

# Implementation of the new Roman missal

Panel of Catholic Academy for Liturgy, January 6, 2011

Presentation by Edward Foley

The Catholic Academy for Liturgy was founded as the premier Roman Catholic scholarly voice in the U.S. for the ongoing reform of the liturgy. We were founded to offer a proper, credible and authentic response to this ongoing work.

I respond as a Franciscan. In the first antiphon of his first vespers, Francis is called *vir catholicus*. What (*pace Liturgiam authenticam*) I would translate as “a truly catholic believer.” So as a catholic believer, and a Roman Catholic who believes, my pastoral responsibility is to urge **complete implementation** of these texts – flawed as they are

I **have** said that and **will** say this to the ordination candidates I prepare to preside at eucharist, last semester and this coming semester, who are practicing and praying and proclaiming these texts. And to the presbyterates that I have been privileged and will be privileged to engage.

I have **no** right to change these texts. I **will not** ... and I cajole everyone else not to as well

At the same time, as a theological educator and a student of the liturgy, I am both acutely aware of and publicly cognizant of the **significant challenges** these texts present

- to theologians and ministerial students,
- to pastors and long suffering pew dwellers,
- to musicians, catechists and religious educators,

all of whom, in their own way, are in the difficult position of translating this material so that believers of every age and ecclesial stripe can be engaged.

No easy task! And while my honored colleagues (Joyce Ann Zimmerman and Steven Janco) will focus more specifically on the mystagogical/catechetical and musical challenges in their ensuing remarks, I would like to take a few moments to outline what I think are 7 key theological challenges - not only of these texts, but of the highly **secretive**, and controverted process that is producing them.

As a *vir catholicus*, I offer this in constructive mode because, as you all know, there was a fifth GIRM, there will be a sixth. There was a 3<sup>rd</sup> *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum*, and there will be a 4<sup>th</sup>. There have been at least 6 renderings of the Roman Missal by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) since 1970, and there will be a seventh.

We do our work not in any way to **refute** the now promulgated texts, but to help construct the **next** set of texts - so that they are **newly** faithful to the reforms of Vatican II, just as ICEL2010 intends to be.

## Challenge I: Inculturation

*Gaudium et spes* describes the church's involvement in the world as a form of dialogue or mutual exchange (nn. 40 and 43). Unlike *Lumen gentium*, *Gaudium et spes* talks not only about the **church** contributing to the well being of the human family, but recognizes that the **church** is "abundantly and variously helped by the **world**." (40, 44-5)

*Gaudium et spes* goes on to say Christians are citizens of both an earthly city and a heavenly one (n. 43). They must live as loyal citizens in **both** realms, the Church itself serving as a kind of leaven in human society (n. 40). There need be no conflict between religious values and living in society. As long as truth, goodness, and proper laws are respected, human endeavors can all serve the enhancement of society (n. 35).

In a parallel vein, *Sacrosanctum concilium*, in what Anscar Chupungco called the *magna carta* of inculturation (nos. 37-40):

- "Even in the liturgy the Church does not wish to impose a **rigid uniformity** in matters which do not involve the faith or the good of the whole community."
- "Anything in these people's way of life which is not indissolubly bound up with superstition and error she studies with sympathy, and, if possible, preserves intact."
- "She sometimes even admits such things into the liturgy itself, provided they harmonize with its true and authentic spirit."

*Liturgiam authenticam*, in what could be considered by theologians as a refutation of this conciliar position, writes:

- "Liturgical texts [are] ... the voice of the Church at prayer, rather than of only particular congregations or individuals."
- They "should be free of an overly servile adherence to prevailing modes of expression."
- "If ... words or expressions are sometimes employed which differ somewhat from usual and everyday speech, it is often enough by virtue of this very fact that the texts become truly memorable and capable of expressing heavenly realities."
- "Observance of the principles ... in this Instruction will contribute to the gradual development, in each vernacular, of a sacred style that will come to be recognized as proper to liturgical language."
- "Thus it may happen that a certain manner of speech which has come to be considered somewhat obsolete in daily usage may continue to be maintained in the liturgical context." [27]

I will return to the ramifications of this in terms of ongoing evangelization. But from the view point of inculturation, it suggests a kind of cultural hierarchicalism, that the "genius of the Roman Rite" is **smarter** or better than indigenous cultures or languages.

Is God adequately revealed only in a liturgy that conforms to Latin thought patterns, syntax and language?

Does this create an unnecessary gulf between what conciliar *peritus* Karl Rahner called the liturgy of the church and the liturgies of the world?

Is the church above culture?

The word “catholic” (small “c”) precisely as a mark of the church, does not mean suppressing cultures or cultural expressions or contextual expressions, but means engaging, respecting, learning from and adapting them.

This is clear to anyone who has even a passing knowledge of the history of the so-called Roman Liturgy which engaged, learned from and eventually adopted a reshaped Roman liturgy: back from the Carolingian empire, back from Frankish influence, filled with what our revered mentor Robert Taft called all that “slop” from the north - the smells and bells ...

Theological challenge no. 1 = inculturation.

### **Theological challenge no. 2 = *Sensus fidelium***

If the assembly is one of the subjects of the liturgy, as Pius XII taught us in *Mediator Dei* (1947), and *Sacrosanctum Concilium* re-dogmatizes in par. 7, to what extent are the baptized **subjects** and not **objects** of liturgical reform? Do their needs, experiences, sensibilities have any impact on the reform of worship? Do they have anything to say about the texts and translations that impact their active participation? *SC* notes that the active participation of the people is the standard by which the reform will be judged [no. 14]. Is active participation only an aspect of the “**liturgy of the church**”? Or is it not also a way of **being** church?

What is the measure of integrity when we ask people to be active in ecclesial worship without inviting their **activity about the reform** of such ecclesial worship?

**Who** judges *Sacrosanctum Concilium*'s instruction? “The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity. They should be short, clear, and free from useless repetitions. They should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation.”

Is this decision made solely by bishops who might decide to wear a *cappa magna* down the center aisle of some national basilica while the people of God push carts down the center aisle of their local grocery store, trying to find **noble simplicity** in their food budget or clothing purchases or household budget if they have a house left at all in this penitential season of increasing homelessness, where too many children are rummaging through garbage bins, a symbolic testimony of how the world has given up on their noble simplicity?

On any given night almost 30,000 people are homeless on the streets of Chicago. By some accounts there were over 90,000 homeless on the streets of Chicago, including at least 15,000 children of school age. Who decides noble simplicity?

Bishops and curial clergy ... as well as many of those of us ordained and religiously professed (and I clearly put myself in this group) are living better than many in this economic downturn. We do not have to worry about food and shelter, gas bills and children's health care, educational costs and the young, and health care for the elderly.

If church is truly a *communio* with an option for the poor, then its liturgy in all of its language and gestures and rites must have an option for the poor. Otherwise, it separates itself from the Jesus Table which was option-central for the poor.

This is related to the theological – and not only pastoral – aspects of catechesis and mystagogy. If catechesis on this and any future missal is only about instructing or requiring or commanding (see Nicholas Lash, *America* 13 December 2010, 17-20), without the echo of the people of God back into the heart of the hierarchy, then there is no catechesis, but only **apologetics**.

Theological challenge no. 2 = *sensus fidelium*.

### **Theological challenge no. 3 = Collegiality**

*Lumen gentium* was clear:

The order of bishops is the successor to the college of the apostles in their role as teachers and pastors, and in it the apostolic college is perpetuated. Together with their head, the Supreme Pontiff, and never apart from him, they have supreme and full authority over the universal Church (n. 22)

*Christus Dominus* did not waver:

Bishops, sharing in the solicitude for all the churches, exercise this episcopal office of theirs, which they have received through episcopal consecration, in communion with and under the authority of the supreme pontiff. As far as their teaching authority and pastoral government are concerned, all are united in a college or body with respect to the universal Church of God (n. 3)

Some bishops [not scholars] have distinguished between effective collegiality and affective: Effective collegiality is what the council describes in *Lumen gentium* when it says, "The order of bishops is the successor to the college of the apostles in their role as teachers and pastors ..." Bishop Raymond Lessard, retired bishop of Savannah:

While theologically there's a key concept of effective collegiality, to me just as important is that of affective collegiality, which cannot be spelled out so clearly in canonical norms or directives because it's more of a feeling, an instinct. But to me that's of crucial importance.

This is an instinct shared by Joseph Cardinal Bernardin on the verge of the 1985 Synod of bishops, called by John Paul II to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of Vatican II: "Collegiality is a principle and style of leadership in the church." This should be reflected in conciliarity or synodality at all levels of Church life. This is the role of pastoral councils giving laity a say in parish life. And similar councils at the diocesan

and national levels giving laity, deacons and priests a say in the life of the diocese or the church across the nation.

Collegiality is a U.S. instinct. Bishop John Carroll convened the first of eight Diocesan Synods in Baltimore in 1791. He thought people should have a say in the election of bishops, and also thought that worship should be in the vernacular.

What happens to collegiality, however, when the text the U.S. bishops approve and send to Rome for recognition comes back *non-recognitio*?

The U.S. bishops' process has been superseded by *Vox Clara* in this retranslation process and the bishops have received back a text they never approved. Some bishops have questioned the canonicity of a text that the bishops never approved.

Is it any surprise that Australian Theologian Brian Gleeson has referred to the Roman Curia a *tertium quid* between the pope and bishops with its own agenda; and Cardinal Daneels of Belgium calls it "a command organization" [*Australian Journal of Theology*, vol. 1, August 2003 = [http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet\\_1/bgleeson.htm](http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_1/bgleeson.htm)] ?

Theological challenge no. 3 = collegiality.

#### **Theological challenge no. 4 = Hospitality and the new evangelization**

John Paul II coined the term "the New Evangelization" – a reawakening of the faith in long-established Christian parts of the world, particularly Europe, but which have since fallen away from the faith which are need of a "New Evangelization." Benedict XIV created the Pontifical Council for the New Evangelization dedicated to the re-evangelization of Western countries that have lost their Christian identity.

Many dioceses and Roman Catholic organizations have created outreach and media campaigns to invite Roman Catholics to take a second look at a church they may have left.

According to the 2007 Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life Survey, 28% of Americans have left their religion for another or no religion at all. Catholicism has experienced the greatest net losses as a result of affiliation changes. While nearly one-in-three Americans (31%) were raised in the Catholic faith, today fewer than one-in-four (24%) describe themselves as Catholic. These losses would have been even more pronounced were it not for the offsetting impact of immigration. Roughly 10% of all Americans are former Catholics.

We are losing them ... especially our best educated Catholics, especially our most educated *young adult* Catholics, at an alarming rate. Maybe in part because we do not respect their *sensus mundi* - not their sense of being faithful Christians, but of being human beings with dignity and rights, and who understand what civil discourse and collaboration looks like in the 21st century.

Kate Devries, associate director of the office of Young Adult Ministry in the Archdiocese of Chicago, in her Doctor of ministry work that I was privileged to direct, reminded us that the Church cannot invite young adults home because, for so many of them, this was never their home in the first place. You cannot return to a place to which you never belonged.

Bishop Trautman, twice chair of the BCL, in 1997 lamented the fact of a new translation of the Bible published by Tyndale, the work of conservative biblical scholars, whose text boasts of gender inclusive language, and yet the Roman Catholic Church in the U.S. cannot ... and is *de facto* ceding growth.

So how hospitable are these texts to young adults, to longsuffering women worshippers who admittedly constitute well over 65% not only of worshippers, but of church volunteers and lay ecclesial ministers.

How hospitable are these texts that do not accept inclusivity as a prevailing or determinative standard.

Theological challenge no. 4 = hospitality.

### **Theological challenge no. 5 = Ecumenism**

Here I particularly want to underscore ecumenism with churches in the west, and not the laudable outreach to Eastern Churches. In view of this respectful outreach, ecumenism as embraced at the time of Vatican II had a very strong Reformation tilt.

Our former president of the North American Academy of Liturgy, Presbyterian pastor and scholar Horace Allen, former chair of the English Language Liturgical consultation, recognized ICEL as *central to the formation* of Consultation on Common Texts (CCT, 1964), International Consultation on English Texts (ICET, 1969), and English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC, 1985).

He and others publicly lamented the fact that in 2001, ICEL was required to withdraw from ELLC and ICET, even though Roman Catholics and ICET published in 1975 *Prayers We Have in Common*, which proposed English versions of liturgical texts that included the Apostles Creed, Nicene Creed, Athanasian Creed, and Lord's Prayer. These have been widely adopted by English-speaking Christians

The 1975 English translation of the Roman Missal included the 1975 ICET Apostles' Creed and the 1975 ICET Nicene Creed.

Furthermore, as we all understand, for many Protestants (thank you Fritz West), the 1969 Roman Catholic Lectionary was a major ecumenical event. The English *Common Lectionary* has found wide spread acceptance around the world. Some Protestants have called this *an ecumenical version of the Roman Catholic Lectionary*, which has generated a "daughter" lectionary: the *Revised Common Lectionary (1983, 1994)*. Has another opportunity for dialogue on lectionary revision been a lost ecumenical moment?

Theological challenge no. 5 = Ecumenism.

### **Theological challenge no. 6 = Liturgical theology**

This includes four obvious and fundamental concerns.

**First:** The use of “arcane” language could, with an underlying theological anthropology that emphasizes that God is holy and people are not (contrary to the instruction of *Lumen gentium*, all of chapter 2), communicate undue emphasis on the transcendence of God, e.g.,

In humble prayer we ask you, almighty God:  
command that these gifts be borne  
by the hands of your holy Angel  
to your altar on high  
in the sight of your divine majesty,  
so that all of us, who through this participation at the altar  
receive the most holy Body and Blood of your Son,  
may be filled with every grace and heavenly blessing.

**Second:** *Pro multis*. This is presently translated as “for all” in the institution narrative over the cup; it is soon to be translated “for many.” This could give the impression that the merits of Jesus’ death are limited, and no longer “for all.” Many of you saw Paul Philibert’s recent and powerful reflection on this in *America* (3 January 2011) 13-15.

Now I know there are many official clarifications, explaining what this text is supposed to mean. But if the liturgy is **theologia prima**, and if the liturgy is an **action** and not simply a text (CS no. 7), then the liturgy has to **perform** the primary meaning and not derive the primary meaning for some external theological gloss.

**Third**, GIRM, no. 78, in one of its most pungent theological commentaries on the Eucharistic Prayer, indicates that “the meaning of the Prayer is that the entire congregation of the faithful should join itself with Christ in confessing the great deeds of God and in the offering of Sacrifice.” This is reminiscent of CSL no. 7 which speaks about every liturgy as an act of Christ, head and members. But when we have texts that say pray that “my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable” – in light of the required change of posture during the Eucharistic prayer after the *Sanctus* – there is a **performed meaning** that suggests there are two different sacrificial offerings here, one by the clergy and one by the people.

By consequence, does *lex orandi lex credendi* (with its multiple translations) now cede to the *lex principalis*, as though the law of praying (*lex orandi*) is now in an unequal dialogue with an original Latin text (*lex textus principalis*) which supersedes any vernacular reception? And does it suggest that the *lex orandi* is only credible if it is grounded in an original Latin *textus principalis*? If one follows this reasoning, it could logically suggest that the law of believing is superseded by the law of a Latin text, even if

the Latin text (as in our prayers for Reconciliation) is documentably anterior to aboriginal texts in other languages.

Does this challenge the “event” nature of Christian liturgy, in which the liturgical “doing” is secondary to the **textus principalis**? Does this render all vernacular worship inferior to that done in Latin? And thus dispense them from having any performative literacy, since their auditory comprehension is now less important than their fidelity to a Latin original text?

Theological challenge no. 6 = liturgical theology.

### **Theological challenge no. 7 = Amplified hybridization of the Roman rite**

The *De facto* celebration of the Roman Rite in the US and Canada at this time is already a hybrid event. Reception of 1969 rite is mixed. People still celebrate the preparation of gifts like an offertory. Not everyone is able to distinguish between a required “showing” at the institution narrative and an elevation. Presiders take liberties with Eucharistic texts, adapting them to their own theologies or speech patterns.

This process of hybridization is going to be amplified enormously with a set of texts that, despite all instruction to the contrary, many clergy are going to adapt, rewrite, and reinterpret, and which, contrary to all instruction, some may not use at all.

The lingering usage of the 1973 translations is predictable on the part of some clergy, not to mention the faithful who have translations of the ordinary seared into their musical memories.

The specter of three parallel liturgical universes in this country - the extra ordinary form, ICEL1975 and ICEL2010, with infinite variations between, will make the challenge of catechesis even more daunting

*Viri et mulieres catholici*: That is what we have to be rigorously studying and engaging in ICEL2010, performing it as best we can, and documenting its graces and its flaws, so that we are fully prepared to retranslate and re-implement the next ICEL translation looming before us on the horizon.

*Fr. Edward Foley, Capuchin, is Professor of Liturgy and Music and the founding Director of the Ecumenical D.Min. Program at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago. He is Past-President of the North American Academy of Liturgy, and a founder and originating member of the executive committee of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy.*