

**A Commentary
on the Order of Mass
of *The Roman Missal***

**A Commentary
on the Order of Mass
of *The Roman Missal***

A New English Translation

Developed under the Auspices
of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy

General Editor

Edward Foley

Associate Editors

John F. Baldovin

Mary Collins

Joanne M. Pierce

Foreword by

His Eminence Cardinal Roger Mahony
Archbishop Emeritus of Los Angeles

A PUEBLO BOOK

Liturgical Press
www.litpress.org

Collegeville, Minnesota

A Pueblo Book published by Liturgical Press

Cover design by David Manahan, OSB. Illustrations by Frank Kacmarcik, OblSB.

Excerpts from the English translation of *The Roman Missal* © 1973, 1997, 2010, International Commission on English in the Liturgy Corporation (ICEL); excerpts from the English translation of *Documents on the Liturgy, 1963–1979: Conciliar, Papal, and Curial Texts* © 1982, ICEL. All rights reserved.

Excerpts from documents of the Second Vatican Council are from *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents*, by Austin Flannery, OP © 1996 (Costello Publishing Company, Inc.). Used with permission.

Scripture texts in this work are taken from the *New American Bible with Revised New Testament and Revised Psalms* © 1991, 1986, 1970 Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington, DC, and are used by permission of the copyright owner. All Rights Reserved. No part of the *New American Bible* may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the copyright owner.

“Libreria Editrice Vaticana omnia sibi vindicat iura. Sine ejusdem licentia scripto data nemini licet hunc Ordo Missae from the Roman Missal editio typica tertia alteram, denuo imprimere aut aliam linguam vertere.” “Ordo Missae from the Roman Missal—editio typica tertia, Copyright 2002, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano.”

© 2011 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegetown, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John’s Abbey, PO Box 7500, Collegetown, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A commentary on the order of Mass of the Roman missal : a new English translation developed under the auspices of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy ; general editor, Edward Foley ; associate editors, John F. Baldovin, Mary Collins, Joanne M. Pierce ; foreword by Roger Mahony.

p. cm.
“A Pueblo book.”
Includes index.

ISBN 978-0-8146-6247-2 — ISBN 978-0-8146-6256-4 (e-book)

1. Catholic Church. Missale Romanum (1970) 2. Catholic Church—Liturgy—Texts—History and criticism. 3. Missals—Texts. 4. Lord’s Supper—Catholic Church—Liturgy—Texts. 5. Mass—Celebration. I. Foley, Edward. II. Baldovin, John F. (John Francis), 1947– III. Collins, Mary, 1935– IV. Pierce, Joanne M. V. Catholic Academy of Liturgy.

BX2015.C58 2011
264’.02036—dc23

2011034410

Contents

Foreword xi

Introduction xiii

List of Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Identifications xvii

Time Line Leading to the New English Translation
of the Roman Missal (ICEL2010) xxiii

Introductory Essays

The *Ordo Missae* of the Roman Rite: Historical Background 3
Joanne M. Pierce and John F. Romano

The History of Vernaculars and Role of Translation 35
Keith Pecklers and Gilbert Ostdiek

Mystagogy: Discerning the Mystery of Faith 73
Mary Collins and Edward Foley

The Introductory Rites

The Latin and English Text 104

History of the Latin Text and Rite 115
John Baldwin

Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 125
Dominic E. Serra

Excursus on Translating *OM2008* 133
Anscar J. Chupungco

The ICEL2010 Translation 137
Anscar J. Chupungco

The Mystagogical Implications 143
Catherine Vincie

The Liturgy of the Word

- The Latin and English Text 152
- History of the Latin Text and Rite 161
Michael Witzak
- Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 171
Nathan D. Mitchell and Demetrio S. Yocum
- The ICEL2010 Translation 181
Anscar J. Chupungco
- The Mystagogical Implications 187
Catherine Vincie

The Preparation of the Gifts

- The Latin and English Text 196
- History of the Latin Text and Rite 201
Michael Witzak
- Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 211
Patrick Regan
- The ICEL2010 Translation 219
Anscar J. Chupungco
- The Mystagogical Implications 221
Catherine Vincie

Eucharistic Prayer I

- The Latin and English Text 230
- History of the Latin Text and Rite 247
John Baldwin
- Excursus on Interpreting Eucharistic Prayers 255
David Power
- Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 259
David Power
- The ICEL2010 Translation 279
Gilbert Ostdiek

The Mystagogical Implications 293
Mark E. Wedig

Eucharistic Prayer II

The Latin and English Text 302
History of the Latin Text and Rite 311
John Baldwin
Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 317
David Power
The ICEL2010 Translation 327
Tom Elich
The Mystagogical Implications 335
Joyce Ann Zimmerman

Eucharistic Prayer III

The Latin and English Text 342
History of the Latin Text and Rite 353
Michael Witczak
Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 365
David Power
The ICEL2010 Translation 375
Tom Elich
The Mystagogical Implications 383
Joyce Ann Zimmerman

Eucharistic Prayer IV

The Latin and English Text 390
History of the Latin Text and Rite 401
John Baldwin
Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 407
David Power
The ICEL2010 Translation 417
Gilbert Ostdiek

A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal

The Mystagogical Implications 425

Mark E. Wedig

Eucharistic Prayers for Reconciliation

The Latin and English Text 432

EP RI and II: History of the Latin Text and Rite 453

Richard E. McCarron

EP RI: Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 465

Susan K. Roll

Excursus on the Eucharistic Prayers for Reconciliation 473

Anscar J. Chupungco

EP RI: The ICEL2010 Translation 475

Anscar J. Chupungco

EP RI: The Mystagogical Implications 485

Edward Foley

EP RII: Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 493

Susan K. Roll

EP RII: The ICEL2010 Translation 501

Anscar J. Chupungco

EP RII: The Mystagogical Implications 503

Joyce Ann Zimmerman

Eucharistic Prayer for Use in Masses for Various Needs

The Latin and English Text 510

History of the Text 549

Richard E. McCarron

Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 557

Richard E. McCarron

The ICEL2010 Translation 571

Anscar J. Chupungco

The Mystagogical Implications 575

Mark E. Wedig

The Communion Rite

- The Latin and English Text 584
History of the Latin Text and Rite 593
John Baldwin
Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 601
David Power
The ICEL2010 Translation 607
Tom Elich
The Mystagogical Implications 615
Joyce Ann Zimmerman

The Concluding Rites

- The Latin and English Text 622
History of the Latin Text and Rite 627
Michael Witczak
Theology of the Latin Text and Rite 635
Susan K. Roll
The ICEL2010 Translation 639
Tom Elich
The Mystagogical Implications 645
Joyce Ann Zimmerman

List of Contributors 651
Scriptural Index 653
Index of Proper Names 657
General Index 667

Foreword

*His Eminence
Cardinal Roger Mahony
Archbishop Emeritus of Los Angeles*

The publication of *A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal* coincides with the introduction of the new English translation of the Roman Missal in the life of our worshipping communities in English-speaking North America. This volume is intended as a companion to *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (Liturgical Press, 2007), which was quickly recognized as an indispensable resource for those charged with understanding and implementing the principles and spirit of the *GIRM*. Taken together, these two commentaries are illustrative of the very best of liturgical scholarship in the English-speaking world at the service of the Church.

The present *Commentary* is in some ways reminiscent of the *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law* (Paulist Press, 2000). Following the promulgation of the 1983 *Code of Canon Law*, priests, theologians, seminarians, pastoral leaders, bishops and canonists who were faced with thorny canonical questions of interpretation and implementation turned to the pages of the *Commentary* to seek counsel from reliable scholars such as Ladislav Orsy, SJ, and Frederick McManus. Few, if any, were disappointed.

This *Commentary* is the fruit of years of collaboration on the part of a wondrous array of scholars under the guidance and direction of general editor Edward Foley, Capuchin, and his associate editors John Baldovin, SJ, Mary Collins, OSB, and Joanne Pierce. The *Commentary's* distinguished contributors include David Power, OMI, Catherine Vincie, RSHM, and Michael Witczak. The volume includes both the Latin text and the new English translation of the *Ordo Missae*, with historical, theological, linguistic and mystagogical reflections on every major section of the *Ordo*, excepting the prefaces. The purpose of the volume is to provide a scholarly commentary for bishops, teachers, pastors and students, examining the foundations and principles of the *Order of Mass*. It is both encyclopedic and concise, gathering an immense amount of complex material into an accessible, albeit hefty, volume accompanied by extensive indices, with the English and Latin

texts of the *Ordo Missae* at the very heart of the book. This is a constructive work commending the fine work that has been accomplished thus far, and recommending how the ongoing work of translation and liturgical reform can continue to move forward.

Each and every one of the scholars involved in this project shares a deep commitment to ongoing liturgical reform in accord with the principles of the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Thus, the sympathetic presentation of the *Order of Mass* in this volume is not uncritical but, rather, highlights in careful and insightful ways those questions and concerns requiring further reflection and discussion. It is a singular delight for me to offer my heartfelt affirmation and deep appreciation of the work of these scholars in their service of the liturgical life of the Church.

Introduction

As we approach the fiftieth anniversary of the convening of the Second Vatican Council, one can only marvel at the many changes that have taken place in the liturgy over these past five decades. Vernacular celebrations have come to characterize Roman Catholic liturgy around the world, virtually every official ritual in our collective repertoire has been revised—some more than once—and the council’s image of full, conscious, and active participation has been realized in many places and in wondrous ways.

At the same time, as historians remind us, the aftermath of any ecumenical council unfolds slowly. For example, the liturgical books that emerged after the Council of Trent (1545–63) sometimes took decades to appear and their full implementation took centuries. Thus, it should be no surprise to contemporary Roman Catholics that the liturgical reforms envisioned by Vatican II continue—and not simply in a clear trajectory from point A to point B, but more as a swinging pendulum through succeeding pontificates, curial directives, and episcopal leadership—as varying interpretations of Vatican II and the direction of its liturgical reforms unfold.

While the promulgation of a new English translation of the Roman Missal (ICEL2010)—the first in almost forty years—is undoubtedly a significant moment for English-speaking Roman Catholics around the world, it may be best to understand it as a midpoint in the current pendulum swing rather than an end point of liturgical reform. Arriving at this translation is the result of an arduous and sometimes contentious process. The twists and turns of this translation process have been so complex that the editors of this volume found it necessary to map out a time line (see xxiii–xxvii below) of the many events that marked this translation process, both for the sake of our readers as well as for our own shared understanding.

The development and writing of this commentary was guided by three primary goals. First, because of the previously noted complexity of this translation process, editors and contributors thought it valuable and necessary to situate ICEL2010 historically and theologically. To that end, we have provided extended essays on the history of vernacular translation as well as an overview of the historical development of the *Ordo Missae* (OM) at the beginning of the volume. Furthermore, we have included both

historical and theological introductions to each unit of the *OM* examined in this volume. Our intent is to offer an accessible and up-to-date historical introduction to the current Order of Mass. The theological analyses that parallel the historical reflections are designed to provide both systematic examinations of the texts and rites of the *OM* as well as overviews of some of the theological developments that gave rise to them.

A second concern of the editors and authors was to contribute to the pastoral implementation of these texts and rites. To that end, we have provided a general introductory article on mystagogy at the beginning of the volume as well as mystagogical reflections on each of the liturgical units of the *OM* addressed throughout this volume. Furthermore, many of our commentaries on the English translation (ICEL2010) note some of the pastoral challenges that may arise in the presider's proclamation of these texts, offer guidelines on how such texts might be interpreted for intelligible proclamation, and underscore where catechesis will be essential for the proper pastoral reception of such texts.

Finally, recognizing that ICEL2010 is neither the first English translation of the *OM* nor the last, the editors and authors of this volume are committed to the ongoing development of vernacular worship for English-speaking Roman Catholics. Every vernacular translation is an experiment as well as a compromise, both a pastoral gift and a pastoral challenge. Multiple times throughout this volume contributors have recognized that translation is more art than science and thus a most demanding ministry in service of the church's liturgy. Our hope is to contribute to the ongoing development of this ministry by offering an informed and critical analysis of ICEL2010.

Like our previous *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, this project was prepared primarily for those in positions of leadership in the church. We hope that bishops, teachers of liturgy and sacramental theology, pastors, directors of liturgy at every level, and those who exercise other forms of liturgical leadership will find this book helpful in their work. At the same time, we have tried to make this commentary accessible to a wide variety of others interested in learning more about the eucharistic liturgy and its current English translation, especially graduate students of the liturgy and those preparing for pastoral ministry.

Mirroring the eucharistic liturgy that stands at the heart of this project, our endeavor has been a collegial one from the outset. Conceived in the context of the Catholic Academy of Liturgy (CAL)—an association of Roman Catholic specialists in liturgy and its allied arts, connected with the North American Academy of Liturgy—this project was shaped through a series of conversations that included many of the nineteen authors who eventually

contributed to this commentary. The editorial board was rich in collegueship, and I am grateful to associate editors John Baldovin, Mary Collins, and Joanne Pierce for their expertise and friendship. We are also grateful to the leadership of CAL for their cosponsorship of this venture. Special thanks to Justin Huyck for his fine work on the indices that accompany this volume, and to Edward Hagman, OFM Cap, for his careful proofreading. Finally, we express our enduring gratitude to Liturgical Press, which has been a strong and constant partner throughout this project. Special thanks are due to Peter Dwyer who has demonstrated unwavering support of CAL and this work accomplished with their sponsorship, and to Hans Christoffersen for his gracious editorial leadership and unabated encouragement in this project. Gratitude is also due to Lauren L. Murphy for her painstaking editorial work and Colleen Stiller who is unflappable as editorial moves to production. This great team from Liturgical Press sets the bar for collaboration. At the same time, any errors in this volume are not to be laid at their doorstep but at mine. I revel in their collegueship, but take responsibility for this content in all its graces and errors.

In the preface of form II of the Mass for Various Needs and Occasions (see 520–21 below), we acknowledge that being church requires pilgrimaging together through this world. At the same time we praise God during that prayer for accompanying us on this journey and profess faith that God's own Spirit is leading us on this path. Whatever the twists and turns of emerging vernacular liturgy in the Roman Catholic Church, we believe deeply that God's own Spirit is with us on this trek as well, as we pilgrimage toward full, conscious, and active participation for the glory of God and in service to the church and the world.

Edward Foley, Capuchin
Holy Thursday, 2011

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Identifications

AAS	<i>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</i> (Rome: 1909 to present)
ADA	<i>Acta et Documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II Apparando, series prima (antepreparatoria)</i> , 5 vols. (Vatican: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1960–1961)
ADP	<i>Acta et Documenta Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II Apparando, series secunda (praeparatoria)</i> , 3 vols. (Vatican: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1964–1969)
Andrieu	Michel Andrieu, ed., <i>Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen-âge</i> , 5 vols., <i>Spi-cilegium Sacrum Lovaniense</i> 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (Louvain, 1931–1961)
ApTrad	Apostolic Tradition
ASSCO	<i>Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II</i> , 4 vols. (Vatican: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970–1978, 1980)
Bugnini	Annibale Bugnini, <i>The Reform of the Liturgy 1948–1975</i> , trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990)
<i>ca.</i>	<i>circa</i>
CCL	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</i> (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954ff.)
CDF	Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
CDW	Congregation for Divine Worship
CDWDS	Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments
CE	Common Era
CCC	Catechism of the Catholic Church
<i>CaerEp</i>	<i>Caeremoniale Episcoporum</i> , editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1985); English trans. ICEL, <i>Ceremonial of Bishops</i> (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1989)
chap., chaps.	chapter, chapters
CLP	<i>Comme le prévoit</i> . Instruction on the translation of liturgical texts for celebrations with a congregation, 25 January 1969. Issued simultaneously in six languages. See “ <i>Comme le prévoit</i> ,” <i>Notitiae</i> 5 (1969): 3–12. English version in DOL 838–880.

A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal

CSDW	Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Worship
d.	died
DOL	International Commission on English in the Liturgy, <i>Documents on the Liturgy 1963–1979: Conciliar, Papal, and Curial Texts</i> (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1982). All numbers in this volume refer to the marginal numbers running sequentially throughout DOL.
<i>editio typica</i>	The official Latin text promulgated by the Holy See
ELLC	English Language Liturgical Consultation
EP(s)	eucharistic prayer(s)
EP I	Eucharistic Prayer I
EP II	Eucharistic Prayer II
EP III	Eucharistic Prayer III
EP IV	Eucharistic Prayer IV
EP RI	Eucharistic Prayer for Reconciliation I
EP RII	Eucharistic Prayer for Reconciliation II
EP MVN	Eucharistic Prayer for Use in Masses for Various Needs
<i>EuchPar</i>	<i>Eucharistiae Participationem</i> , Circular letter from CDW, <i>Notitiae</i> 9 (1973): 193–201, with a short commentary following, 202–8. English trans. in DOL 1975–1993.
<i>Gelasianum</i>	Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, ed., <i>Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli</i> (Vat. Reg. lat. 316), <i>Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes</i> IV (Rome: Herder, 1960)
GIRM1970	ICEL translation of <i>IGMR1970</i>
GIRM1975	ICEL translation of <i>IGMR1975</i>
GIRM2003	ICEL translation of <i>IGMR2002</i> , incorporating adaptations approved for dioceses of the United States
gray book	term introduced in 2003 ICEL Statutes to replace “white book,” i.e., indicating that this was a final text for voting by bishops’ conferences
green book	the provisional English translation of the Latin text submitted to the various English-speaking bishops’ conferences around the world
GS	<i>Gaudium et spes</i> , Vatican II “Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World,” 1965
<i>Hadrianum</i>	Jean Deshusses, ed., <i>Le Sacramentaire Grégorien d’après ses principaux manuscrits</i> , 2nd ed., <i>Spicilegium Friburgense</i> 16 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1979)

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Identifications

ICEL	International Commission on English in the Liturgy
ICEL1973	Original English translation of <i>Missale Romanum, editio typica</i> by ICEL, proposed for a five-year period of use <i>ad experimentum</i>
ICEL1995	New draft translation of <i>MR1975</i> , submitted as a green book to the eleven English-speaking bishops' conferences
ICEL1998	Unpublished ICEL translation of <i>MR1975</i> , approved by eleven English-speaking bishops' conferences but never confirmed by Rome
ICEL2003	New draft translation of <i>MR2002</i> , submitted as a green book to the eleven English-speaking bishops' conferences
ICEL2006	ICEL translation of <i>MR2002</i> , submitted as a gray book, approved by the eleven English-speaking bishops' conferences with multiple corrections
ICEL2008	ICEL translation of the <i>Ordo Missae</i> from <i>MR2002</i> , submitted by the English-speaking bishops' conferences, and given the <i>recognitio</i> by Rome
ICEL2010	ICEL translation of <i>MR2002</i> with the 2008 emendations, given the <i>recognitio</i> by Rome
ICET	The International Consultation on English Texts
IGMR	<i>Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani</i>
IGMR1969	The first version of <i>IGMR</i> , associated with <i>OM1969</i>
IGMR1970	The second version of <i>IGMR</i> , associated with <i>MR1970</i> , officially considered the first edition of the <i>IGMR</i>
IGMR1972	The third version of <i>IGMR</i> , issued in light of Paul VI's <i>Ministeria quaedam</i> (1972) on first tonsure, minor orders, and the subdiaconate
IGMR1975	The fourth version of <i>IGMR</i> , associated with <i>MR1975</i> , officially considered the second edition of the <i>IGMR</i>
IGMR1983	The fifth version of <i>IGMR</i> , issued in light of the 1983 Code of Canon Law
IGMR2000	A preliminary sixth version of the <i>IGMR</i> , intended to accompany the <i>MR editio typica tertia</i>
IGMR2002	The seventh version of <i>IGMR</i> , associated with <i>MR2002</i> , officially considered the third edition of the <i>IGMR</i>
<i>IntOec</i>	<i>Inter Oecumenici</i> , issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 1964; English trans. in DOL 293-391
ITTOM	Introduction to the Order of Mass, issued by the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy of the USCCB (Washington, DC: USCCB, 2003)

A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal

- Jasper & Cuming R. C. D. Jasper and G. C. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd ed. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990)
- Johnson Lawrence Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*, 4 vols. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009)
- Jungmann MRR Josef A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, trans. Francis Brunner, 2 vols. (New York: Benziger, 1951 & 1955; reprinted Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1986)
- Jungmann MS Josef A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia: Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*, 5th ed., 2 vols. (Vienna: Herder, 1962)
- LitAuth* *Liturgiam Authenticam*, issued by CDWDS in 2001. Published with both Latin text and English trans. in *Liturgiam authenticam: Fifth Instruction on the Vernacular Translation of the Roman Liturgy* (Washington, DC: USCCB, 2001)
- LG *Lumen Gentium*, Vatican II's "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," 1964
- MR *Missale Romanum*
- MR1474 *Missalis Romani Editio Princeps Mediolani Anno 1474 Prelis Mandata*, ed. Anthony Ward and Cuthbert Johnson (Rome: C.L.V-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1996)
- MR1570 *Missale Romanum*, promulgated by Pius V; for edition see Sodi-Triacca below
- MR1962 *Missale Romanum*, promulgated by John XXIII; for edition, see Sodi-Toniolo below
- MR1970 *Missale Romanum, editio typica*, promulgated by Paul VI as *Missale romanum ex decreto sacrosancti oecumenici concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP VI promulgatum* (Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970)
- MR1975 *Missale Romanum, editio typica altera*, promulgated by Paul VI as *Missale romanum ex decreto sacrosancti oecumenici concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP VI promulgatum* (Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1975)
- MR2002 *Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia*, promulgated by John Paul II, as *Missale Romanum: ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum: auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum: Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum* (Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2002), emended in 2008
- n., nn. note, notes
- NABRE New American Bible, Revised Edition

Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Identifications

NJBC	<i>New Jerome Biblical Commentary</i> , ed. Raymond Brown, Joseph Fitzmyer, Roland Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990)
no., nos.	number, numbers
<i>Nova Vulgata</i>	<i>Nova Vulgata Bibliorum Sacrorum Editio</i> (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1986)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OHCW	<i>The Oxford History of Christian Worship</i> , ed. Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen Westerfield Tucker (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006)
OLM1969	<i>Ordo Lectionum Missae</i> (Città del Vaticano: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1969)
OLM1981-Pr	<i>Proemium (Introduction) of the Ordo Lectionum Missae, editio typica altera</i> (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1981)
OM(s)	<i>Ordo (Ordines) Missae</i>
OM1969	<i>Ordo Missae</i> promulgated by the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship in 1969, and incorporated into MR1970
OM2008	<i>Ordo Missae</i> from MR2002, emended edition
OR I	<i>Ordo Romanus Primus</i> ; for the critical edition, see Andrieu above
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , ed. J. P. Migne, 161 vols. (Paris: 1857–66)
PL	<i>Patrologia Latina</i> , ed. J. P. Migne, 221 vols. (Paris: 1844–64)
<i>Prex Eucharistica</i> 1	Anton A. Hänggi and Irmgard Pahl, eds. <i>Prex Eucharistica: Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti</i> , Spicilegium Friburgense 12 (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires Fribourg Suisse, 1968)
<i>Prex Eucharistica</i> 3	A. Gerhards, H. Brakmann, and M. Klöckener, eds. <i>Prex Eucharistica III: Studia—Pars Prima: Ecclesia Antiqua et Occidentalis</i> (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005)
RCIA	Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults, 1988
SC	<i>Sacrosanctum Concilium</i> , Vatican II's "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," 1963
<i>SacCar</i>	<i>Sacramentum Caritatis</i> , post-synodal exhortation of Benedict XVI on the Eucharist, 2007; online at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20070222_sacramentum-caritatis_en.html
Sodi	Manlio Sodi and Alessandro Toniolo, <i>Concordantia et Indices Missalis Romani, editio typical tertia</i> (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002); online at www.liturgia.it/editiotertia.htm

A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal

- Sodi-Toniolo *Missale romanum: ex decreto ss. concilii tridentini restitutum summorum pontificum cura recognitum*, ed. Manlio Sodi and Alessandro Toniolo, Monumenta liturgica plana 1 (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007)
- Sodi-Triacca Manlio Sodi and Achille Maria Triacca, eds. *Missale Romanum: editio princeps, 1570* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria editrice vaticana, 1998)
- Tanner Norman Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (London and Washington, DC: Sheed & Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990)
- USCCB United States Catholic Conference of Bishops
- VarLeg* *Varietates Legitimae*, issued by CDWDS, 2004
- Veronense* Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, ed., *Sacramentarium Veronense, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes I* (Rome: Herder, 1966)
- Vogel Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and ed. William Story and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Portland: Pastoral Press, 1986)
- Vulgate *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, ed. Robert Weber, et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983)
- white book the presumed “final” translation of the Latin text submitted to Rome by various English-speaking conferences of bishops for the *recognitio*; while the term was replaced with “gray book” in 2003 ICEL Statutes, the USCCB called its approved ICEL gray book sent to Rome for *recognitio* in June 2006 its “white book.”

Time Line Leading to the New English Translation of the Roman Missal (ICEL2010)¹

- **17 October 1963:** Bishops representing ten English episcopal conferences (Australia, Canada, England and Wales, India, Ireland, New Zealand, Pakistan, Scotland, South Africa, and the United States) gather at the Venerable English College in Rome to lay the foundation for what would become the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL)
- **4 December 1963:** *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC) is promulgated, allowing for vernacular translations of the liturgy
- **25 January 1964:** Paul VI issues *Sacram Liturgiam*, indicating that translations had to be submitted to the Vatican for an official *recognitio*
- **October 1964:** Bishops of ICEL draw up a mandate to guide the work of ICEL's advisory committee, approved by the member conferences of bishops
- **9–13 November 1965:** Concilium holds a conference in Rome with 249 participants from around the world to develop common orientations and general criteria for liturgical translation, eventually leading to the instruction *Comme le prévoit*
- **1966:** ICEL issues *English for the Mass*, the first of over thirty consultation books and study texts sent to the various English-speaking conferences for their comment, discussion, and review
- **31 January 1967:** Paul VI allows the use of the vernacular in the eucharistic prayer *ad experimentum*

¹This timeline is compiled from official statements of various curial and episcopal leaders, news reports, the personal notes of some individuals involved in the process, the *Annual Report of the Episcopal Board of ICEL to the Member and Associate Member Conferences* (1976, 1988–89, 1990–91, 1992–95, 1996–97), unpublished versions of liturgical texts and instructions, and Peter Finn's time line published in his "ICEL: Alphabet Soup," *Today's Liturgy* (Easter 2003): 14–20.

- **1967:** The Philippines joins the other ten bishops' conferences as the eleventh member of ICEL
- **1967:** ICEL issues the first provisional draft translation, *The Roman Canon*
- **25 January 1969:** The Sacred Congregation of Rites (with Concilium) issues the instruction *Comme le prévoit (CLP)*, on the translation of liturgical texts for celebrations with a congregation
- **3 April 1969:** Paul VI issues the apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum*, approving the new *Missale Romanum (MR1970)*, which is to take effect on 30 November 1969 (the First Sunday of Advent)
- **6 April 1969:** The Sacred Congregation of Rites (with Concilium) issues the decree *Ordine Missae*, promulgating the *editio typica* of the *Ordo Missae (OM1969)* and issues *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani (IGMR1969)*
- **26 March 1970:** The Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship promulgates the second version of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani (IGMR1970)* along with the first *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum (MR1970)*
- **15 May 1972:** The USCC publishes a provisional English text of the *Sacramentary for Sundays and Other Occasions* approved by the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship on 14 January 1972
- **23 December 1972:** The Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship issues the third version of *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani (IGMR1972)*, in light of *Ministeria quaedam* (15 August 1972) and its suppression of the subdiaconate
- **1973:** ICEL produces the first translation of *MR1970* (ICEL1973)
- **26 October 1974:** Paul VI issues the decree *Postquam de Precibus*, authorizing the use of Eucharistic Prayers for Reconciliation I and II
- **27 March 1975:** The Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship issues the fourth version of *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani (IGMR1975)*, as well as the decree *Cum Missale Romanum* promulgating the *Missale Romanum, editio altera (MR1975)*
- **1976:** ICEL forms an ad hoc committee to study the question of inclusive language
- **1976:** ICEL reorganizes to prepare for revising all first-generation translations in light of pastoral experience; three standing subcommittees (on

translation and revision of liturgical texts, original texts, and presentation of texts) are added to the already existing subcommittee on music

- **9 November 1977:** Episcopal board of ICEL announces that it will begin a comprehensive program of revision
- **1980:** ICEL issues the green book *Eucharistic Prayers*, containing interim revisions of the eucharistic prayers introducing more inclusive language
- **1982:** ICEL issues a workbook on the “Revision [of] the Roman Missal—Presidential Prayers”
- **1983:** Revisions are made to the fifth version of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (IGMR1975) in order to bring it into conformity with the newly revised Code of Canon Law (1983)
- **March 1986:** ICEL issues a workbook to the bishops and consultants of the various English-speaking conferences on the “Revision [of] the Roman Missal Order of Mass”
- **1988:** ICEL issues the first of three progress reports (the others in 1990 and 1992) on the revision of the Roman Missal
- **1992:** Vatican gives permission to employ the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible for liturgical use
- **1993–1996:** The revised Sacramentary in two volumes is issued to English-speaking bishops’ conferences in eight parts for their discussion and vote
 - **September 1993:** Segment one—Ordinary Time
 - **April 1994:** Segment two—Proper of Seasons
 - **August 1994:** Segment three—Order of Mass and EPs
 - **February 1995:** Segment four—prefaces, solemn blessings, prayers over the people
 - **May 1995:** Segment five—Proper of Saints
 - **August 1995:** Segment six—Holy Week and Antiphonal for Volume I
 - **February 1996:** Segment seven—Common of Saints, Ritual Masses, Votive Masses, Masses for the Dead
 - **August 1996:** Segment eight—Mass for Various Needs and Occasions, Antiphonal for Volume II

- **1994:** Vatican objects to the Canadian publication of a New Revised Standard Version lectionary
- **April 1996:** The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith instructs the president of the NCCB to withdraw the *imprimatur*, granted by the USCC in January 1995, for the *Liturgical Psalter* prepared by ICEL
- **1997:** All eleven English-speaking conferences of bishops approve the new Sacramentary based on the eight segments previously submitted to them
- **September 1997:** English translation of the Ordination Rite, approved by all English-speaking conferences of bishops, is rejected by the Vatican
- **1998:** Each of the eleven English-speaking bishops' conferences of ICEL submits the new Sacramentary, based on multiple revisions of the eight segments of the Sacramentary in two volumes, to Rome for approval
- **October 1999:** Cardinal Medina, prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, demands widespread changes in ICEL's mandate, structures, and personnel
- **20 April 2000:** John Paul II authorizes a new edition of the *Missale Romanum*
- **15 July 2000:** The NCCB Secretariat for the Liturgy issues "An English Language Study Translation of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*" (IGMR2000)
- **28 March 2001:** The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments issues *Liturgiam Authenticam*, the fifth instruction "for the right application of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," changing the rules for vernacular translation of the Latin liturgy
- **16 March 2002:** The Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments rejects the proposed English translation of the Roman Missal
- **18 March 2002:** *Missale Romanum editio typica tertia* (MR2002) and the seventh version of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (IGMR2002), previously promulgated by John Paul II, are published by the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments
- **20 April 2002:** John Paul II establishes the *Vox Clara* committee to oversee the English translation of liturgical texts

- **July 2002:** The Vatican releases a preliminary sixth version of the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani (IGMR2000)*, intended to accompany the *Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia*
- **17 March 2003:** The USCCB issues the approved English translation of *IGMR2002 (GIRM2003)*
- **15 September 2003:** Cardinal Arinze issues a formal decree establishing ICEL as a mixed commission, with new statutes governing its operation
- **2 February 2004:** ICEL sends a newly drafted English translation of the Order of Mass (green book), made in accordance with *Liturgiam Authenticam* (as are all subsequent translations), to the English-speaking bishops' conferences of the world (ICEL2003/2004)
- **1 June 2005:** Because of so many substantive comments (e.g., regarding length of sentences, archaic language, etc.) on the first green book (2 February 2004), ICEL issues a second draft green book translation of the Order of Mass
- **17 February 2006:** ICEL issues its final draft gray book translation of the Order of Mass to the English-speaking bishops' conferences for their approval (ICEL2006)
- **2006:** The 2006 gray book of the Order of Mass from ICEL is approved by various English-speaking bishops' conferences
- **September 2007:** Vatican gives *recognitio* to Canadian bishops for using a "corrected" NRSV translation in their new lectionary
- **23 June 2008:** Vatican gives *recognitio* for the English translation of the Order of Mass submitted by English-speaking bishops' conferences (ICEL2008), which contained revisions of the 2006 gray book
- **2008:** Rome publishes a *Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia emendata*
- **November 2009:** US bishops and other English-speaking conferences submit an English translation of the Roman Missal to Rome (ICEL2008)
- **26 March 2010:** The Vatican's *recognitio* is given to the English translation of the Roman Missal (ICEL2010)
- **28 April 2010:** The *recognitio* is announced at meeting of *Vox Clara* with Benedict XVI
- **24 July 2010:** The *recognitio* of the adaptations for the Roman Missal in the United States is granted

- **20 August 2010:** English translation of the Order of Mass is made public, with over one hundred changes to what had been established by the text of 2008, which had received the *recognitio* in March of 2010
- **November 2010:** English translations of the Masses for Reconciliation and Masses for Various Needs and Occasions are made public
- **31 December 2010:** Text and music files of ICEL2010 are transmitted to seven US publishers approved for releasing ritual editions of the *Roman Missal*; they encompass an estimated ten thousand changes in what was originally sent to Rome as the gray book of the Roman Missal approved by eleven English-speaking episcopal conferences

Introductory Essays

The *Ordo Missae* of the Roman Rite

Historical Background

Joanne M. Pierce and John F. Romano

The structure or “order” of the Mass of the Roman Rite can best be understood when viewed through a number of different lenses. The task of this essay is to provide one such view through the lens of its historical development over the centuries. Such a task is not as straightforward as it sounds, for liturgical history is as much a matter of interpretation of sources as it is an attempt to collect and analyze the data provided by these sources.

Interpretation

As liturgical scholar Robert Taft has noted, “Only the unhistorical mind thinks history is the past. History is a view of the past, and as such is the product of the historian’s mind.”¹ History is thus always a construct, an interpretation, and this is true of liturgical history as well. Every analyst brings their presuppositions to the study of liturgical sources from various historical periods, e.g., in defense of an accepted “orthodox” interpretation or to support a “revisionist” challenge to that interpretation, “otherwise it [history] is mere repetition of what has already been written.”²

In the sixteenth century, for example, some prominent Lutheran theologians attempted to justify elements of their Mass reforms by appealing to liturgical texts that they identified as dating back to the earliest decades of Christianity. In particular, the Lutheran historian Matthias Flacius Illyricus (d. 1575) engaged in a lengthy study of liturgical manuscripts in his search for such evidence. In 1557, he edited and published an elaborate *ordo missae* (OM), claiming that the manuscript text was a solid witness to early Christian eucharistic practice, particularly in support of the practice of lay communion from the cup. Late nineteenth- and twentieth-century research,

¹ Robert F. Taft, review of Paul Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, in *The Catholic Historical Review* 80 (1994) 556–58; on history as interpretation, cf. Collins and Foley, 82 below.

² John Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 160.

however, proved that the manuscript dated from the early eleventh century and thus was not a witness to ancient Christian practice. Furthermore, the rubric accompanying the distribution of Communion to the laity made no reference in the original hand to “the Blood of Christ”; the phrase *et sanguis* had been added in pencil (likely centuries later) over the rubric’s mention of the “Body of Christ.”³ Illyricus’ interpretation had been shaped by the motives underlying his research agenda.

The great Roman Catholic liturgical scholars of the mid-twentieth century also interpreted the sources according to what they understood to be the needs of the church at their own time. The most important analysis of the development of the Roman Mass was first published by the Austrian Jesuit Josef Jungmann in 1948. His monumental two-volume study, titled *Missarum Sollemnia*, went through five editions, the last published in 1962 just as Vatican II began. The second edition (1949) was the only one translated into English; it was published in the United States in 1951 as *The Mass of the Roman Rite*.⁴ While Jungmann does borrow ideas from interpretive frameworks considered “orthodox” in his time—e.g., he does not hesitate to describe the Last Supper as “the first Holy Mass”⁵—his main concern in his massive study is to distill the essential structure of the Mass from multiple later accretions: “Jungmann . . . [was] convinced that the Middle Ages saw a considerable decline in the fortunes of Christian liturgical celebration. . . . The clear implication is that at a certain point liturgical development ceased, i.e., it died.”⁶ As Jungmann notes in his introduction, “It is the task of the history of the liturgy to bring to light these ideal patterns of past phases of development which has been hidden in darkness and whose shapes are all awry.”⁷

This task was not simply an academic exercise for Jungmann: The impetus for his study of the Mass was shaped, in part, by his desire for reform and renewal of the liturgy that had already found expression in various ways earlier in the twentieth century. In his view, the external “forms” of the eucharistic liturgy could and should be clarified (“a purity and clarity such as it possessed in the time of the Fathers”) so that all of the faithful could participate with “an entirely new understanding” of its structure and

³ Ironically, this early medieval manuscript is still an important element in studying the history of the *OM* in the West but for an entirely different reason than Flacius Illyricus had imagined (see 22, n. 108 below).

⁴ See Jungmann in the list of abbreviations above (xx) for publishing information.

⁵ Jungmann MRR, 1:7.

⁶ Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 160.

⁷ Jungmann MRR, 1:5.

meaning and thus realize even more fully “that they are the Church” united together in Christ as his Body.⁸ To this end, uncovering the more pristine liturgy “of the Fathers” was his goal.

Diverging from the previously held academic assumption that such documents are a relatively simple description of reality, contemporary scholars of the liturgy tend to approach liturgical sources with hermeneutical methods similar to those that have come to prominence in biblical studies. Thus scholars have engaged in careful source criticism of liturgical sources, questioned how to read silences in such documents, and demonstrated increased skepticism about how much information authoritative sources provide about real practice or how much stock one can place in explanations for the origins of specific customs.⁹ Such methods call into question long-standing assumptions that underlie previous studies of the liturgy. Contemporary liturgical scholars, like those in other areas of historical theology, thus tend to reject the notion of any earlier historical period as a so-called golden age of Christian life and practice and approach the sources from a different perspective:

This is not to say that the third century—or the second or the first—represents a golden age of Christian worship. There is no period to go back to and imitate: not fourth-century Jerusalem, or seventh-century Rome, or tenth-century Constantinople, or fourteenth-century Salisbury or sixteenth-century Geneva, for that matter.¹⁰

Dispelling the notion of a golden age is only one of the important shifts in ways that researchers have approached, read, and interpreted liturgical texts over the past fifty years.

While this is not the place for a lengthy discussion of the history of hermeneutics,¹¹ there are a few important elements that should be noted here. In addition to the methods used in biblical study (e.g., source, redaction, historical, and form criticism), other “postcritical” and “postcolonial” methods stemming from more contemporary literary, linguistic, philosophical, and contextual studies are also used in the analysis of liturgical sources, including texts.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 1:164–65.

⁹ Paul Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 14–20.

¹⁰ Baldwin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 163.

¹¹ For a fine overview of this topic, see Maurizio Ferraris, *History of Hermeneutics*, trans. Luca Somigli, Contemporary Studies in Philosophy and the Human Sciences (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1996).

Here, the interpretive focus shifts away from determining “the authorial intention, history, and context”¹² of a liturgical text. Instead, the starting point is a familiarity with the texts themselves, including an analysis of their literary genre or form, moving next to an evaluation of the “interplay of different elements” in the actual liturgical celebration.¹³ In contemporary discussion, most scholars base their analytical work on several key points: critique of historical/theoretical foundations; attention to culture and context; openness to the plurality of traditions around the “common memory of the one foundational event, which is the story of Jesus of Nazareth and his crucifixion”; attention to language itself (including the variations of genre and usage); and finally, recognition of the importance of taking seriously the “actuality of event,” that is, the “originating event of Christian faith,” without which none of the language of revelation (and thus the written texts through which it is transmitted) makes sense or has any meaning.¹⁴

Interpretive methods have expanded to take into account the complexity of the context of the liturgical sources (societal, cultural, literary) as well as the specific nature and use of both verbal and nonverbal sources and the ways the text has been and is read and received by specific individuals (and groups) across time and place. Some scholars have begun to move beyond the text and consider the inextricable relationship between text and liturgical performance: For them, acting out the words of the text is an essential part of understanding and experiencing worship.¹⁵ Indeed, contemporary hermeneutics raise major questions about the very “text”-centered nature of much of contemporary liturgical scholarship.

The *OM* as a Liturgical Document

While at first glance the *OM* seems to be a relatively straightforward, step-by-step description of the actions of the eucharistic liturgy, it is clear that understanding it—especially in the midst of previously noted historical trends—is increasingly challenging for scholars. It is important first to define the meaning of the term *ordo missae*. The Latin word *ordo* is translated

¹² Joyce Ann Zimmerman, *Liturgy and Hermeneutics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 12.

¹³ David Power, *Sacrament: The Language of God's Giving* (New York: Crossroad, 1999), 41–42.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 47–48.

¹⁵ See, for example, Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 41–71.

most simply as “order” or “arrangement.”¹⁶ This noun is found frequently in the Vulgate, often referring to the proper arrangement of the cult or its ministers.¹⁷ More broadly, it can also refer to the correct and harmonious arrangement of people in society.¹⁸ Order was a particular concern for liturgical celebration. Often throughout Christian history it was thought important to achieve and maintain a sense of order in the liturgy, sometimes thought to mirror the more exalted order of heavenly worship.¹⁹ Although we only have a small number of extant liturgical documents, those that remain can help us to reconstruct how this order was achieved in practical terms. An *ordo* (plural *ordines*) is a liturgical script, a description of the action of a celebration of the public worship of the church.²⁰ *Libri ordinarii* or ordinaries were reference books designed and used for a specific cathedral or community, which contained information on the texts to be read, chanted, or sung in the Eucharist or Divine Office.²¹ The *OM* is a subset of the larger class of *ordines*, intended specifically to outline eucharistic worship, providing rubrics, prayer texts, and music that facilitate the performance of the Mass, originally intended for the priest alone.²²

Eucharistic practice in the early centuries of Christianity was a local affair, and it is improbable to claim that any single document represents a form of worship that held sway throughout the Roman Empire. The majority of early forms of eucharistic celebrations were not preserved in any kind of written form. Early presiders improvised the prayers of the Mass, even

¹⁶ Ursula Keudel, “Ordo nel ‘Thesaurus linguae latinae,’” in *Ordo: Atti del II colloquio internazionale. Roma, 7–9 gennaio 1977*, ed. Marta Fattori and Massimo Bianchi, *Lessico intellettuale europeo 20* (Rome: Edizioni dell’Ateneo & Bizzarri, 1979), 13–22.

¹⁷ For example, Exod 28:17; 28:20; 39:10; 39:13; 40:21; 40:23; Lev 17:15; Num 7:5; Deut 15:2; Ps 109:4; Luke 1:8; 1 Cor 14:40; 15:23; Col 2:5.

¹⁸ Otto Gerhard Oexle, “Ordo, Ordines I,” *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, ed. Robert Auty et al., 10 vols. (Munich and Zurich: Artemis Verlag, 1977–99), 6:1436–37.

¹⁹ Eric Peterson, *The Angels and the Liturgy: The Status and Significance of the Holy Angels in Worship*, trans. Robert Walls (London: Darton, 1964).

²⁰ For *ordines*, see especially Aimé Georges Martimort, *Les Ordines, les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*, *Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 56* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1991), 20–50; Eric Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993), 175–85; Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. William G. Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1986), 135–224.

²¹ Edward Foley, “‘Libri ordinarii’: An Introduction,” *Ephemerides liturgicae* 102 (1988): 129–37.

²² For brief description of the *OM*, see Andrew Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to Their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 148–53; John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 62–63, 66, 195, 308.

EPs.²³ Only gradually did guidelines emerge that helped to shape the content of these prayers, and not until the third and fourth century did written EPs become widespread and begin to supplant extemporaneous prayer. No *ordines* from this period have survived. As documents of practice envisioned as appropriate for only a limited time, they might have been written down on papyrus and perished after their initial period of use. In fact, we do not possess any *ordines* earlier than the seventh century, and only in the ninth century does the *OM* appear as a separate text, either as a small booklet (or *libellus*) or as a separate section in larger liturgical books.²⁴ There are many earlier sources, however, that offer important information about the structure of the eucharistic celebration in antiquity and the early medieval period.

Early Sources

Recent scholarship has largely abandoned the notion that there was one unified apostolic tradition of liturgy handed down by Jesus and then transmitted in attenuated form through the apostles and the later churches. When viewed broadly, the history of the eucharistic liturgy before modernity must be seen as one marked more by diversity rather than uniformity,²⁵ and any further work on the history of its development must take this diversity into account: “Multiple accounts of Eucharistic origins and development, involving ‘thicker’ description of particular settings and practices, may therefore be necessary before there can be a more adequate single historical picture.”²⁶ This is particularly true in studying the historical development of the *OM*; scholars are careful not to interpret this development as more marked by uniformity on the one hand, or diversity on the other hand, beyond what the sources themselves might indicate.

²³ Allan Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1981).

²⁴ For example, in some manuscripts of the Gregorian Sacramentary; see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 82–83 (early ninth-century Sacramentary of Hildebrand, an “uncorrected” text of the *Hadrianum*) and 98–100 (early- to mid-ninth-century Sacramentary of Trent, a more complex composition).

²⁵ Bradshaw, *The Search*, and in particular his discussion of the evolution of eucharistic liturgy, 118–43. Bradshaw’s theories have come under intense discussion. He has, for instance, been criticized for being too much of a “splitter” as opposed to a “lumper,” an approach that makes it difficult to make general statements about past liturgical practice. See the review by Taft in *The Catholic Historical Review*, cited in n. 1 above.

²⁶ Andrew McGowan, “Rethinking Agape and Eucharist in Early North African Christianity,” *Studia liturgica* 34 (2004): 165–76; here 167.

Scriptural Texts

In the NT there are several references to what took place during the “breaking of the bread,” although these are not provided as outlines for an order of service. Rather than assume that the NT contains literal renderings of past liturgical practice, recent scholarship has introduced new ways of examining these texts. For example, some twentieth-century scholarship on the scriptural texts of the words of Jesus over the elements (referred to as the institution narratives) has begun to question “the relatively common assumption among NT scholars regarding the liturgical character of these traditions . . . [that is, that they] . . . are texts for liturgical recitation over bread and cup at the Eucharistic meal.”²⁷ Furthermore, attention has shifted from uncovering the actual “historical core” of the Last Supper to locating “the source of the Eucharist more broadly within the context of other meals in Jesus’ life . . . and to take seriously various layers of meaning that can be discerned within the New Testament.”²⁸ The variety of “meal accounts,” both in the narratives of Jesus’ life and ministry as well as in others describing immediate “apostolic” practice, provide a rich pattern of eucharistic “meaning,” the real focus for contemporary interpreters, as opposed to what might be called “the quest for the historical Last Supper.” Finally, scholars have begun to question if the biblical accounts of the Last Supper were shaped less by a concern for historical accuracy and more by the interests and liturgical practices of the communities that produced them; instead of mirroring the actions of Jesus, they may instead address some of the more significant or controversial elements of their diverse eucharistic celebrations.²⁹

The Synoptic Gospels offer related perspectives on the actions of the Last Supper as well as reflect the liturgical practice of their own communities. Nevertheless, contemporary liturgical researchers warn against interpreting the structure and wording of these narratives as actual liturgical texts in and of themselves: “The most that we can say is that, because the narratives were passed on within Christian communities which celebrated the Eucharist, their liturgical experience appears, not surprisingly, to have had some effect on the way in which they told the story of the Last Supper.”³⁰ For

²⁷ Andrew McGowan, “Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel?: The Institution Narratives and Their Early Interpretative Communities,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 73–87; here, 73.

²⁸ Paul Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (London: SPCK, 2004), 2.

²⁹ Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), esp. 12–26.

³⁰ Bradshaw, *The Search*, 48.

example, the earliest gospel, Mark, was probably composed at Rome in about 70 CE.³¹ In Mark and the other Synoptic Gospels the Last Supper is a Passover meal; however, scholars urge caution in making too much of this, “since Mark’s church is unlikely to have been concerned with the observance of the external details of the Jewish Passover ritual . . . [since] the entire focus of the meal is on Jesus’ death.”³² Contemporary liturgical interpretation is much less concerned with arriving at a description of the actual “order of service” for the Last Supper, and some are moving away from attempts to discern within these institution narratives the local eucharistic practice of the communities within which these gospels were redacted:

Thus, the institution narratives were neither liturgical texts to be recited at the celebration nor liturgical instructions to regulate it, but instead catechesis of a liturgical kind. It was their regular repetition for catechetical purposes within some—but apparently not all—early Christian communities that gave them their particular literary style and character, and that in turn has misled New Testament scholars into imagining that they must therefore have been read as part of every celebration.³³

The earliest account of an “institution narrative” is found in 1 Corinthians, dating from about 54 CE, written by Paul in response to a letter from the Christians at Corinth raising several questions about various problems the group was facing.³⁴ After discussing issues involved with social interactions with pagans, Paul offers his opinion on a number of questions raised in connection with behavior at “liturgical assemblies” (chaps. 11–14).³⁵ His initial comments address one of the major issues: when the group comes together, the factions and divisions within the community are clearly expressed in their behavior at the Lord’s supper. Paul’s references to some “becoming drunk” while others “go hungry” clearly indicate the setting in the context of a full meal at which some (probably because of lower socio-economic status) might arrive late or even be shunted off into another room while the more privileged arrive earlier and partake of better food and more

³¹ PHEME PERKINS, “The Gospel of Mark,” in *New Interpreter’s Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 8:517.

³² *Ibid.*, 703.

³³ BRADSHAW, *Eucharistic Origins*, 14.

³⁴ See J. PAUL SAMPLEY, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” in *New Interpreter’s Bible*, ed. LEANDER KECK (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000), 10:777; also, JEROME MURPHY-O’CONNOR, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” *NJBC*, 49:8.

³⁵ MURPHY-O’CONNOR, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” 49:51–64.

wine.³⁶ As Paul writes, “When you meet in one place, then, it is not to eat the Lord’s supper” (1 Cor 11:20), language “designed to shock” in a culture so strongly “ordered around shame and honor.”³⁷ This misbehavior signals to Paul that they have “lost any sense that love as the right relation to others is the . . . necessary expression of their faith as the right relation to God.”³⁸ Because of this “lack of love . . . in reality there was no Eucharist.”³⁹

It is in this context that Paul offers to the Corinthian readers his own witness and memory of the eucharistic tradition “handed on” from the Lord. First, Jesus takes bread, gives thanks, and breaks it with the words, “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me” (1 Cor 11:24). Next, “after supper,” Jesus acts “in the same way” with the cup, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me”⁴⁰ (1 Cor 11:25). In the light of the context, however, this text “is not functioning as an *ordo* or script: Paul quotes it in order to remind the Corinthians of the meaning that he attaches to their celebration of the Lord’s Supper,”⁴¹ adding force and urgency to his judgments about the morality of their conduct.

Contemporary researchers have studied the meal practices in the wider Greco-Roman culture of the first century in order to uncover other influences that might have shaped the earliest Christian eucharistic practice.⁴² Some of these elements may indeed have been structural (and influential for Jewish as well as Christian practice). For example, the structure of the Greek *symposium* (or Latin *convivium*) suggests the possibility that some early Christian Eucharists began with the meal (what we might understand to be the Liturgy of the Eucharist) and ended with readings and discussion (suggestive of the Liturgy of the Word).⁴³ In addition, the wider societal

³⁶ Sampley, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” 10:777 and 934; also, Murphy-O’Connor, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” 49:56.

³⁷ Sampley, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” 10:928 and 934.

³⁸ Sampley, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” 10:934.

³⁹ Murphy-O’Connor, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” 49:56.

⁴⁰ The anamnestic phrase for the cup (“Do this . . .”) may have originated with Paul himself; see Murphy-O’Connor, “The First Letter to the Corinthians,” 49:56.

⁴¹ Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 13.

⁴² See, for example, Dennis Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003); Jan Michael Joncas, “Tasting the Kingdom of God: The Meal Ministry of Jesus and Its Implications for Contemporary Ministry and Life,” *Worship* 74 (2000): 329–65; Blake Leyerle, “Meal Customs in the Graeco-Roman World,” in *Passover and Easter: The Liturgical Structuring of a Sacred Season*, ed. Paul Bradshaw and Lawrence Hoffmann, *Two Liturgical Traditions* 5 (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 29–61; Andrew McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

⁴³ Joncas, “Tasting the Kingdom of God,” 363.

expectations for forms of meals and meal-sharing may also have shaped emerging understandings of church, Eucharist, and worship practices. Patterns of inclusion and exclusion, for example, offer insights into the powerful countercultural, ethical, and eschatological suppositions of early Christian communities.⁴⁴

Other Early Sources

Noncanonical sources are also “read” differently in contemporary scholarship. Here too scholars approach these through the lenses of contemporary hermeneutics; Christian tradition is understood to be pluriform in its traditions, in the unfolding of historical practice and interpretation.⁴⁵ For example, the use of water instead of wine seems to have been a fairly widespread practice by certain ascetic Christian communities, best understood in the wider context of all of their communal meals, where the concern for avoiding the product of pagan sacrifice, “the sacrificial elements of meat and wine,”⁴⁶ influenced early dining patterns more generally. Meat consumed at meals was usually made available, directly or indirectly, from animals killed in ritual sacrifices, and the drinking of wine at meals was prefaced by the practice of libation, a ritual “pouring out” of a small splash of wine directly onto the ground, in honor of the gods. So, strict, ascetic Christian groups consumed food that was understood to be culturally more ordinary, not sacral: bread (the “opposite” of meat) and water (the “opposite” of wine).⁴⁷

Other early sources also offer some insight into the structure of the early eucharistic celebration. For example, the writings of early Christian apologists and bishops can offer some fragmentary glimpses into the structure of the eucharistic celebrations of their home communities. One key example is the *First Apology* of Justin Martyr (Rome), from ca. 150 CE and addressed to the emperor, containing two brief descriptions of Christian eucharistic practice. One is part of a longer description of baptism, and the second appears to be “an outline of a normal Sunday gathering.”⁴⁸ This might well be a description of the Eucharist as celebrated by the Syrian Christian community in Rome—there could have been many different “ethnic” versions

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 356.

⁴⁵ See, for example, Raymond Brown, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984).

⁴⁶ McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 142.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 60–66.

⁴⁸ Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 61; cf. *First Apology*, 65:1–5, 66:1–4, and 67:1–7 = *Prex Eucharistica*, 1:68–73.

of Christian worship practiced by different churches in the city—one not meant for Christian consumption but instead as a defense of Christian beliefs and practice to non-Christians.⁴⁹ Nonetheless, there are certain elements of note in this text, e.g., in the baptismal section, Justin explicitly refers to (1) common prayers on behalf of the newly baptized and the community, (2) the exchange of a kiss at their conclusion, (3) a prayer over bread and cups of water and wine mixed with water⁵⁰ concluded by a communal “Amen” of assent, and (4) the distribution of these elements by “deacons” to those present (as well as to those not present). Later in the text, the words of Jesus over the bread and cup are also cited.

The second description of a Eucharist describes an “assembly” on the “day called Sunday,” at which readings from “the records of the apostles or writings of the prophets are read as time allows,” after which the presider “in a discourse admonishes and exhorts (us) to imitate these good things.” The community next offers prayers, the “bread and water and wine” are brought and the presider prays over them, after which the people “assent, saying the Amen.” Then “the (elements over which) thanks have been given are distributed and everyone partakes.”⁵¹

In the practice of Justin’s Syrian-influenced Christian community, we find a number of familiar-looking elements that will be included in later OMs: (1) shared intercessory prayers; (2) readings from the “apostles” or the “prophets;” (3) an expository address to the community by the presider; (4) the “bringing” of the bread and cup; (5) a prayer of “blessing” and “thanksgiving” over the bread and cup, including a version of the words of Jesus from 1 Corinthians and the Synoptics; and (6) distribution of the blessed elements, with provision made for those who are absent. This is also not an *ordo*, however; it is a set of descriptions included by Justin in his defense of Christian practice against common rumor and public suspicion.

Another category of early Christian sources are texts known as church orders.⁵² Unlike the *Apologies*, these documents were intended to be used within particular Christian communities as guides to structuring a number

⁴⁹ Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 63–64.

⁵⁰ There has been occasional controversy since the late nineteenth century over whether or not the reference to wine here is an interpolation; this would imply that Justin’s Eucharist involved the thanksgiving over a cup of water, not wine: “At the very least, Justin’s account should be treated with some reserve on this particular point” (Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 76–77).

⁵¹ *Second Apology*, 67:2–5 = Jasper & Cuming, 29–30.

⁵² For further discussion, see Basil Studer, “Liturgical Documents of the First Four Centuries,” in *Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. Anscar Chupungco, Handbook for Liturgical Studies 1

of elements of communal Christian practice. The *Didache* is the earliest known church order, “a rule for ecclesiastical praxis, a handbook of Church morals, ritual and discipline,”⁵³ most likely composed in Syria and dating from either the mid-first century or early second century.⁵⁴ It contains two sets of prayers over bread and wine: a set of blessings over cup and bread (9:1-5) and a thanksgiving prayer with three benedictions after a meal (10:1-5), which may well be considered a “eucharistic prayer.”⁵⁵ The *Didache* continued to influence later church orders in the same geographical region for three more centuries:⁵⁶ the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (mid-third century)⁵⁷ and, through that text, the first books of the much longer *Apostolic Constitutions*.⁵⁸ As will be noted later, the euchology of the *Didache* also had an influence on the texts of *MR1970*.⁵⁹

Another early church order (ApTrad) was once thought to be a description of early third-century worship of the city of Rome by the writer and “antipope” Hippolytus; a growing number of scholars now believe it represents a complex combination of different rites, from different times and places, compiled later into a single document.⁶⁰ If so, then certain elements may date from “as early as the mid-second century to as late as the mid-fourth,” and some conclude that it is “unlikely that it represents the practice of any single Christian community” and further study should focus on “attempting to discern the various elements and layers that constitute it.”⁶¹

The ApTrad contains two accounts of EPs: one after the ordination of a bishop (4:1-13) and another associated with the baptismal liturgy (21:25-

(Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 200–205; also, Maxwell Johnson, “The Apostolic Tradition,” OHCW, 44–60.

⁵³ Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary, Hermeneia series* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1998), 2.

⁵⁴ Bradshaw, *The Search*, 85–86.

⁵⁵ Niederwimmer, 161.

⁵⁶ For a more detailed analysis, see *ibid.*, 13–17.

⁵⁷ See Alistair Stewart-Sykes, *The Didascalia Apostolorum: An English Version with Introduction and Annotation* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009).

⁵⁸ For a helpful flow chart of these interactions, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 399. For a more detailed presentation of the texts, in parallel columns, see Paul Bradshaw, Maxwell Johnson, and L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, *Hermeneia series* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

⁵⁹ See 205 below.

⁶⁰ See especially John Baldovin, “Hippolytus and the *Apostolic Tradition*: Recent Research and Commentary,” *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 520–42; and Bradshaw et al., *The Apostolic Tradition*.

⁶¹ Bradshaw et al., *The Apostolic Tradition*, 14.

38),⁶² during which three cups are distributed, with clear reference to the newly baptized (one of water, one of mixed milk and honey, and one of wine). Brief prayers to accompany the offering of oil and cheese follow (5:1-2 and 6:1-4). A third prayer of thanksgiving at an evening meal (29C) seems not to have been a eucharistic celebration. It is important to note again, however, that early Christian meal and Eucharist are not “so sharply and simply differentiated from one another in the very early period of the Church’s history.”⁶³

Regardless of its actual date and composition, the ApTrad has been influential in other ways in the history of the *OM*. Several other compilers of later church orders make use of the ApTrad more or less heavily in preparing their own documents: e.g., the Egyptian *Canons of Hippolytus* (mid-fourth century), the *Apostolic Constitutions* (where it forms much of Book VIII, and is also known as the *Epitome*), and the fifth-century *Testamentum Domini* (probably also from Syria).⁶⁴ Like the texts of the *Didache*, the EP section of the ApTrad had a significant influence on the liturgical reforms of the later twentieth century, including the composition of EP II of *MR1970*.⁶⁵

Beyond the early church orders, other sources offer additional information about important phases in the development of liturgical forms during the late patristic period.⁶⁶ Especially important for the development of the *OM* are the changes made to the way liturgy was celebrated in Rome by the popes, the heads of the public cult. In the city of Rome, the most central change was the translation of the liturgy from Greek to Latin in the fourth century, likely during the pontificate of Damasus I (366–84).⁶⁷ It has been argued that this transition was intended to exalt traditional Roman values

⁶² Numberings according to the edition of Bradshaw et al., *The Apostolic Tradition*.

⁶³ Bradshaw et al., *The Apostolic Tradition*, 160.

⁶⁴ Robert Beylot, ed., *Testamentum Domini Ethiopien* (Louvain: Peeters, 1984); also, Bradshaw, *The Search*, 84–96; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 399.

⁶⁵ See 311–15 below.

⁶⁶ See, for example, Martin Klöckener, “Das eucharistische Hochgebet in der nordafrikanischen Liturgie der christlichen Spätantike,” *Prex Eucharistica*, 3:43–128, esp. the comparative table, 124–25.

⁶⁷ Theodor Klauser, “Der Übergang der römischen Kirche von der griechischen zur lateinischen Liturgiesprache,” *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Studi e Testi 121 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1946), 1:467–82; Massey H. Shepherd, “The Liturgical Reform of Damasus I,” in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 2: 847–63; cf. Pecklers and Ostdiek, 37 below.

and assert Damasus' power.⁶⁸ The responsorial psalm was likely introduced into the Roman liturgy by Pope Celestine I (422–32).⁶⁹ Certain fifth- and sixth-century popes were responsible for the composition of EPs, some in response to contemporary issues.⁷⁰ Pope Gregory I (590–604) altered the wording of the Canon of the Mass.⁷¹ Sergius I (687–701) introduced the *Agnus Dei* to the eucharistic celebration in Rome.⁷²

The Early Medieval Period (to 1200)⁷³

While early church orders and descriptions of papal changes to the liturgy offer scholars some access to understanding the contexts, texts, and practices of the Eucharist in late antiquity, technically speaking, we do not possess any *ordines* until the seventh century. The first extant *ordo* for the Mass is the celebrated witness to the papal high Mass during Easter Week, *OR I*.⁷⁴ Like many other Roman *ordines*, it survived due to its popularity among the Christians north of the Alps, who would copy and carry back descriptions of the Mass to their homes after pilgrimages. An examination of its contents reveals that *OR I* was intended to regulate the complicated interactions of the numerous members of the papal court and preserve a clear idea of who was responsible for costly liturgical furnishings. This

⁶⁸ Maura K. Lafferty, "Translating Faith from Greek to Latin: *Romanitas* and *Christianitas* in Late Fourth Century Rome and Milan," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11, no. 1 (2003): 21–62.

⁶⁹ Peter Jeffery, "The Introduction of Psalmody into the Roman Mass by Pope Celestine I (422–432): Reinterpreting a Passage in the *Liber Pontificalis*," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 26 (1984): 147–55.

⁷⁰ See, for example, Antoine Chavasse, "Messés du pape Vigile (537–555) dans le sacramentaire léonien," *Ephemerides liturgicae* 64 (1950): 161–213; and 66 (1952): 145–219; Charles Coebergh, "Le pape saint Gélase I^{er} auteur de plusieurs messes et préfaces du soi-disant sacramentaire léonien," *Sacris erudiri* 4 (1952): 46–102; Henry Ashworth, "The Influence of the Lombard Invasions on the Gregorian Sacramentary," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 36 (1953–54): 305–27; Arthur P. Lang, *Leo der Grosse und die Texte des Altgelasianums: mit Berücksichtigung des Sacramentarium Leonianum und des Sacramentarium Gregorianum* (Steyley: Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957); and, most recently, Bryan D. Spinks, "The Roman Canon Missae," *Prex Eucharistica*, 3:129–43.

⁷¹ *Gestorum pontificum Romanorum volumen I. Libri pontificalis pars prior*, ed. Theodor Mommsen (Berlin: Weidmannos, 1898), 161; *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, ed. John R. C. Martyn, *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 40 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004), 2:561–63; Andreas Heinz, "Papst Gregor der Grosse und die römische Liturgie," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 54 (2004): 69–84.

⁷² Mommsen, *Gestorum pontificum Romanorum*, 215.

⁷³ For a helpful chart illustrating some of this development, see John Baldovin, "The Empire Baptized," *OHCW*, 97.

⁷⁴ John F. Romano, "The Fates of Liturgies: Towards a History of the First Roman Ordo," *Antiphon* 11 (2007): 43–77.

influential text focused almost exclusively on the actions of the Mass, excluding most spoken parts of the Mass or explanation of its meaning. Roman liturgical documents like it were held up as an ideal and flourished in the Frankish Empire in the eighth and ninth centuries; they fostered imitation of Roman practices, even if it is unclear to what extent the liturgy north of the Alps was Romanized.⁷⁵

Early *ordines* like *OR I* were one of many liturgical books employed to regulate early medieval Roman worship. The numerous ministers needed separate books for prayers, readings, and rubrics. One of these volumes was the Sacramentary, the most significant book employed by the presider for celebrating the Mass,⁷⁶ which (in various arrangements) would include a calendar, prayers for individual celebrations, and an *OM*.⁷⁷ In the late seventh-century papal Gregorian Sacramentary, an abbreviated *OM* that outlines the basic parts of the Mass and some of the major prayers appears.⁷⁸ Often, particularly between the ninth and twelfth centuries, the *OM* circulated not as part of a prayer book but in its own independent booklet,⁷⁹ which could be used in conjunction with other books to celebrate the Eucharist. The system of having several different service books gradually became impractical, at least in part because of the growing practice of private Masses for votive purposes with only one priest. The *OM* eventually became part of the “full” missal (*missalis plenarius*), intended to bring together all of the parts of the Mass in one place.⁸⁰ Missals started appearing in the ninth century, and by the twelfth century they had already achieved ascendancy over older sacramentaries.⁸¹

⁷⁵ Yitzhak Hen, “Liturgische hervormingen onder Pepijn de Korte en Karel de Grote: de illusie van romanisering,” *Millennium* 15 (2001): 97–113; also, his *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul*, Henry Bradshaw Society Subsidia 3 (London: Boydell Press, 2001).

⁷⁶ Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 21.

⁷⁷ Daniel Sheerin, “The Liturgy,” in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. Frank Anthony Carl Mantello and A. G. Rigg (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 157–82; here 171.

⁷⁸ *Hadrianum*, 85–92.

⁷⁹ Harper, *The Forms*, 62–63. The earliest separate *OM* is the ninth-century *OM* found in the Sacramentary of Amiens; see Victor Leroquais, “L’ordo missae du sacramentaire d’Amiens, B.N. lat. 9432,” *Ephemerides liturgicae* 41 (1927): 435–45.

⁸⁰ Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts*, 119; Andreas Odenthal, “Zwei Formulare des Apologientyps der Messe vor dem Jahre 1000: Zu Codex 88 und 137 der Kölner Dombibliothek,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 37 (1995): 25–44; here 42–43.

⁸¹ Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 105; for a helpful summary of the history, content, and structure of early medieval sacramentaries see Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 21–61.

Despite being classified in the same genre, there is a bewildering variety in the specific contents of the *OM*.⁸² While this kind of variety is foreign to modern Roman Catholic liturgical books, it is in fact typical of medieval liturgy,⁸³ making it impossible to reduce the wide variety of eucharistic practice across the Middle Ages to one uniform pattern.⁸⁴ This kind of plurality was viewed not with opprobrium but with acceptance and even interest by ancient and early medieval Christians.⁸⁵

An examination of the various *OM* manuscripts gives us a more concrete sense of how their contents diverge.⁸⁶ They do not all have equal numbers of prayer texts or other liturgical “units” in them and, as a result, are often different lengths. Depending on the individual manuscript, the *OM* might contain a wide variety of prayer texts.⁸⁷ Some include only the *incipits* or opening phrases of certain prayers, while others contain the prayer texts in more complete forms. The number and detail of rubrics for individual ritual elements can differ. Graphically, the *OMs* are also presented in various ways. Many manuscripts use rubricated or larger letters to call attention to the most significant prayers; this is especially true of the Canon. Some use musical notation to show how to sing the chants provided, even if music was not provided in the rest of the *OM* or Missal. Some provide illuminations, especially full page pictures before the Canon. In addition, the *OM* itself is located at different points in different missals. Sometimes it is at the beginning or end,⁸⁸ but more usually the *OM* is placed before Easter Sunday.

In spite of the internal differences among *OMs*, certain commonalities bind these texts together. At heart, they are flowcharts that demonstrate for the priest how to perform the Mass and, as a result, must include the items

⁸² Joanne Pierce, “New Research Directions in Medieval Liturgy: The Liturgical Books of Siegbert of Minden (1022–1036),” in *Fountain of Life*, ed. Gerard Austin (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1986), 51–67; here 52.

⁸³ Jungmann MRR, 1:97–98; Hans Bernhard Meyer, *Eucharistie: Geschichte, Theologie, Pastoral*, ed. Hans Bernhard Meyer et al., Gottesdienst der Kirche: Handbuch der Liturgiewissenschaft 4 (Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1989), 207–8.

⁸⁴ Edward Foley, “A Tale of Two Sanctuaries: Late Medieval Eucharist and the Analogous,” in *Companion to the Medieval Eucharist*, eds. Ian Levy, Gary Macy, and Kristen Van Ausdall (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 327–63.

⁸⁵ Victor Saxer, *Les rites de l’initiation chrétienne du IIe au VIe siècle. Esquisse historique et signification d’après leurs principaux témoins* (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo, 1988), esp. 663–64.

⁸⁶ For a detailed description of the form of an *OM*, see Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts*, 151–53.

⁸⁷ Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 24.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

that will assist him in this task: prayer texts that provide which words to pronounce at certain points in the service, rubrics to direct him how to act, and musical texts that designate what to sing. Frequently, these texts provide direction that would not be clear from the prayers and music included in sacramentaries or missals, rubrics that must be listed in sequential order for the priest to follow. Although there is no one standard table of contents, stress is often placed on specific “moments” in the eucharistic celebration. Important points include: (1) the vesting ceremony, (2) the *Confiteor*, (3) the *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, (4) the creed, (5) offertory prayers, (6) the preface, (7) the Canon, (8) communion prayers, and (9) readings and chants said at the end of Mass. In addition, many of the prayer texts interlaced within these sections of the *OM* belong to the genre known as apologies (*apologiae*), private prayers of the presider expressing his sinfulness or unworthiness.⁸⁹

Because of the variability in the content of the *OM* before the advent of printing, much of the work of recent scholars has centered on simply recovering the different forms of this text and editing them,⁹⁰ yet a good deal of work remains on this front. Many examples of *OMs* remain unedited, which impedes a broader understanding of their contents and the historical evolution of this genre.⁹¹ Some older editions of *OM* are now outdated and need to be reedited if they are to be used effectively in critical modern studies.⁹² Only by editing and publishing the contents of as many manuscripts as possible and comparing all of these examples of the *OM* can we understand more deeply its history and development.

While many of the ceremonies and prayers of the *OM*, if not individual examples of *OMs*, received attention from scholars, few attempted to

⁸⁹ Joanne M. Pierce, “The Evolution of the *Ordo Missae* in the Early Middle Ages,” in *Medieval Liturgy: A Book of Essays*, ed. Lizette Larson-Miller (New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1997), 8.

⁹⁰ See, for example, the list of edited *OMs* in *ibid.*, 3–24; here 6–8. For recent editions to be added to her list, see especially Andreas Odenthal, “Ein Formular des ‘rheinischen Messordo’ aus St. Aposteln in Köln,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 34 (1992): 333–44; Odenthal, “Zwei Formulare”; Michael G. Witczak, “St. Gall Mass Orders (I): MS. Sangallensis 338: Searching for the Origins of the ‘Rheinish Mass Order,’” *Ecclesia orans* 16 (1999): 393–410; Witczak, “St. Gall Mass Orders (II): MS. Sangallensis 339,” *Ecclesia orans* 22 (2005): 47–62; and Witczak, “St. Gall Mass Orders (III): MS. Sangallensis 340,” *Ecclesia orans* 24 (2007): 243–61.

⁹¹ Odenthal, “Zwei Formulare,” 26; Pierce, “Evolution,” 13; Niels Krogh Rasmussen, “An Early ‘ordo missae’ with a ‘litania abecedaria’ addressed to Christ (Rome, Bibl. Vallicelliana, Cod. B. 141, XI. Cent.),” *Ephemerides liturgicae* 86 (1972): 198–211; here 199–200; Witczak, “St. Gall Mass Orders (I),” 396.

⁹² This especially holds for texts edited in the eighteenth century by Edmond Martène; see Pierce, “The Evolution,” 6–8.

construct a paradigm of how the genre of the *OM* emerged as a complete unit and how it changed over time.⁹³ The twentieth-century scholar primarily responsible for developing the first typology of the *OM* was Boniface (Bonifaas) Luykx.⁹⁴ His theory was intended to articulate some kind of progressive classification system for these diverse texts. He distinguished three levels or stages in the development of the *OM*:

- 1) *The Apology type*: Apologies are private prayers said by the priest in which he accuses himself of sins and asks God for pardon and purification in order to be worthy to celebrate Mass. These *OMs* included chains of these prayers said at the beginning of Mass at the foot of altar, at the offertory, and at Communion. Apology type *OMs* first appeared in the ninth century and flourished in the tenth century.
- 2) *The Frankish type*: In addition to sacerdotal apologies, these *OMs* included additional, private prayers by the priest or presider that accompanied and often articulated different levels of spiritual meaning for various ritual actions. Prayers and psalms were added to the Mass at several different points, including vesting prayers, the entrance procession, the censing of the altar, before and after the gospel, the offertory prayers, the *Sanctus*, the mixing the of the bread and wine, and at end of Mass. This type also featured a novel concentration of gestures (like signs of the cross and bows) by the priest and new rubrics. This form would eventually replace the earlier Apology type *OM*. It flourished in the eleventh century, especially in the Frankish Empire.
- 3) *The Rheinisch OM*: *Ordines* of this type were expanded by a further increase in the number of prayers and psalms, to the extent that nearly every liturgical action was connected with a private sacerdotal prayer and preceded by rubrics. The end result was a Mass that was almost entirely the personal experience of a priest, rather than a communal one. Several different elements were added or elaborated, including the vesting and preparation before Mass, the entrance rite, the *Confiteor*,

⁹³ Pierce, "The Evolution," 3–4.

⁹⁴ Bonifaas Luykx, *De oorsprong van het gewone der Mis*, De Eredienst der kerk 3 (Utrecht and Antwerp: Spectrum, 1955), and its German translation, "Der Ursprung der gleichbleibenden Teile der heiligen Messe (*Ordinarium Missae*)," *Liturgie und Mönchtum* 29 (1961): 72–119. For a summary and discussion of the classification, see Pierce, "The Evolution," 10–13. A useful Italian summary and discussion is found in Bonifacio Baroffio and Ferdinando dell'Oro, "L'ordo missae' di Warmondo d'Ivrea," *Studi medievali* ser. 3, 16 (1975): 795–821; here 801–6. For a comparative chart of Luykx's three types, see Odenthal, "Zwei Formulare," 26.

the treatment of gospel books, the kiss of peace, communion prayers, kissing of the altar, and thanksgiving prayers after Mass. The offertory would henceforth become more clericalized, including the blessing of offerings and washing of the priest's hands and increasingly excluding the laity. While this form was initially intended for use by a bishop, it would eventually become the standard for all priests. The Rheinisch *OM* would soon supplant both other forms. It emerged at the beginning of the eleventh century, originating most likely in the Swiss monastery of St. Gall. From there, it was adopted by the German cities of Reichenau and Mainz, then radiated further from all three centers.

The overall effect of incorporating the elements contained within these three types of *OMs* (especially the Rheinisch *OM*) on the Mass was considerable.⁹⁵ The Roman Mass before this point was known for its soberness, simplicity, and straightforwardness.⁹⁶ These *OMs* filled out the framework of the Roman Rite with new prayers, psalms, and gestures, elaborating the "soft spots" of the liturgy⁹⁷ that had not previously received full elaboration, especially actions that occur without words. They imbued the Roman eucharistic liturgy with new embellishment, drama, and allegorical symbolism.⁹⁸

The theories of Luykx on the development of the Mass order have been generally accepted. His work is cited with approval in standard studies of the history of the liturgy or the Mass, such as S. J. P. Van Dijk and Joan Hazelden Walker,⁹⁹ Josef A. Jungmann,¹⁰⁰ Burkhard Neunheuser,¹⁰¹ Hans Bernhard Meyer,¹⁰² and Eric Palazzo.¹⁰³ This is especially striking in Jungmann's

⁹⁵ Jungmann *MS*, 1:124–30.

⁹⁶ See the classic formulation of Edmund Bishop, "The Genius of the Roman Rite," in *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918), 1–19; for a different perspective see the discussion of the work of Burkhard Neunheuser and the comments of Power below, 259, esp. n. 3; also 414.

⁹⁷ On Robert Taft's use of this term, see Baldovin 115 below; also Witczak 201; Pierce uses this concept to describe the incorporation of elements of the *OM* into the Mass in "The Evolution," 10–11.

⁹⁸ Anscar Chupungco, "History of the Liturgy until the Fifteenth Century," in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 131–52; here 145.

⁹⁹ S. J. P. Van Dijk and Joan Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the Thirteenth Century* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1960), 49–51. The authors refer to the Rheinisch *OM* as the "Lotharingian type."

¹⁰⁰ Jungmann *MS*, 1:123–29.

¹⁰¹ Burkhard Neunheuser, *Storia della liturgia attraverso le epoche culturali* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1977), 88–89.

¹⁰² Meyer, *Eucharistie*, 204–8.

¹⁰³ Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, 24.

influential study of the Mass, which only in its fifth and last edition (1962) fully incorporated Luykx's results.

Some scholars have begun not only to recapitulate but also to build upon his scheme,¹⁰⁴ although not every scholar remains fully convinced that Luykx has definitively solved the problem of the origins of the *OM*.¹⁰⁵ Recent studies concur that Luykx's ideas are best characterized as a hypothesis that was never fully tested and cannot be until more examples see the light of publication.¹⁰⁶ Even scholars who agree with his overall structure anticipate that it will need further refinement,¹⁰⁷ especially in the case of texts that do not easily fit into Luykx's typology.¹⁰⁸ Some of these important areas for further study include the variety and malleability of apologies and the new spiritual character of these elements of the *OM* (as compared to the older Roman Mass), which introduced a much more individualistic, devotional series of prayers often stressing personal penitence.¹⁰⁹ Scholars have also begun asking not only what is in the *OM*, but also how these texts were used by priests; e.g., some of the long lists of apologies in certain of these *OMs*—like the Minden *OM*—might have been menus from which the priest chose, rather than all individually pronounced during any given celebration of the Mass.¹¹⁰ This suggestion may hold in other cases as well and is in line with the new focus on performance, which examines how texts were used during the actual experience of worship.¹¹¹ Other studies have explored these *OMs* for what they have to tell us about the mentalities and piety of those who crafted and used them. The apologies, for instance, are seen as representative of a brand of spirituality that particularly stresses sinfulness,

¹⁰⁴ For example, Joseph Lemarié was able to define more precisely the new additions in the Rheinisch *OM* by comparing it with other known *OMs*; see Joseph Lemarié, "A propos de l'Ordo Missae du Pontifical d'Hugues de Salins," *Didaskalia* 9 (1979): 3–9. For an English summary and discussion, see Pierce, "The Evolution," 12–13.

¹⁰⁵ See especially Theodor Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, trans. John Halliburton (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 104–5.

¹⁰⁶ Pierce, "The Evolution," 14; also, Witzcak, "St. Gall Mass Orders (I)," 396.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Rasmussen, "An Early 'ordo missae,'" 200.

¹⁰⁸ For example, the Salins *OM*; see Lemarié, "A propos de l'Ordo Missae," esp. 8–9. Another elaborate, and perhaps influential, *OM* of the Rheinisch type is the Minden *OM*, prepared for the eleventh-century German bishop Sigebert of Minden (first published as the *Missa Illyrica* by Flacius Illyricus; see 3–4 above). See Joanne M. Pierce, "Sacerdotal Spirituality at Mass: Text and Study of the Prayerbook of Sigebert of Minden," (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1988). The main results of this study were published in her "New Research Directions."

¹⁰⁹ Pierce, "New Research Directions," 61–62.

¹¹⁰ Lemarié, "A propos de l'Ordo Missae," 6.

¹¹¹ Eric Palazzo, "Performing the Liturgy," in *Early Medieval Christianities*, ed. Thomas F. X. Noble and Julia M. H. Smith, Cambridge History of Christianity 3 (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 472–88.

unworthiness, and the necessity for purification.¹¹² Vesting prayers reveal that the allegorical method of interpretation popularly applied to the Bible also attached a deeper moral purpose to ritual actions.¹¹³

The impact of these *OMs* would not be limited to the area of personal spirituality, but would in fact shape the form of the Western Mass, even after the liturgical reforms of Pope Gregory VII (1073–85), ironically enacted in an “attempt at ‘restoring’ the integrity of the Roman liturgy and purifying it of ‘Germanic’ influences.”¹¹⁴ The developmental stages of the *OM* were one of the main elements in the broader story in the history of the liturgy. Between the eighth and tenth centuries, the Mass would transform itself in Frankish and Germanic lands, mixing together the imported Roman liturgy with local patterns of worship. The resulting Romano-Frankish Mass would not remain north of the Alps but in the tenth century would travel back to Rome and profoundly influence the worship of the eternal city. The Rheinisch *OM*, along with the Romano-Germanic Pontifical, was one of the main documents that contributed fundamentally to this process¹¹⁵ and changed the standard for what was considered the “Roman” Mass.

The Late Medieval Period (1200–1500)

The story of the *OM* did not end in the city of Rome at the end of the twelfth century. Important political and liturgical changes were made in the thirteenth century that would again influence the whole of Western Europe. Increasingly powerful popes began to impose the model of worship of the papal Curia more widely.¹¹⁶

¹¹² See Pierce, “The Evolution,” 8–9. For one significant case study, see Joaquim O. Bragança, “A apologia ‘Suscipe confessionem meam,’” *Didaskalia* 1 (1971): 319–34. Apologies were particularly significant in the early eleventh-century *OM* prepared for Sigebert of Minden.

¹¹³ Joanne M. Pierce, “Early Medieval Vesting Prayers in the *Ordo Missae* of Sigebert of Minden (1022–1036),” in *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B.*, ed. Nathan Mitchell and John Baldovin (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 80–105.

¹¹⁴ Timothy Thibodeau, “Western Christendom,” *OHCW*, 225; also, Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 105–6. For other historical summaries, see especially Jungmann *MRR*, 1:74–92; also, Theodor Klauser, “Die liturgischen Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischen und der fränkischen-deutschen Kirche vom achten bis zum elften Jahrhundert,” *Historisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1933): 169–89.

¹¹⁵ Neunheuser, *Storia*, 89.

¹¹⁶ The liturgical situation in Rome at the time was complex. Note that “by the year 1275, the city of Rome knew four liturgical customs: the papal court, St. Peter’s in the Vatican, the reform of Cardinal Orsini (later Pope Nicholas III), and the Lateran Basilica” (Cassian Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 245–314; here 265).

The main movers in this process were Franciscan friars who in 1230 had “adopted” for the use of their order a Roman curial missal known as the “missal of Honorius,” after Pope Honorius III (d. 1227).¹¹⁷ In accordance with their mendicant style of life, they then traveled throughout Europe with these *Regula* missals, stamped with the Roman Curia’s method of celebrating Mass.¹¹⁸ Revisions were made to this missal by the English Franciscan Haymo of Faversham in 1243–44, with a second edition published in the following decade.¹¹⁹ The *OM* of Haymo’s missal is often referenced by the first two words of its opening rubric, *Indutus planeta*, describing the initial actions of the priest when beginning Mass.¹²⁰

Although more work needs to be done on missals of this period, it is clear that the need for a travel-adapted *OM* was felt beyond the Franciscan orbit. One example comes from southwestern Germany. The fourteenth-century archbishop of Trier, Balduin of Luxemburg (d. 1354) seems to have traveled with a portable breviary containing a brief *OM*¹²¹ titled *Officium sacerdotis quando se preparat ad missam*. The preparation rites before Mass seem to have been heavily influenced by the Rheinisch type *OM*, and sections of the *OM* differ in several ways from that found in the *MR1570*.¹²²

The introduction of the printing press in the mid-fifteenth century expanded the degree of influence that the Franciscan curial liturgy achieved. With printing, the exact words of this *OM* could be easily disseminated and promoted throughout Europe. The second edition of Haymo’s missal was reestablished in Rome early in the next century. It was “approved by Clement V (1305–14) and adopted by the papal chapel . . . [this *Missale secundum consuetudinem Romanae Curiae* later forming] . . . the basis for the

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 265–66.

¹¹⁸ See Van Dijk and Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*. Earlier work on this liturgical development was done by Vincent L. Kennedy, “The Franciscan Ordo Missae in the Thirteenth Century,” *Mediaeval Studies* 2 (1940): 204–22.

¹¹⁹ For the edition, see *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Ordinals by Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents (1243–1307)*, ed. S. J. P. Van Dijk, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 2:3–14; also Folsom, “The Liturgical Books,” 266.

¹²⁰ *Indutus planeta sacerdos stet ante gradum altaris*. See Edward Foley, “Franciscan Liturgical Prayer,” in *Franciscan Prayer*, ed. Timothy Johnson (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 385–412; here 393–97; also, Nathan Mitchell and John Baldovin, “*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* and the Class of Liturgical Documents to Which It Belongs,” in *A Commentary on the General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, ed. Edward Foley, Nathan Mitchell, Joanne Pierce (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007), 18–19.

¹²¹ Described by Andreas Heinz, “Der Ordo Missae im ‘Reisemissale’ des Trierer Erzbischofs Balduin von Luxemburg (1308–1354),” in *Ars et Ecclesia. Festschrift für Franz J. Ronig zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Hans-Walter Stork, Christoph Gerhardt, and Alois Thomas (Trier: Paulinus-Verlag, 1989), 217–33.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 220–33.

first printed missal,"¹²³ i.e., *MR1474*. Its *OM*, which begins *Paratus sacerdos*, however, is somewhat less detailed than its model, *Indutus planeta*, and appears to follow a late twelfth-century *OM* used by the papal Curia.¹²⁴ Through the work of the Franciscans and the new printed missals, the *ordo* of the papal Curia achieved a certain level of popularity in Europe in the century and a half before the Council of Trent (1545–63).¹²⁵

These would not be the only influences on the *OM* or the *MR1570*. The latter was also prepared with reference to the already widespread late fifteenth-century *OM* of the papal master of ceremonies John Burckard of Strasbourg, published in 1501. This *OM* also represented curial practice,¹²⁶ and combined mostly medieval elements and some new modifications when it was crafted.¹²⁷ The editorial process was conservative, involving pruning certain formulae and changing the wording of others.¹²⁸ This is an elaborate text, which "in its length, precision, scope, and rubrical detail . . . goes well beyond medieval precedents, such as *Indutus planeta* and *Paratus* . . . that are relatively brief by comparison," as is the *OM* of *MR1474*.¹²⁹

The Council of Trent called for a revision of the Roman liturgical books and left this task in the hands of the papacy. The work of a commission supervised by Pius IV and Pius V, *MR1570* would be the second of these new liturgical books to appear after the council—the first being the breviary of 1568. The Missal's prefatory directions—the *ritus servandus*, forerunner of the contemporary *IGMR*—depended heavily on Burckard's text, while its edition of the *OM* was based largely on that of the *MR1474*.¹³⁰ Through both of these key elements, *MR1570* would ultimately set the standard for the celebration of Mass for centuries both in traditionally Roman Catholic lands and new missionary territory throughout the world.

¹²³ Folsom, "The Liturgical Books," 266.

¹²⁴ This *OM* is known as *Paratus*; see Foley, "Franciscan Liturgical Prayer," 397; also, Mitchell and Baldovin, "*Institutio Generalis*," 19–20, and n. 88. The ceremonial of the Franciscan missal can be found in *Ordines of Haymo of Faversham*, Henry Bradshaw Society 85 (London: Boydell Press, 1853).

¹²⁵ Nathan Mitchell, "Reforms, Protestant and Catholic," *OHCW*, 307–50; here 337.

¹²⁶ Jungmann *MRR*, 1:135; for an edition, see *Tracts on the Mass*, ed. J. Wickham Legg, Henry Bradshaw Society 27 (London: Harrison and Sons, 1904), 121–71.

¹²⁷ For a more complete description, see Mitchell and Baldovin, "*Institutio Generalis*," 20–22.

¹²⁸ Jungmann *MRR*, 1:127–35.

¹²⁹ Mitchell and Baldovin, "*Institutio Generalis*," 21.

¹³⁰ See Jungmann *MRR*, 1:135–37, as well as Mitchell and Baldovin, "*Institutio Generalis*," 21–22.

From Reformation to 1962

After the promulgation of the *MR1570*, the *OM* would retain virtually the same form for nearly four hundred years.¹³¹ Two very slight revisions were made to *MR1570* in 1604 and 1634.¹³² Nevertheless, there was significant variation in the *OM* even during this period. When Pius V promulgated *MR1570*, the papal bull *Qui Primum* noted that other eucharistic rites¹³³ could be retained if they were more than two hundred years old (either by papal institution or by custom). Some religious orders retained their earlier usages (e.g., Carthusians, Dominicans, and Premonstratensians), as did some cities or regions. In Spain and Italy, for example, the Old Spanish rite in Toledo¹³⁴ and the Ambrosian rite in Milan¹³⁵ continued to be celebrated.¹³⁶

However, most (Roman rite) dioceses throughout Europe willingly adopted *MR1570* regardless of the antiquity of their own traditions, with the exception of France; there, many bishops chose to retain their diocesan missals, “correcting” them with Tridentine texts.¹³⁷

Later religious and political influences in France during the mid-seventeenth century led to the development of what have been called “neo-Gallican” liturgies, as “a number of dioceses in France published a series of service books with rubrics printed in French and with variations in

¹³¹ For the 1570 *OM*, see Robert Cabié, *The Eucharist*, ed. Aimé Georges Martimort, trans. Matthew O’Connell, *The Church at Prayer 2* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1986), 149–71. For a modern reproduction of this missal, see Sodi-Triacca, 279–352. For a discussion of the process of this reform, see Mitchell, “Reforms, Protestant and Catholic,” 337–39.

¹³² These changes included clarification of rubrics, adjustment of the wording of some scriptural texts, editing of the priest’s prayers at the beginning of Mass, and revision of the final blessing at the end of Mass; see Jungmann *MRR*, 1:140; also Folsom, “Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite,” in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 267.

¹³³ On the very definition of a “rite,” and whether many of these continuing practices actually constituted a rite (with special attention to the so-called Norbertine rite), see Andrew Ciferri, “The Post-Vatican II Discussion of the So-Called Praemonstratensian Rite: A Question of Liturgical Pluriformity,” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1978), esp. 1–34.

¹³⁴ An accessible overview of the history and contemporary restoration of this rite can be found in Raul Gomez, *Mozarabs, Hispanics, and the Cross* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2007).

¹³⁵ A recent dictionary on this rite was published by Marco Navoni, ed., *Dizionario di liturgia ambrosiana* (Milan: Nuove Edizione Duomo, 1996). Introductions to many liturgical books employed in the contemporary Ambrosian Liturgy are posted by the Pontificio Istituto Ambrosiano di Musica Sacra at <http://www.unipiains.org/?id=32> (accessed 19 January 2009).

¹³⁶ Cabié, *The Eucharist*, 149; in 1948 Jungmann noted that other dioceses retaining their own rites included “Trier, Cologne, Liège, Braga and Lyons, of which only the last two have kept their own rite until now” (*MRR*, 1:138).

¹³⁷ Pierre Journel, “Les liturgies diocésaines de France de 1685 à 1875,” in *Liturgie aux multiples visages: mélanges*, *Bibliotheca ‘Ephemerides liturgicae’ Subsidia* 68 (Rome: C.L.V. Edizioni Liturgiche, 1993), 201–9; here, 201.

content from diocese to diocese.”¹³⁸ A “unique phenomenon in liturgical history,”¹³⁹ these neo-Gallican books reflected the Jansenist morality and Gallican ecclesiology¹⁴⁰ of the time (the latter especially supported by the Bourbon kings). Their compilers and composers were also influenced by the “biblical and patristic revival taking place in France and throughout Europe [which] gave added incentive to return to the sources.”¹⁴¹ In fact, a number of Catholic scholars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries undertook the massive task of collecting “ancient” liturgical texts, and many of these early modern editions are still in use.¹⁴²

Many French bishops and abbots chose to use one of two influential diocesan missals as models in preparing their own missals: the Missal of Paris (1738) and the Missal of Troyes (1736).¹⁴³ Their use continued in France through the French revolution into the nineteenth century. The number, texts, and “themes” of Mass formularies in these missals varied—sometimes widely—from those of *MR1570*; however, the structure of the *OM* itself remained unchanged. Because of the revolutionary social and political turmoil and increasing pressure from Ultramontanist critics urging the adoption of the Roman liturgical books (most notably Dom Prosper

¹³⁸ Keith Pecklers, “History of the Roman Liturgy from the Sixteenth until the Twentieth Centuries,” in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 163; also F. Ellen Weaver, “The Neo-Gallican Liturgies Revisited,” *Studia liturgica* 16 (1986–87): 54–72. These sets of diocesan liturgical books included missals, breviaries, and rituals. For more on the missals, see Franco Brovelli, “Per uno studio dei messali francesi del XVIII secolo. Saggi di analisi” *Ephemerides liturgicae* 96 (1982): 279–406 and *Ephemerides liturgicae* 97 (1983): 482–549; also, Pierre Jounel, “Les missels diocésains français du 18e siècle,” *La Maison-Dieu* 141 (1980): 91–96; and Jounel, “Presentation des missels diocésains français du XVIIe au XIXe siècle,” *La Maison-Dieu* 141 (1980): 97–166.

¹³⁹ Jounel, “Les liturgies diocésaines,” 201 (translation by Pierce).

¹⁴⁰ See, for example, Joanne Pierce, “A Study of the Ecclesiology of the Missal of Troyes (1736),” *Ecclesia orans* 6 (1989): 33–68. The catechetical dimension of many of these missals is also important to note; see C. van der Plancke, “Un conscience d’Eglise à travers la catéchèse janséniste du XVIIIe s.,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 72 (1977): 5–39.

¹⁴¹ “Liturgical innovations continued to the extent that by the eighteenth century, 90 of the 139 dioceses in France had its own liturgy” (Pecklers, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 164). Ripples of similar efforts were felt elsewhere during the eighteenth century; the Italian Synod of Pistoia (1786), in an effort to “return to the pristine liturgy of the early Church,” called for missals with Latin texts accompanied by vernacular translations, as well as a reduction in the number of altars to one in each church, although in 1794 these and other recommendations of the synod were condemned; see Pecklers, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” 165; also Jungmann *MRR*, 1:153, n. 62.

¹⁴² Jungmann *MRR*, 1:153, n. 62. Among these researchers are Cardinal Giuseppe Tommasi (d. 1713), Antonio Vezzosi (d. 1783), Jean Mabillon (d. 1707), Edmond Martène (d. 1739), and later (and much more extensively) J.-P. Migne (d. 1875).

¹⁴³ Jounel, “Les liturgies diocésaines,” 205.

Guéranger¹⁴⁴), these neo-Gallican missals were eventually replaced in French dioceses by *MR1570*; the diocese of Orléans would be the last to give up its liturgical books in 1875.¹⁴⁵

Later developments had important effects, not on the structure of the *OM*, but on lay participation in the Mass itself. Through the efforts of Guéranger, the monks at his abbey of Solesmes researched and revived Gregorian chant during the nineteenth century, and their liturgical example assisted “in bringing about ecclesial unity and uniformity in France.”¹⁴⁶ Through his books on liturgy, Guéranger “educated many of the French clergy and laity,”¹⁴⁷ and influenced other liturgical scholars. These leaders would, in turn, move beyond the nineteenth-century Ultramontanist goal of restoring the uniformity of the Roman Rite to form the liturgical movement of the twentieth century, with its own governing principle: “full and active participation” of the laity in the liturgy.¹⁴⁸

The work of the leaders of the twentieth-century liturgical movement in promoting this goal was aided by other developments. For example, Pius X “coined the phrase ‘active participation’ in his 1903 *motu proprio* on sacred music.”¹⁴⁹ His decree *Quam singulari* (1910) set the age of seven (the “age of reason”) for First Communion, and his encyclical *Divino afflatus* (1911) “led to changes in the Roman Missal published by Benedict XV in 1920.”¹⁵⁰ The publication of bilingual missals (some appearing as early as the late nineteenth century)¹⁵¹ for the use of the laity, with the Latin texts and their vernacular translation on alternating pages or in parallel columns, had an important effect on making the liturgy more comprehensible to laypeople;

¹⁴⁴ See R. William Franklin, “The People’s Work: Anti-Jansenist Prejudice in the Benedictine Movement for Popular Participation in the Nineteenth Century,” *Studia liturgica* 19 (1989): 60–77. See also André Haquin, “The Liturgical Movement and Catholic Ritual Revision,” *OHCW*, 697–98.

¹⁴⁵ Jounel, “Les liturgies diocésaines,” 201 and 209.

¹⁴⁶ Pecklers, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 166.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁸ As articulated first in 1909 by Dom Lambert Beauduin of the monastery of Mont César in Belgium; see *ibid.*, 167.

¹⁴⁹ Michael Witczak, “The Sacramentary of Paul VI,” in *The Eucharist*, ed. Anscar Chupungco, *Handbook for Liturgical Studies* 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 133–75; here, 133.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ “In the revision of the *Index of Forbidden Books*, issued under Leo XIII in 1897, the prohibition [against translating the *OM* into vernacular languages] was no longer mentioned,” and it seems not to have been “seriously” enforced for several decades earlier (Jungmann *MRR*, 1:161).

later came the promotion of various forms of Mass celebration with a more active role assumed by the laity.¹⁵²

During this period, other editions of the *MR* were issued (1884, 1920, 1955), largely encompassing minor changes or corrections in the calendar, rubrics, or texts of readings.¹⁵³ However, *MR1920* also included new prefaces “for the first time in a thousand years.”¹⁵⁴ New Mass formularies were included for new feasts (for example, the feast of St. Joseph the Worker on May 1 was added by Pius XII [d. 1958] in 1955) as well as rubrical instructions detailing differences in ceremonial among the pontifical, solemn, and private forms of the Mass.¹⁵⁵ During the 1950s more explicit revision and renewal of the liturgy quietly began to take place under the leadership of Pius XII. After his 1947 encyclical *Mediator Dei*, the papal “Pian Commission” oversaw a number of liturgical reforms, including the revision of the Easter Vigil (1951) and the rites for Holy Week (1955).¹⁵⁶ A final edition of the Tridentine *MR* appeared in 1962, when John XXIII (d. 1963) inserted the name of St. Joseph into the Roman Canon. By this time, however, more sweeping changes were coming: “John XXIII had also called a council in 1959, and it was clear that the reform of the liturgy would be a part of its agenda.”¹⁵⁷

Vatican II and Its Aftermath

The last major revision of the *OM* occurred in the aftermath of Vatican II (1962–65).¹⁵⁸ A new *OM* was issued in 1969 followed by *MR1970* and *MR1975* and now *MR2002*.¹⁵⁹ The overriding aim of the postconciliar reforms was to increase the participation of the laity in the Mass, which was to have a corresponding effect on the shape of the *OM*. The commission of

¹⁵² For example, the *missa recitata* and the “dialogue Mass,” in which the laity would actually recite the responses of the *OM*, and in Germany, the *Deutsches Hochamt* (“Sung Mass”) with the use of vernacular hymnody; see *ibid*, 1:162–63.

¹⁵³ Pecklers, “History of the Roman Liturgy,” in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 161.

¹⁵⁴ Jungmann *MRR*, 1:167.

¹⁵⁵ Marcel Metzger, “The History of the Eucharistic Liturgy in Rome,” in Chupungco, *The Eucharist*, 130.

¹⁵⁶ Keith F. Pecklers, *The Genius of the Roman Rite: On the Reception and Implementation of the New Missal* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press / Pueblo, 2009), 25.

¹⁵⁷ Witczak, “The Sacramentary of Paul VI,” in Chupungco, *The Eucharist*, 133.

¹⁵⁸ For a detailed account of the liturgical changes after Vatican II, see Cabié, *The Eucharist*, 189–230; for a detailed account of the process by which the *OM* was reformed, see Bugnini, 337–92.

¹⁵⁹ Jan Michael Joncas, “The *Ordo Missae* in the *Missale Romanum 2002*,” *Worship* 76 (2002): 521–36.

experts charged with the task of revising the liturgical books, the Consilium,¹⁶⁰ was divided into several working groups, each assigned to a particular component of liturgical reform; Group 10 was the study group responsible for the *OM*. The initial parameters of its work on the *OM*, as called for in SC, no. 50, were outlined in *IntOec*.¹⁶¹ Group 10 actually began meeting in April 1964 before *IntOec* was promulgated; these meetings concluded in May 1968.¹⁶² Study Group 10 included some of the foremost liturgical scholars of the time, including Josef Jungmann, Pierre Journel, Pierre-Marie Gy, and Cipriano Vagaggini. Later additions included Joseph Gelineau, Louis Bouyer, and, as an advisor, the secretary of the national liturgical commission in the United States, Frederick McManus.¹⁶³

Over the course of these four years, the work of Group 10 would continue steadily in a series of careful steps, including meeting together as a working group and reporting back periodically to the wider Consilium. In all, seven schemata of the *OM* were drawn up before the final *OM* was promulgated.¹⁶⁴ One important component of the revision process was the “testing” of proposed schemata (with variations) of the *OM* through “experimental celebrations” with special invitees as the congregation; in 1967 the congregation was composed of members of the assembled synod of bishops.¹⁶⁵ Feedback was solicited in some detail, and in early 1968 Paul VI himself requested a short series of changes, including the sign of the cross at the beginning of Mass,¹⁶⁶ a review of the offertory formulas, and a re-ordering of the “rites for the greeting of peace.”¹⁶⁷

Paul VI issued the apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum* on 3 April 1969,¹⁶⁸ promulgating the new Roman Missal (effective the First Sunday of Advent 1969). In this brief document he notes the basic principles from SC

¹⁶⁰ See Pecklers and Ostdiek 57 below.

¹⁶¹ DOL nos. 293ff; on the *OM*, nos. 340–51.

¹⁶² Piero Marini, “Elenco degli ‘Schemata’ del ‘Consilium’ e della Congregazione per il Culto Divino,” *Notitiae* 18 (1982): 455–772; here one can find a complete list of Group 10’s meeting dates and agendas.

¹⁶³ Bugnini, 337.

¹⁶⁴ For a helpful summary, see Frederick McManus, “The Roman Order of Mass from 1964 to 1969: The Preparation of the Gifts,” in *Shaping English Liturgy: Studies in Honor of Archbishop Denis Hurley*, ed. Peter Finn and James Schellman (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1990), 109–10.

¹⁶⁵ Bugnini, 342–50.

¹⁶⁶ For a more detailed examination of the various schemata of the opening and closing rites, not only in terms of textual changes but also in the light of semiotics theory, see Mark Searle, “*Semper Reformanda*: The Opening and Closing Rites of the Mass,” in *Shaping English Liturgy*, ed. Finn and Schellman, 53–92.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 369–70.

¹⁶⁸ DOL 1357ff.; also Mitchell and Baldovin, “*Institutio Generalis*,” 24–27.

on which the revision was based: clarity, simplicity of structure, participation of the laity, expansion of biblical readings, and provisions for concelebration. The standard phrasing of the words of institution in every EP is described as “the chief innovation”¹⁶⁹ in the new *OM*. Three days later the new *OM* was promulgated through the decree *Ordine Missae*.¹⁷⁰ On 26 March 1970, *MR1970* was promulgated by the decree *Celebrationes eucharisticae*.¹⁷¹

The new *OM* was not simply a result of “pruning” the *OM* found in *MR1570* of elaborations and accretions. In some cases, the group did eliminate elements considered to be repetitive or disadvantageous to the faithful but, in other cases, added parts that had been removed over the centuries to the detriment of the rite. Among the many changes in the rite, a few significant ones included the following: the music for the entrance procession, preparation of the gifts, and Communion are freely chosen rather than singing fixed antiphons; the priest and people sign themselves at the beginning of the Mass; a new reading from the OT was introduced; the prayer of the faithful, which had dropped out of use, was restored; the preparation of gifts (no longer an offertory) uses new prayers and encourages people to bring up gifts; there are new options for the EP; there is a doxology after the Our Father; the faithful exchange a sign of peace; during Communion, the faithful may receive Communion in the hand and drink from the chalice; finally, there is a blessing by the priest at the end of the Mass. In some cases, older items were retained but their meaning or referent was altered. For instance, the *Confiteor* was originally a priest’s private prayer, but after the reform it was to be said by all of the faithful in order to “cleanse” the entire community before Mass.¹⁷² As a whole, this kind of editing was meant to reveal the significance of parts of the Mass and the relationship among them.¹⁷³

The alterations made to the *OM* after Vatican II often aimed at the elimination or modification of early medieval elements originally added to the Mass in France and Germany and only later incorporated into eucharistic celebration at Rome.¹⁷⁴ This especially involved private sacerdotal prayers and devotional gestures. The revisers of the *OM* after Vatican II were aware

¹⁶⁹ DOL 1360.

¹⁷⁰ DOL 1367.

¹⁷¹ DOL 1765.

¹⁷² Cabié, *The Eucharist*, 195–96.

¹⁷³ For an early analysis, see Adrien Nocent, “The Parts of the Mass,” in *The Liturgy of Vatican II: A Symposium in Two Volumes*, ed. William Baraúna, English ed. Jovian Lang (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1966), 2:27–61.

¹⁷⁴ Anscar Chupungco, *Liturgies of the Future: The Process and Methods of Inculturation* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 56–71.

of the scholarship on the liturgy and made a conscious attempt to achieve a brand of classical Roman simplicity, especially as epitomized by *OR I*.¹⁷⁵ This clarification process was one of the key elements guiding Jungmann's massive study of the Mass in the mid-twentieth century. Some contemporary critics of the postconciliar liturgical reforms, however, based on their reading of history, charged that the 1970 *Novus ordo* represented either an entirely new rite without a basis in the past or, at the very least, an over-reaching reform that did not flow "organically" from Catholic liturgical tradition.¹⁷⁶ In spite of this criticism, there has been widespread satisfaction with the new *OM*, although some would like to see a reduction of certain long-standing but now arguably esoteric elements of Mass and a greater flexibility in celebration than the current *OM* would allow.¹⁷⁷

Conclusion

The history of the *OM* should not be viewed as a distant event that is over and done with; rather, the process by which it was formed and reformed continues to resonate in the church to this day. Contemporary research offers some helpful insights. It seems clear that the history of the development of the *OM* is a prime example of the changes undergone by Western Christian and Roman Catholic liturgy in new cultural settings. Further study of the stages of this development could be helpful in discussions regarding the adaptation of liturgical rites into different cultures and contexts. In addition, the prayer texts and gestures of the *OMs* tell us much about the spiritual concerns of the people who shaped and used them, providing useful frameworks for evaluating the suitability of certain prayers or gestures for our own historical context. In the vast diversity that marks twenty-first-century Roman Catholicism, certain traditional elements might not always resonate with contemporary spiritual needs, pieties, or customs. The evolution of the *OM* also provides us with one source of evidence about a liturgical world in which neither complete local diversity nor Roman-centered uniformity reigned supreme but rather both tendencies interacted

¹⁷⁵ Anscar Chupungco, "History of the Liturgy until the Fifteenth Century," in Chupungco, *Introduction to the Liturgy*, 141.

¹⁷⁶ Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 37–64. For a critique of the work done on the *OM* after the council, see, for instance, Alcuin Reid, "Sacrosanctum concilium and the Reform of the *Ordo Missae*," *Antiphon* 10 (2006): 277–95.

¹⁷⁷ Charles W. Gusmer, "Reviewing the Order of Mass," *Worship* 57 (1983): 345–48.

in creative tension. This could serve as a basis for modern discussions of how to strike such a balance in our own historical and cultural settings.¹⁷⁸

Further study of the *OM*, combined with a more general consideration of the current state of worship, will continue to generate useful lessons in shaping contemporary and future eucharistic liturgy. Any such inquiries must take seriously our long and rich tradition of worship. If our study of the past is any guide, however, dynamic development in liturgical practice is not a measure of weakness or inauthenticity in worship. We may read these texts and interpret this process instead as evidence of a living, vibrant tradition that continues to change, and indeed must change, as the context of its living participants across the globe changes “from age to age.”

¹⁷⁸ See *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Woodbridge, Suffolk; Rochester: Boydell Press, 1999).