpia. Ces Bénédictins, avec ceux de Parme, furent vraiment les pionniers et les généreux apôtres du mouvement, au milieu des plus grandes difficultés.³⁶

It can be stated, however, that the Centro di Azione Liturgica (C.A.L.) was formally established in 1948.

In this study, it is possible to make only passing mention of the influence of the liturgical renewal on church art and architecture. And yet it is here, especially in architecture, that the contemporary freshness and vitality of the movement can literally be seen.

In the twentieth century, architecture as an art has experienced a thoroughgoing renewal. It was in 1923 that Le Corbusier published his epoch-making book, Vers une

Architecture. Hammond says of the modern movement in architecture: "In essence it was a revolt against the falsehood of an approach to architecture which had degraded the architect into a purveyor of assorted styles and historical souvenirs, and which had isolated the most social of the arts from the daily life of the community."³⁷ Architecture and the Church were both seeking to recover an integrity, a full and honest self-realization, and the time was thus ripe for them to cooperate.

The renewal of church architecture in Europe took place for the most part in Germany up until 1933 when the National Socialists came to power. Already in 1922 a group of clergy, architects and artists, including Abbot Herwegen and Romano Guardini, was formed to study the basic principles of modern church design. The liturgical movement, rediscovering as it was the meaning of the liturgy in the life of the Church, was thus raising the question, How can the building best serve the liturgy? Rudolf Schwarz and Dominikus Bohm were two outstanding examples of architects who worked from theological principles in the designing of churches, and they were both deeply involved in the programme of research and experiment carried out in Germany between the wars. Schwarz's first church, Corpus Christi at Aachen

(consecrated in 1930), and Bohm's St. Englebert at Cologne (consecrated in 1932), are two of the earliest examples of churches which express the potentialities "of a living architecture as an instrument of a living liturgy."³⁸

No mention has been made of Switzerland in this study, but here it can be noted that church architecture in that country, from about 1933 on, has received wide acclaim.

The German Liturgical Commission in 1946 published a set of Guiding Principles for the Design of Churches, according to the Spirit of the Roman Liturgy.³⁹ These directives are a striking expression of insights that have been recovered, and the churches built in Western Germany in the reconstruction following the war bear testimony to the renewal of the Church's life that the liturgical movement has brought about.

The liturgical movement was to receive special attention from the Holy See when on 20 November 1947 the encyclical, Mediator Dei, was issued. On 18 September (two months before) the Pope had given an important address in the Basilica of St. Paul outside the Walls on the occasion of the fourteenth centennial celebrations in honour of St. Benedict. A part of his address was devoted to the

liturgical movement and formed a prelude to the publication of the encyclical.

The encyclical has often been described as the Magna Carta of the movement and was the first encyclical ever to be devoted entirely to the liturgy. Seasoltz makes the following brief assessment of it:

Although it is generally positive in tone, it contains many statements which reflect the spirit of unrest which the liturgical movement had engendered in various European countries. Nevertheless, the document gave the liturgical renewal a decisive impetus.⁴⁰

Mediator Dei can be considered a sequel to Mystici Corporis. In it there is no open disavowal of liturgical theory and practice which the work of scholars in the half century before had shown to come from periods of decadence and misunderstanding of the liturgy. In fact, the encyclical supports much of the inheritance of the past. At the same time it gave recognition to the movement and, by discussing the thought of those who promoted the liturgical renewal, it brought their thinking into the open and publicised it.

The encyclical praises the revival of liturgical studies, and it recognizes that the liturgy, as a part of the life of an organism, must grow and adapt itself to

changing needs and circumstances. But it adds: "This notwithstanding, the temerity and daring of those who introduce novel liturgical practices, or call for the revival of obsolete rites out of harmony with prevailing laws and rubrics, deserve severe reproof" (59).⁴¹

It can be said, generally speaking, that the liturgical movement at its best has promoted a dynamic concept of the Church, whereas for a long time a static concept had prevailed. The movement has placed great emphasis on the importance of community in the life of the Church. In this connection the encyclical encourages participation on the part of the faithful in the liturgy (following the Motu Proprio of 1903 as would be expected), and it declares that it is a mistake to think of the liturgy as an "ornamental ceremonial" (25)--echoes of Père Navatel!--but it approves of attitudes and practices that work against and deny true community.

The hierarchical priesthood, for instance, is reaffirmed: "Let all then who would live in Christ, flock to their priests. By them they will be supplied with the comforts and food of the spiritual life" (43). Furthermore, the teaching that in the New Testament "priesthood" is applied to all who have been baptized, and therefore that at

the Eucharist priest and people should "concelebrate", is declared to be "captious error" (84). It is re-affirmed that it is the priest who is the essential agent in the offering of the Mass (92), a static concept of the Mass is thus maintained, and private Masses (although, as prescribed, a server should be present) are approved (95-97). It is admitted that the people offer, but "in a different sense" (85). Again, the practice of people communicating before or after Mass, and the use of pre-consecrated Hosts, is given full recognition (122). Finally, the use of Latin as a sign of unity is lauded, but the door is left open for the use of the vernacular, provided permission has been obtained from the Holy See (60).

The encyclical speaks of the emphasis by some on "so-called 'objective' piety" (28) to the extent that "subjective" piety is belittled. It strongly disapproves of this and just as strongly supports the traditional devotions, of which the chief are listed as: "meditation on spiritual things, diligent examination of conscience, enclosed retreats, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, and those special prayers in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary among which the rosary, as all know, has pride of place" (174).

Strictures are also declared against modern writers who, "deceived by the illusion of a higher mysticism, dare to assert that attention should be paid not to the historic Christ but to a 'pneumatic' or glorified Christ" (162).

The encyclical re-emphasizes that in the Catholic faith the Redeemer on the Cross constitutes the principal mystery of man's redemption, and so that this is the image that should adorn churches (162-164).

With the publication of Mediator Dei the liturgical movement had come to maturity. The long years of work were now rewarded with the official recognition that a renewal was taking place in the life of the Church. The renewal was by no means complete, for much work remained to be done, and unexpected developments would take place, but now, as had not been the case before, and willingly or unwillingly, the whole Church was a part of the renewal.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Cf. above pp. 105-107.
2. Liturgical Renewal in Retrospect and Prospect, p. 19.
3. Cf. above p. 106.
4. Op. cit., p. 21.
5. Cf. above pp. 110-111.
6. Johannes Wagner, "Le mouvement liturgique en Allemagne." Rapport du Dr. Johannes Wagner à la rencontre liturgique de Luxembourg, 22 juillet 1950. La Maison-Dieu, XXV (1951), 75.
7. Ibid., pp. 76-77.
8. "Lettre de Romano Guardini à S. Exc. Mgr L'Evêque de Mayence," La Maison-Dieu, III (1945), 7-24. The two letters originally published as Ein Wort zur liturgischen Frage by Matthias Grünewald, 1940.
9. Ibid., p. 8.
10. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
11. "Dernières étapes . . .," La Maison-Dieu, VII (1946), pp. 64-65.
12. Ferdinand Kolbe, "Allemagne," La Maison-Dieu, LXXIV (1963), 48. (Issue devoted to "Le renouveau liturgique dans le monde.")
13. Ibid., quoting the Preface of the Richtlinien, 1953 edition (Trier, Paulinus Verlag).

14. Printed in translation, La Maison-Dieu, III (1946), 105-107.
15. "Memorandum de S.E. Mgr Groeber, Archevêque de Fribourg," trans. P. Duployé, ibid., 97-104.
16. Trans. H. Chirat, ibid., 108-114.
17. (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943).
18. La Maison-Dieu, I (1945), 172.
19. Cf. G. Michonneau and H.C. Chéry, Paroisse, communauté missionnaire (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1945).
20. "A Travers les Revues--Dix Ans de Pastorale liturgique en France." Résumé of an article by Canon Martimort, a director of the C.P.L., published in L'Ami du Clergé, 9 December 1954. La Maison-Dieu, XL bis (1955), 170.
21. Ibid., p. 171.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., p. 172.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., pp. 172-73.
26. La Maison-Dieu, XVI (1948), 163, quoting Bilan français (Paris: Editions du Monde Nouveau, 1948), p. 43.
27. The publishing house of the C.P.L. is Editions du Cerf, Paris.
28. La Maison-Dieu, I (1945), 171.

29. Reference was made in Chapter iii (pp. 73-74) to the establishment after World War II by the Institut catholique de Paris, under the direction of Dom Botte, of the first liturgical institute on the university plan.

30. P. Luc Brinkhoff, O.F.M., (Interdiocesaan Liturgisch Secretariaat, Alverne), "Le mouvement liturgique en Hollande," La Maison-Dieu, XL bis (1955), 158.

31. Ibid., p. 159.

32. Casiano Floristan, "Espagne," La Maison-Dieu, LXXIV (1963), 109.

33. Cf. above p. 30.

34. The New Liturgy, p. xxvi.

35. Rinaldo Falsini, o.f.m., "Italie," La Maison-Dieu, LXXIV (1963), 155-56.

36. Ibid., p. 156.

37. Peter Hammond, Liturgy and Architecture (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1960), p. 51.

38. Ibid., p. 59.

39. Printed in Peter Hammond (ed.), Towards a Church Architecture (London: Architectural Press, 1962), pp. 248-54.

40. Op. cit., pp. xxxiii-xxxiv.

41. (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, n.d.).

CONCLUSION

This study has attempted to explore the origins and development of the liturgical movement in the Roman Catholic Church in Europe up to 1950. It has been shown how a renewed interest in the liturgy and in liturgical studies arose when Dom Prosper Guéranger, filled with admiration and romantic nostalgia for the Middle Ages, the great "Age of Faith," re-founded the Benedictine monastery at Solesmes in France and set to work to do all he could to establish the Church again in her former glory.

For all its weakness in several respects, Dom Guéranger's work had a direct influence on the work begun in the Benedictine monasteries in Belgium under the influence of Dom Lambert Beauduin, work which aimed to bring the average parishioner to share in the riches of the Church's liturgical life. At this stage the emphasis was on the renewal, not the reform, of the Church's worship. Apprehension of and participation in what was a present possession was the goal.

Then after the First World War the Benedictine monasteries in Germany, and in particular the monastery of Maria Laach, through the profound and careful scholarship of thinkers such as Abbot Ildefons Herwegen and Dom Odo Casel, began to recover a rich and vital understanding of the Church, and so of her worship. In this way, what began as a liturgical renewal passed into a renewal of the whole life of the Church, for it involved a renewal of the Church's understanding of herself.

In Austria, Dr. Pius Parsch made a remarkable effort at Klosterneuburg to put into effect at the parish level the insights of the liturgical and theological renewal that was in process. And in France after the Second World War the founding of the Centre de Pastorale liturgique drew together and spearheaded the movement for renewal in that country.

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century the work of renewal manifested itself in many different ways in different countries, and even in the same country. As has been shown, too, the renewal did not proceed without opposition and adverse criticism and great difficulty. But in 1947 official recognition was given to the movement when Pope Pius XII issued the encyclical Mediator Dei on the Sacred Liturgy.

This particular period has been studied as being the period of beginnings, the period of hard and patient and faithful labour. The middle of the century delimits the end of a stage as well, in the sense that a point had been made, a victory had been won. No one in the Church should have been unaware at that point that a renewal was taking place in the life of the Church, and that this was particularly applicable to her worship.

There were many steps in the renewal that would now be taken, and indeed the Church would move past renewal to reform, but the point that is made here is simply that when 1950 came the stage had been set, and set in the middle of the theatre so that all the audience could perform.

It is difficult to recapture in imagination how priestly, how much of an institution, how static the Roman Catholic Church was at the beginning of the twentieth century. Externally, the faithful were required to fulfil certain obligations such as the baptism of their children and attendance at Sunday Mass, but inwardly their spiritual life was sustained by individual and popular devotions. If there was a sense of certainty and confidence conveyed by membership in the Church, and a corresponding loyalty on the part of her members, it is also true that for most Roman Catholics

there was a passive acceptance of whatever was handed down. There was no explicit participation--in worship, in the study of the Bible, in the councils of the Church.

What then, in summary, was achieved in the half century with which this study has been concerned?

There was first a far-reaching theological recovery of the meaning of the Church as the Body of Christ, and of how this mystery is expressed in the Church's worship. Germany's contribution to the liturgical movement was above all to strengthen and deepen the theological foundation which thoughtful promoters of the movement recognized from the beginning to be a prerequisite of a sound renewal.

Following on this there developed a new awareness of the parish as a worshipping community. The parish was seen to be the local manifestation of the People of God, called in Christ to be His People, called to live in relationship with Him and with one another the New Life into which, as members of the Church, they had been born at their baptism. The parish as a worshipping community was thus seen in a new way to be the locus of grace. Growth in grace was now perceived to take place in the dynamic of life lived in relationship with God and with fellow man.

Finally, the Bible (in particular, through the work of Dr. Pius Parsch at Klosterneuburg) was given a new place and significance in the life of the people of the Church. Instead of being for most people a closed book--and it was that for many clergy also--it was now recovered as the Word of God for the People of God. Preaching, too, as a direct consequence of this, assumed new vitality and power.

The renewal, of course, and the salient features that have been described, constituted a process; it must not be thought that the whole Church was changed overnight. To a certain extent it is probably true to say that in some parts of the Church in Europe today, twenty-one years after 1950, no renewal in depth has yet taken place. But the process has been initiated. And it has been a necessary renewal in the life of the Church. Undoubtedly there are many in the Roman Catholic Church who have been disturbed by the renewal and who would much have preferred to see the Church remain as it was. Even some outside the Church have been dismayed. Malcolm Muggeridge, for instance, has written:

I used to suppose that the Roman Catholic Church, having so valiantly and obstinately defended its citadel against the assaults of a triumphant and vainglorious scientific materialism, would celebrate a well-deserved victory. Instead, to my amazement,

just when the attacking forces were about to withdraw in disarray, the citadel's defenders have opened their gates and emerged bearing white flags.¹

But truth is not the possession of the Church alone. And surely, if the Church's faith is true, it is more healthy that this should be tested openly in the world of men than that the faith should be protected behind the battlements. This is not to deny that the Church must be prepared to defend to the death what she believes to be true, but rather to affirm that she must not fear for the safety of the truth. It follows, too, from this that where men have made the truth their own and have not received it at second hand, it is a much stronger reality in their lives. At the heart of the liturgical renewal has been the recognition of the need for the faith of the members of the Church to be an explicit faith, a faith in which they participate fully as men, and not as children.

It will be of value now to relate this study briefly to developments that have taken place since 1950.

At the first German Liturgical Congress in June 1950 a proposal by Romano Guardini led to a resolution that the German bishops be asked to petition Rome for the transfer of the Holy Saturday celebration to the evening or night.

The bishops of Germany, France and Austria made this petition in November of the same year, and permission for this for an experimental period of a year was granted for Holy Saturday 1951. The night celebration of the Easter Vigil then passed into regular use. This was a most important step, for in the cycle of the Church's year the understanding of the Church's worship that the liturgical renewal had recovered gave first importance to the celebration of the Easter mysteries.

Then in November 1955, following recommendations submitted to Rome as a fruit of the Third International Study meeting held at Lugano in Italy in 1953, a revision of the whole of Holy Week was issued.

Many other meetings were held, decrees issued and permissions granted during the 1950's and early 1960's, until the Second Vatican Council took place, and on 4 December 1963 Pope Paul VI promulgated the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. The Council Fathers voted overwhelmingly in favour of it: 2147 for, 4 against.

If Mediator Dei was hailed by promoters of the liturgical renewal as an important milestone that had been reached, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy marked a

point much farther along the road. Priests of St. Severin and St. Joseph make the comment:

Those who have worked, not without opposition, for a restoration of the Church's worship to its proper place and function and have tried to promote a better understanding of it will be greatly encouraged by this Constitution, for it seems that what has come to be known as the liturgical movement has achieved at one stroke all that it has been working for for some fifty years.²

It was stated in Chapter v that at its best the liturgical movement has promoted a dynamic rather than a static³ concept of the Church, and this is fully supported by the Constitution;⁴ the granting of permission for the extended use of the vernacular is provided for (39); and the intention to reform the different service books is stated (21).

Of course, it goes without saying, and the Constitution itself recognizes this, that a programme of instruction and education was being initiated when the Constitution was approved. Certain parishes, such as those in which the liturgical renewal was already being promoted, were understandably better prepared for this, the work of renewal had already been started there; but even in these renewal was to be an ongoing process, not an objective goal that a parish could announce at a particular point in time.

It may now be asked, therefore, what is the status of the renewal in the Roman Catholic Church, not only in Europe but generally, in 1971?

Many Roman Catholics have welcomed the renewal that is taking place, but the change in the thinking and practice of many others, such as the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy requires, has literally involved an upheaval for them. Ways of thought and practice that had become established in the Church over a long period of time cannot be changed simply by the issuing of a Constitution. It is inevitable that there should be disapproval, dismay and overt hostility on the part of many to the renewal that is taking place. The task, too, of instructing people and helping them to accept change always involves a great deal of time and patience.

But there is a much more serious problem that is being identified by some thinkers. It is the problem of a world in which liturgy itself no longer seems to carry any meaning for people. In spite of the renewal, people are still ceasing to take part in the worshipping life of the Church.

In 1964, shortly after the issue of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Romano Guardini, unable to attend the

Third German Liturgical Congress in Mainz, wrote to Mgr. Wagner, organizer of the Congress. Having spoken of the work of the Vatican Council and of the work of education that lay ahead as to the meaning of the liturgical act, he went on to say:

Is not the liturgical act and, with it, all that goes under the name of "liturgy" so bound up with the historical background--antique or medieval or baroque--that it would be more honest to give it up altogether? Would it not be better to admit that man in this industrial and scientific age, with its new sociological structure, is no longer capable of a liturgical act? And instead of talking of renewal ought we not to consider how best to celebrate the sacred mysteries so that modern man can grasp their meaning through his own approach to truth?⁵

What Guardini already sensed has been stated in a more developed way by Charles Davis in an article which constituted a paper given at a consultation held in Geneva in 1969 on the subject, "Worship and Secularization." Davis's contention is that men are living in a secular age, an age in which life is lived without reference to the transcendent. Paul van Buren, in a paper delivered at the same meeting, identifies five features which mark the shift in emphasis or of relative valuation that has taken place in men's thinking in a secular world: a shift from permanence to change, from the universal to the particular, from unity

to plurality, from the absolute to the relative, and from passivity to activity.⁶

Another feature of life in a secular world that has bearing on liturgy is that symbols for many have lost their meaning and power. This is bound up with the technological advances that have taken place in the modern world; as Blackman has stated it well: "The threat of technology to culture is that people become matter-of-fact and unimaginative, and this may be a sinister step toward depersonalization and decivilization."⁷

The basic problem, Davis maintains, that the Church must recognize exists in the world today is that there is a crisis of faith. Liturgical reform has simply made this problem more apparent. He writes:

There is no modern way of being a Christian, precisely because the modern world is not Christian. Likewise the problem of worship is not that of finding modern forms of worship to replace outdated forms. It is that worship itself is outdated. There is no modern form of public worship because the modern world is secular. Unless we face this unflinchingly we shall continue to dodge the real problem and make things worse rather than better for faithful Christians by our dabbling in liturgical reform.⁸

The situation, therefore, being what it is, he concludes that it is impossible at this point in the Church's history for a modern liturgy to be created. Again he writes:

The implication of this for Christian worship is that there is no present possibility of a liturgy in the ordinary sense of that word. I speak, obviously, of a truly modern liturgy. All that the phrase "public worship" adds to "corporate worship" is impossible: namely an officially sanctioned ritual in generalized use, having stability and continuity. In other words, modern Christians can worship together; they cannot create a liturgy.⁹

The conviction in which this study is written is that the liturgical renewal in the Roman Catholic Church was a necessary renewal, and that what has taken place in the life of the Church has been good and healthy. It may, therefore, seem at first sight that an analysis such as Charles Davis makes is a cause for dismay. That need not be so. For even when Christians speak of the secular world, it remains God's world, and there are many signs that even if He is not identified as God by secular man, He is nevertheless in some ways served by him. The vision of the Christian Faith has been so little realized that perhaps it is not visionary to hope that a new expression of the faith "once for all delivered"¹⁰ is about to be born.

It may well be true that this present time is not ripe for the creation of a modern liturgy; it may well be true, too, that the Church will experience even greater

shrinkage in the numbers of those who take part in its worship than it has up to the present. But Christians will continue to meet, drawn together by the mystery of God and of His love. Perhaps what is necessary above all at this time is that they be prepared to listen to what God is saying through the Church (by means of its traditions, its worship, its life), and through the secular world which is forming them as well as being formed by them. It may be then possible to create a liturgy that will express this new apprehension of the Christian Faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- The Assisi Papers: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy, Assisi-Rome, September 18-22, 1956. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press/St. John's Abbey, 1957. Published as a supplement to Worship.
- Beauduin, Dom Lambert. Liturgy the Life of the Church. Translated by Virgil Michel. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1926.
- _____. Mélanges Liturgiques recueillis parmi les oeuvres de Dom Lambert Beauduin, O.S.B., à l'occasion de ses 80 ans (1873-1953). Louvain: Centre Liturgique, Abbaye du Mont César, 1954.
- Bishop, Edmund. Liturgica Historica. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1918.
- Bouyer, Louis. Dom Lambert Beauduin: Un homme d'Eglise. Tournai: Casterman, 1964.
- _____. Life and Liturgy. London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- _____. The Liturgy Revived: A Doctrinal Commentary of the Conciliar Constitution on the Liturgy. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964.
- Cabrol, Dom Fernand. Liturgical Prayer--Its History and Spirit. Translated by a Benedictine of Stanbrook, London: Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1922. Originally published as Le Livre de la Prière Antiqué, 1900.
- Casel, Dom Odo. The Mystery of Christian Worship and Other Writings. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press; London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962.

NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. Malcolm Muggeridge, Jesus Rediscovered (Fontana Books; London: Collins, 1969), p. 140.
2. What is the Liturgical Movement?, p. 136.
3. Cf. above, p. 172.
4. (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, n.d.).
5. "A Letter from Romano Guardini," Herder Correspondence, I, No. 0, Special Issue, p. 26.
6. Cf. Paul van Buren, "The Tendency of our Age and the Reconciliation of Worship," Studia Liturgica, VII (1970), Nos. 2-3, p. 4.
7. E.C. Blackman, "~~New~~ Methods of Parable Interpretation," Canadian Journal of Theology, XV, No. 1 (Jan. 1969), p. 4.
8. Charles Davis, "Ghetto or Desert: Liturgy in a Cultural Dilemma," Studia Liturgica, VII (1970), Nos. 2-3, p. 11.
9. Ibid., pp. 22-23.
10. Jude, v. 3.

- Guardini, Romano. The Church and the Catholic and The Spirit of the Liturgy. Translated by Ada Lane. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1940.
- _____. L'Esprit de la Liturgie. Translation and Introduction by Robert d'Harcourt. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1929.
- Guéranger, Dom Prosper. L'Année Liturgique. 15 vols. Tours: Maison Alfred Mame et Fils, 1920.
- _____. Institutions Liturgiques. 4 vols. 2d ed. Paris: Société Générale de Librairie Catholique, 1878-1885.
- Hammond, Peter. Liturgy and Architecture. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1960.
- _____. (ed.). Towards a Church Architecture. London: The Architectural Press, 1962.
- Hebert, A.G. Liturgy and Society. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1935.
- Jungmann, Josef. Liturgical Renewal in Retrospect and Prospect. Translated by Clifford Howell, S.J. Challoner Books; London: Burns and Oates, 1965.
- Koenker, Ernest Benjamin. The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Muggeridge, Malcolm. Jesus Rediscovered. Fontana Books; London: Collins, 1969.
- Parsch, Pius. Le Renouveau liturgique au service de la paroisse. Traduit sur la seconde édition par l'abbé Marcel Grandclaudon. Mulhouse: Editions Salvator, 1950.
- Priests of St. Severin (Paris) and St. Joseph (Nice). What is the Liturgical Movement? Faith and Fact Books No. 110; London: Burns and Oates, 1964.

- Rousseau, Dom Olivier. Histoire du mouvement liturgique: Esquisse historique depuis le début du XIXe siècle jusqu'au pontificat de Pie X. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1945.
-
- . The Progress of the Liturgy: An Historical Sketch from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the Pontificate of Pius X. Translated by the Benedictines of Westminster Priory, Vancouver, B.C. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1951.
- Seasoltz, R. Kevin. The New Liturgy: A Documentation 1903-1965. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.
- Shands, Alfred. The Liturgical Movement and the Local Church. Rev. ed. London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1965.
- Shepherd, Massey H., Jr. (ed.). The Liturgical Renewal of the Church. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Srawley, J.H. The Liturgical Movement: Its Origin and Growth. Alcuin Club Tracts XXVII; London: A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., for the Alcuin Club, 1954.
- Vidler, A.R. The Modernist Movement in the Roman Catholic Church: Its Origins and Outcome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- Vismans, Th. A., and Brinkhoff, L. Critical Bibliography of Liturgical Literature. Translated from the German Edition by R.W. Fitzpatrick and C. Howell. Nijmegen: Bestelcentrale Der V.S.K.B. Publ., 1961.
- von Geusau, Alting (ed.). Liturgy in Development. Translated by H.J.J. Vaughan. Stagbooks; London and Melbourne: Sheed and Ward, 1965.

Booklets

Klauser, Theodor. The Western Liturgy and Its History.
Translated by F.L. Cross. London: A.R. Mowbray
and Co. Ltd.; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co.,
1952.

_____. The Western Liturgy Today. Translated by F.L.
Cross. London: A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1963.

Papal Documents

Mystici Corporis Christi. Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius
XII on the Mystical Body of Christ. Promulgated
29 June 1943. Washington, D.C.: National Catholic
Welfare Conference, 1943.

Mediator Dei. Encyclical Letter of His Holiness Pius XII
on the Sacred Liturgy. Promulgated 20 November 1947.
Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Confer-
ence, n.d.

Constitution on the Liturgy. Promulgated by Pope Paul VI
at the closing of the Second Session of the Second
Vatican Council, 4 December 1963. Washington, D.C.:
National Catholic Welfare Conference, n.d.

Periodicals

La Maison-Dieu. Cahier I, III, IV (1945) - Cahier XL bis,
containing Tables Décennales 1945-1954 (1955),
LXXIV (1963). Paris: Centre de Pastorale Liturgi-
que, Les Editions du Cerf.

Les Questions liturgiques. Vol. I, Nos. 1, 2 and 8 (1910-1911) - Vol. IV (1913-1914). Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César.

Les Questions liturgiques et paroissiales. Vol. V (1919) - Vol. XI (1926); Vol. XII, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 (1927) - Vol. XV (1930), Vols. XIX-XX (1934-1935), XL (1959), XLVII (1966). Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César.

_____. Première Table Décennale (1910-1925.) Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1928.

_____. Table Générale, 1926-1959. Louvain: Abbaye du Mont César, 1959.

Articles

Blackman, E.C. "New Methods of Parable Interpretation," Canadian Journal of Theology, XV, No. 1 (Jan. 1969), 3-13.

Cabrol, Dom Fernand. "Guéranger, Prosper," Cabrol, Dom Fernand, and Leclercq, Dom Henri, (and collaborators), Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie, VI, Part II, Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1925, cols. 1875-1879.

"Casel, Odo," New Catholic Encyclopedia. Prepared by an Editorial Staff at The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967, III, 176-77.

C[hirat], H. "Echos du renouveau liturgique d'Allemagne et d'Autriche," La Vie Spirituelle, CCCI (Nov. 1945), 457-66.

Davis, Charles. "Ghetto or Desert: Liturgy in a Cultural Dilemma," Studia Liturgica, VII (1970), Nos. 2-3, 10-27.

- "A Letter from Romano Guardini," Herder Correspondence, I, No. 0, Special Issue, 24-26.
- Maertens, Dom Thierry. "Belgique," in "Le Mouvement Liturgique en Divers Pays," Lumen Vitae, X, No. 1 (January-March 1955), 413-20.
- Michels, Dom Thomas. "Abbot Ildefons Herwegen (1874-1946)," Orate Fratres, XXI (1946-47), 2-7.
- Navatel, Jean-Joseph. "L'Apostolat liturgique et la Piété personnelle," Etudes, CXXXVII, 20 November 1913, 449-76.
- Parsch, Pius. "Intensive or Extensive Pastoral Care?," Orate Fratres, XXI (1946-1947), 433-38.
- _____. "Liturgy and Pastoral Work," Orate Fratres, XXI (1946-1947), 337-42.
- _____. "Towards Christian Inwardness," Orate Fratres, XXI (1946-1947), 535-40.
- "Parsch, Pius," New Catholic Encyclopedia. Prepared by an Editorial Staff at The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967, X, 1040.
- van Buren, Paul M. "The Tendency of our Age and the Re-conception of Worship," Studia Liturgica, VII (1970), Nos. 2-3, 3-9.