"With both theoretical reflections and examples of new approaches, this volume is a key addition to considering the range of methodologies needed for the writing of liturgical history."

—Lester Ruth
Duke Divinity School

"People throughout the ages have re-created the past in their worship and rituals. This rich and beautifully organized collection by major scholars in the field demonstrates how and why this is so in a multiplicity of ways, across times and cultures, and often with interdisciplinary evidence that points to new methods of working. It will be a classic in the field of liturgical studies and will be gratefully received by scholars in a wide range of disciplines."

—Margot E. Fassler
Keough-Hesburgh Professor of Music History and Liturgy
University of Notre Dame

Liturgy's Imagined Past/s

Methodologies and Materials in the Writing of Liturgical History Today

Edited by
Teresa Berger and
Bryan D. Spinks

A PUEBLO BOOK

Liturgical Press Collegeville, Minnesota
www.litpress.org

A Pueblo Book published by Liturgical Press

Cover design by Ann Blattner. Detail of the Dura-Europos Baptistery Wall Painting, 3rd century. Yale University Art Gallery.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Berger, Teresa, editor.
Title: Liturgy's imagined pasts : methodologies and materials in the writing of liturgical history today / edited by Teresa Berger and Bryan D. Spinks.
Description: Collegeville, Minnesota : Liturgical Press, 2016. | "A Pueblo book."
Identifiers: LCCN 2015038832 | ISBN 9780814662687 | ISBN 9780814662939 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Liturgics.
Classification: LCC BV176.3 .L585 2016 | DDC 264.009—dc23
LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015038832

Contents

Illustrations

Foreword

A religious act, more often than not, is an act of remembering. A prayer recalls a need in the world or in a human life or offers thanks for a blessing given. The reading of Scripture in an assembly calls to mind the acts of God in human history. Celebration of a ritual such as the Christian Eucharist reenacts the salvific story of Christ. Christian liturgies, especially, are libraries of such historical assertions. But each of these statements is itself a liturgical claim, because each lays hold of a deeply held, though often unspoken, notion that says that as we worship, we recall our histories.

This volume of essays probes and reflects on the acts of history making that liturgies are. To reduce liturgical expression to this notion alone would be an oversimplification, but one of the significant contributions of liturgical studies is that it gives even deeper insights into how individuals and communities construct their identities through the histories they recount. These essays peer back in time like a series of relay lenses, each one allowing us a glimpse around a historical "corner," as it were. Or they function like someone who gazes at a mirror reflecting in a mirror. One reads a liturgy to understand not only how its creators understood their world but also how this understanding was itself shaped by the creators' progenitors. Back and back it goes, each generation adding a layer of knowing.

The essays gathered here share this common goal, but they also focus on contemporary challenges in the writing of liturgy's past. The 2014 Liturgy Conference at the Yale Institute of Sacred Music sought to call attention to the need to reflect on both methodology and contemporary historical research in that process. With regard

to the first—methodology—the conference probed the impact of important shifts in historiography (for example, the turns to social history and gender history) on the work of historians of liturgy and on how they imagine and display the past. With regard to the second—historical research itself—the conference presented new scholarship that promises to reconfigure some of the established images of liturgy's past.

The essays in this volume not only bear witness to the historical act that gave birth to them—that international scholarly conference at the Yale Institute of Sacred Music—but they also give evidence to the labors of its conveners, our cherished colleagues Professors Teresa Berger and Bryan Spinks, to whom we owe a great debt of gratitude.

Such a conference and volume are only a small part of a much larger complex of activities at our institute, which employs the sacred arts and ritual as ways to explore the human condition. Such a pursuit is limitless, and our hope is that these essays will not only serve as a small window into our own activity but also inspire others along similar quests. Only by understanding the claims religious actions make can we understand their power to do both good and ill.

Martin D. Jean
Director
Yale Institute of Sacred Music

Acknowledgments

The editors would like to thank a number of people at the Yale Institute of Sacred Music and at Yale Divinity School without whose encouragement, support, and hard work neither the Fourth Yale Liturgy Conference, "Liturgy's Imagined Past/*s*" 2014, nor this volume would have been possible.

First and foremost, we wish to thank Martin Jean, Director of the Yale Institute of Sacred Music, who generously hosted the 2014 conference and enthusiastically supported the publication of these papers.

We are grateful to Melissa Maier, ISM Manager of External Relations and Publications, for overseeing the organization of the conference, and to Albert Agbayani, who was our "person on the ground."

We owe a debt of gratitude to Rona Johnston for her outstanding editorial work and her commitment to ensure that, at short notice, the manuscript reached the publishers on time.

We express our thanks to Sydney Thomas, ISM MAR '16, for checking bibliographical details.

We continue to be grateful to the wonderful ISM staff, without whose dedication the institute's manifold activities could not flourish, especially Jacqueline Campoli, Kristen Forman, Andrea Hart, Trisha Lendroth, Sachin Ramabhadran, and Elizabeth Santamaria.

As with the past three collections of papers from the liturgy conferences of the Yale Institute of Sacred Music, it has been a pleasure to work with Hans Christoffersen and staff at the Liturgical Press.

Part 1

Foundational Matters

Imagining the Past

Historical Methodologies and Liturgical Study

Bryan D. Spinks

In a book titled *Imagining the Past: East Hampton Histories*, Timothy H. Breen presented his research on the history of the town of East Hampton, Long Island, New York, which had been founded in the 1640s. Breen's original mission was to write about the Mulford Farmstead, which dates from the 1680s, to which end he set out to use artifacts and texts from the town's records. Among the many documents he examined was a sermon delivered in 1806 by the town's Presbyterian minister, the Reverend Lyman Beecher. In his sermon, Beecher reconstructed the history of East Hampton and concluded that the community had prospered not because its inhabitants had been especially clever or diligent, but because they feared God.[1] Writing his history in 1989, Breen decided that in addition to employing archival material, he would listen to contemporary perceptions of the town's history from those who currently lived in East Hampton. He noted, "I soon became aware of a commonly accepted mythic history, a broadly shared sense of how East Hampton got to be the way it is, that bears only problematic relation to what I encountered in the records."[2]

[1] The sermon was partly motivated by Beecher's wish to persuade his congregation to raise his salary, which it failed to do. Beecher later moved to the congregational church at Litchfield, Connecticut.

[2] Timothy H. Breen, *Imagining the Past: East Hampton Histories* (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1989), 9–10.

What became obvious to Breen was that "a process, a bundle of values, a set of relations between human beings and the environment have powerfully bound the past and the future in this town."[3] East Hampton's past(s) was/were being imagined to direct the future, and different parties appropriated and interpreted the town's past(s) to validate their particular views on its future identity. A comment by Breen adds another dimension: "I can claim no more than to have presented a personal reading of how various people have thought about East Hampton's past."[4] Thus, in addition to the town's artifacts and records and the imagined histories of many of the then residents of the town, Breen gave a personal reading of the data—*his* imagined past.

The stuff of Breen's history is a reflection of the human mind's tendency and human nature's impulse to explain the way things are, a compulsion that has been called the "cognitive imperative."[5] This process involves interplay between observing, remembering, and imagining. David Hogue has defined the latter:

> Imagination is the distinctively human capacity to envision multiple alternative realities, scenarios, and outcomes. It involves the ability to represent, internally and symbolically, scenarios and configurations of space and time that are not immediately represented to the senses.
>
> Imagination frees us from the tyranny of the present, of the logical, of "real." It also frees us from the constraints of the now, as it pictures what events were like in the historic past or what they might become in the future.[6]

Imagination and imagining thus play important roles in how the past (history) is configured and described. Breen's history of East

[3] Ibid., 11.

[4] Ibid., 15.

[5] Eugene d'Aquili and Andrew B. Newberg, *The Mystical Mind: Probing the Biology of Religious Experience* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999), 196f. For a more "clinical" account see Kathleen Taylor, *The Brain Supremacy: Notes from the Frontiers of Neuroscience* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

[6] David A. Hogue, *Remembering the Future, Imagining the Past: Story, Ritual, and the Human Brain* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2003), 44–45.

Hampton was different from Lyman Beecher's but no less governed by the imaginings of the human mind.

Historians pride themselves on being objective, and in the nineteenth century, many historians believed they lived up to Leopold von Ranke's aphorism that the task of the historian is simply to show "how it really was."[7] More sober reflections acknowledge that objectivity is always tempered by subjectivity and that recounting and assessing the past involves much more than empirical "facts." At least in the English-speaking world, a change was sounded by E. H. Carr in his 1961 work *What Is History?* His first answer to this question was the assertion that "it is a continuous process of interaction between the historian and his facts, an unending dialogue between the present and the past."[8] Carr questioned historical writing that, as was typical of his time, consisted mainly of political narratives with biography. He defended the growing interest in social and economic history and suggested that understanding the past would help with understandings of the present and possibly change the future. History was a search for causation. Carr is seen as the catalyst for one shift in historical methodology, but other shifts have occurred since. Subsequent historical studies have embraced anthropology, postmodernism, and the "linguistic turn," as well as cultural histories, women's histories, gender studies, and postcolonialism. They have also shifted away from causation and toward meaning and understanding. Historiography has become more interdisciplinary and now makes greater use of artifacts and material culture.

In her recent book *The Look of the Past: Visual and Material Evidence in Historical Practice*, Ludmilla Jordanova notes:

[7] Leopold von Ranke, *Histories of the Latin and Teutonic Nations from 1494–1514* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1909): "History has had assigned to it the office of judging the past and of instructing the present for the benefit of the future ages. To such high offices the present work does not presume: it seeks only to show what actually happened" [*wie es eigentlich gewesen*].

[8] E. H. Carr, *What Is History*? 2nd ed. (New York: Knopf, 1961; repr. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1987), 30.

> As in the present, so in the past, the sense of sight shapes experience. The material world is a visual world, which impacts upon human beings through their eyes, and is ultimately bound up with touch. Historians can only benefit from approaching the past with a vivid appreciation of these points, with a willingness to consider what people looked at, how they looked and the roles of objects designed to be looked at. Sight has long been accorded privileged status: that the expression "I see" means "I understand" neatly reveals the point. . . . Artifacts mediate past ideas and experiences, making them ripe for historical analysis.[9]

Reflecting on contemporary historical writing, David Cannadine has noted that in moving from causation to concern for meaning and understanding, we have become much more sophisticated in our comprehension of the past. He adds, however, an important caveat, that "historians . . . are themselves both agents and victims of the historical process. Every generation, scholars have arisen proclaiming that they have found a new key which unlocks the essence of the past in a way that no previous historical approach has ever done. Our own generation is no exception to this rule—and it will probably be no exception to this fate."[10]

An important observation regarding subjectivity, or the historian's own imagination, was made by Keith Jenkins in *Re-thinking History*, when he reflected that "the historian's viewpoint and predilections will shape the choice of historical materials, and our own personal constructs determine what we make of them. The past that we 'know' is always contingent upon our own views, our own 'present.' . . . Epistemology shows we can never really know the past; that the gap between the past and history (historiography) is an ontological one, that is, is in the very nature of things such that no amount of epistemological effort can bridge it."[11] The operative words here are "our own present." How we imagine the past is

[9] Ludmilla Jordanova, *The Look of the Past: Visual Material Evidence in Historical Practice* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 1.

[10] David Cannadine, ed., *What Is History Now?* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), xii.

[11] Keith Jenkins, *Re-thinking History* (London: Routledge, 1991), 12, 19.

mediated to a certain degree by our own present views, needs, and concerns, both conscious and unconscious. As Breen discovered in the contemporary oral histories of East Hampton, to which his own study was an addition, the past is always reconstructed through the lenses of the present. A prime example is the nineteenth-century interest in the medieval world, and that fascination's romantic re-creation of a lost age. The "Romantic" movement was a reaction against a so-called rationalism of the Enlightenment mind and fulfilled a need in rediscovering a mysterious golden past. How far the medieval world imagined by Sir Walter Scott and others bore any resemblance to that era is a study in its own right.[12]

HOW DOES ANY OF THIS RELATE TO LITURGICAL STUDIES?

In *How Societies Remember*, Paul Connerton acknowledges that while texts, other documentary evidence, and works of art are all important sources for the transmission of the past, rituals and commemorative ceremonies as embodied practices are also crucial repositories of the social memory.[13] In other words, liturgy and ritual are extremely revealing resources for history, be it of a denomination, a religion, or a wider society and culture. The older concern with liturgical textual minutiae and close comparison of texts coupled with an apparent obsession with rubrics and correct ceremonial suggested that liturgiology was an arcane discipline pursued by those who had found nothing better to do with their lives. This negative view still persists in many theological and church circles that really should know better. Anton Baumstark (1872–1948) is generally regarded as the father of the older comparative historical

[12] Charles L. Eastlake, *A History of the Gothic Revival* (American Life Foundation, Watkins Glen, 1979) was originally published in 1872 and provides what was then a contemporary understanding of the Gothic revival. For more recent reflections, see A. Dwight Culler, *The Victorian Mirror of History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985), and Clare A. Simmons, *Popular Medievalism in Romantic-Era Britain* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

[13] Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

liturgical method.[14] The papers presented at a conference held in Rome in 1998 to mark fifty years since his death witnessed to the refinement and expansion of historical liturgical methodologies.[15] They illustrated a vibrant subject, far removed from Dean Inge's (in)famous cryptic comparison of liturgiology with stamp collecting.[16] Those who are committed to serious liturgical scholarship know that their craft has changed dramatically, and it now employs the full range of tools and methodologies of historiography, as well as theological, musicological, and ethnological analyses and approaches, and it frequently embraces the evidence of material culture in the same manner as many other scholarly endeavors.

Liturgical rites are for performance and always have been. When their content is codified for future performance, the result is a liturgical text, or score, in some form. Texts are still important. The older method tended to be concerned with discovering the use of earlier sources—the liturgical antecedents—and/or identifying the author, with exploring the author's theology (always *his* theology), and with interpreting the liturgical texts accordingly. Newer, more complex and sophisticated understandings of "text" have tended to show the limitations of such approaches. The strictures of Robert Morgan and John Barton made in reference to biblical texts are no less applicable to liturgical texts: "Texts, like dead men and women, have no rights, no aims, no interests. They can be used in whatever way readers or interpreters choose."[17]

With reference to studies on the "Euchology of Serapion," Juliette Day has recently written: "The urauthor can be given the

[14] Anton Baumstark, *On the Historical Development of the Liturgy*, introduced, trans., and annotated by Fritz West, with foreword by Robert F. Taft (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011). See also n. 4 in Teresa Berger's essay in this volume.

[15] Robert F. Taft and Gabriele Winkler, eds., *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)* (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2001).

[16] A comment made by Inge to Edward Ratcliff, recorded by A. H. Couratin, in "Liturgy," in *The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology*, vol. 2, ed. J. Daniélou, A. H. Couratin, and John Kent (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1969), 131.

[17] Robert Morgan and John Barton, *Biblical Interpretation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 7.

name Serapion, but our construction of him may well not be the same as the historical Serapion whom, in any case, we cannot recover. The historical Serapion cannot control the interpretations we place upon the prayers which bear his name, but starting with whatever (historical) information we can gather from within and without the text, we are then free to interpret."[18] Day's book usefully explores the dimensions of text, authorship, genre, narrative, and intertextuality and their implications for liturgical studies. The application of a broader textual methodology to liturgical study is also illustrated by the methodology developed at the Pontifical Institute of Liturgy at Saint Anselmo, Rome, by Renato De Zan and now adapted for the Institute of Liturgy at Ealing Abbey, England. According to De Zan, study begins with textuality (historical-semantic dimension) and leads to liturgicity (pragmatic dimension), which is situated within liturgical celebrations and linguistic-pragmatic contexts. That process requires understanding of how a text relates to other texts of a rite, the gestures, the mystery being celebrated, and the liturgical season and leads eventually to a liturgical theology.[19] De Zan has recently demonstrated this form of engagement with particular reference to collects.[20]

Morgan and Barton's comment that texts have no aims and interests is not entirely accurate for liturgical texts, which quite often have particular interests—theological, ideological, or even functional. Matthew Cheung Salisbury has remarked of medieval liturgical manuscripts of the Sarum use, "The extant sources vary in a surprising range of aspects, but within individual Uses some contents are absolutely consistent. It would seem that some changes to

[18] Juliette J. Day, *Reading the Liturgy: An Exploration of Texts in Christian Worship* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 36.

[19] Renato De Zan, "Criticism and Interpretation of Liturgical Texts," in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 1: *Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. Anscar J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 331–65.

[20] Renato De Zan, "How to Interpret a Collect," in *Appreciating the Collect: An Irenic Methodology*, ed. James G. Leachman and Daniel P. McCarthy (Farnborough: Saint Michael's Abbey Press, 2008), 57–77. Leachman and McCarthy have adapted this methodology for the institute at Ealing Abbey in which they teach.

liturgical texts were deliberately applied or enforced, in attempts to create or preserve specific traditions, and that others simply reflected contemporary trends in the transmission of text and music, and varying adherence to authority."[21]

An obvious example from the early centuries that is discussed further in this collection is the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* attributed to Hippolytus. Liturgical revisers of the 1960s approached this text as though it not only represented the practice of all the churches of Rome in circa 215 but also was normative for the whole West and normative for liturgical revision in the late twentieth century. Dom Gregory Dix had written confidently in 1937: "Here from the pen of a disciple of St. Irenaeus is what claims to be an accurate and authoritative account of the rites and organization of the Church as the men of the later second century had received them from the sub-apostolic age. . . . It represents the mind and practice not of St. Hippolytus only but of the whole Catholic Church of the second century. As such it is of outstanding importance."[22] In 1970 Dom Bernard Botte wrote of the anaphora in this text, "It is certainly one of the oldest examples of Christian prayer literature so it is hardly surprising that when the liturgical reform was initiated consideration was given to restoring to use this admirably simple prayer."[23] The influence of "Hippolytus" on liturgical revision in many Western churches in the post–Vatican II decade was widespread and notable, for example, in the new Roman Catholic ordination rites of Vatican II and of the Episcopal Church of the United States.

More recent scholarship suggests that this particular text is a composite document, redacted in the late third or, more probably, early fourth century. The text now seems to be itself the imagined past of a particular group in Rome and was an attempt to estab-

[21] Matthew Cheung Salisbury, *The Secular Liturgical Office in Late Medieval England* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), 7.

[22] Gregory Dix, *The Treatise on The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1968), xi, xliv.

[23] Bernard Botte, "The Short Anaphora," in *The New Liturgy: A Comprehensive Introduction*, ed. Lancelot Sheppard (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 194–99.

lish some sort of authority through an imagined tradition. Church orders are not innocent, neutral documents. The text *Apostolic Tradition* used by revisers in the 1960s was itself a scholarly reconstruction from other church orders. A manuscript called *Apostolic Tradition* is no greater reality than New Testament scholars' supposed manuscript of "Q." What was/is presented has been/is a scholarly imagining. As Morgan and Barton note, "The balance of power and moral rights then shifts to the interpreters. They are the masters or judges of meaning now, for better or worse. The interpreters are never mindless servants of the text, or midwives at the birth or communication of meaning. They are human agents with their own aims, interests, and rights."[24]

Liturgical scholars and revisers of the mid-twentieth century gave the *Apostolic Tradition* an assumed authority to help direct their ideas and ideals of liturgical revision. They reimagined what appears to have been an already imagined past. Although this scenario seems obvious to twenty-first-century liturgical scholars in hindsight, it was not obvious to those revisers of the twentieth century.

Current agendas often color how a liturgical past is imagined, and some biases are less opaque than others. The preface to the first *Book of Common Prayer*, presumably penned by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, stated, "And where heretofore, there hath been great diversitie in saying and synging in churches within this realme: some folowyng Salsbury use, some Herford use, some the use of Bangor, some of Yorke, and some of Lincolne: Now from hencefurth, all the whole realme shall have but one use." Nigel Morgan has rightly said that not only has no evidence ever been found of a use of Bangor and it is unlikely to have existed (the Bangor Pontifical sheds no light on the subject) but also no evidence exists for a distinct use of Lincoln, only minor differences from a basically Sarum use.[25] Richard Pfaff came to a similar

[24] Morgan and Barton, *Biblical Interpretation*, 6–7.

[25] Nigel Morgan, "The Introduction of the Sarum Calendar into the Dioceses of England in the Thirteenth Century," in *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999*, ed. Michael Prestwich, Richard

conclusion.[26] By the sixteenth century, Sarum use seems to have been almost universal in the English church other than in Hereford and York. Why, then, did Cranmer multiply the uses? Did he believe there were Bangor and Lincoln uses? Did he hear that each of these cathedrals had its own use and imagined those accounts to be true? Or with Sarum use the sole use in the province of Canterbury since 1542, did Cranmer deliberately exaggerate the diversity in order to justify the enacted uniformity of the new 1549 liturgy?[27]

A recent example of undisguised bias is found in *Resurgent in the Midst of Crisis: Sacred Liturgy, the Traditional Latin Mass, and Renewal in the Church*, by Peter Kwasniewski. Kwasniewski is a theologian whose sympathies lie with the "Reform of the Reform" movement in the Roman Catholic Church, which regards the *Novus Ordo Missae* of Pope Paul VI as a departure from Catholic tradition and a product of modernity. The *Novus Ordo Missae* is described as possessing symbolic value as "a kind of rough-and-ready repudiation of the Council of Trent, of Boniface VIII's Unam Sanctam, of patristic mystagogy and the antithesis of the ancient and medieval heritage."[28] Whether the revised Mass actually is any of these things is highly questionable. Kwasniewski clearly prefers the older Latin Rite as found in the Missal of Pope John XXIII of 1962, which he refers to as "The Classical Roman Rite." Although a footnote acknowledges historical development and regional accretions, the author asserts the existence of a core that constitutes the traditional Latin Mass "going back substantially to the first millennium and even the first half of the first millennium."[29] This definition is con-

---

Britnell, and Robin Frame (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001), 179–206, see in particular 182–83.

[26] Richard Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 458, 502–5.

[27] *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, a synodo Verolamiensi AD 496 ad Londinensem AD 1717*, ed. David Wilkens, 4 vols. (London: R. Gosling, 1737), 3:861f.

[28] Peter Kwasniewski, *Resurgent in the Midst of Crisis: Sacred Liturgy, the Traditional Mass, and Renewal in the Church* (Kettering, OH: Angelico Press, 2014), 151.

[29] Ibid., 151n1.

flated and misleading history, yet this imagined past is used to legitimate the author's view of the 1970 missal as the source of most of what is wrong in the contemporary Catholic Church.

A more measured approach is found in an essay by Paul Gunter.[30] Although we might take issue with some of his statements (his attribution of the Supplement to the Hadrianum to Alcuin of York, for example), Gunter is on solid ground when he proposes, "In order to avoid the misconception that the Ordinary Form of the Mass in its 2002 edition and the Extraordinary Form of 1962 are two distinct entities irreconcilably at odds with each other (since each, in its distinctive form, represents the Roman Rite), we need to trace the historical developments out of which the missal of 1570 arose."[31] The 1962 missal carries a more cultic view of priesthood, understood through its links to the 1570 Mass and that Mass's theology and beauty of form and artifact, while the missal of 1970, with its emphasis on the assembly, requires that the content of the celebration and the rites should be self-explanatory.[32] Gunter may have a personal preference, but that inclination cannot be easily gleaned from his historical narrative. As Richard Muller has said, "Historiography ought not to be grounded in theological assumptions."[33]

Having a preference or a personal (even group-shared) liturgical agenda is entirely legitimate. When, however, a particular agenda drives and distorts the interpretation of the historical data, the resulting assumed narrative is problematic. The "organic" development of the 1962 rite to which Kwasniewski appeals over against the "genetic engineering" of the new rite actually came to an abrupt end with the Council of Trent, when reform was put in the hands of the pope and all local "organic" changes were ended. The

[30] Paul Gunter, "'Sacerdos paratus' and 'Populo congregato': The Historical Development of the Roman Missal," in *Benedict XVI and the Roman Missal*, ed. Janet E. Rutherford and James O'Brien (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 40–69.

[31] Ibid., 41.

[32] Ibid., 66.

[33] Richard A. Muller, "Historiography in the Service of Theology and Worship: Toward Dialogue with John Frame," *Westminster Theological Journal* 59 (1997): 301–10.

revisers who compiled the *Novus Ordo Missae* believed they were restoring an older, more classical shape using the best scholarship of the 1960s. From today's perspective, it seems that they simply created an imagined retrieval and that the result is a product of modernity. Equally though, whatever the age of certain elements of the 1962 Latin Mass, its codification and control at Trent make it an early-modern liturgy, and the 1962 version is simply a recycling of material that generates, in turn, a product of twentieth-century modernity.

Contemporary liturgical scholars often try to be mindful of their prejudices and agendas, though the suggestion that those studies whose ultimate ancestry is the liturgical movement are more agenda driven than are the critical editions of important liturgical texts, as Richard Pfaff has claimed, is something of a self-deception.[34] On the whole, liturgists do their best (though not always successfully) to avoid searching for a "golden age" of liturgy. They are also well aware of and employ more recent methodologies. In addition, they make no apology for discussing implicit and explicit theology, since their training allows them to do just that. Robert Taft exemplifies the older textual comparative method in his monumental volumes on the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. His copious footnotes witness to tireless comparison of manuscripts and readings in order to establish the best text. As a theologian, Taft also discusses theological issues raised by the texts. Yet he has pioneered structural analysis of liturgical units.[35] He has also written *Through Their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It*, which attempts a social history of the Byzantine Rite, using then-contemporary lay sources.[36] Taft says, "One can no longer re-

[34] Richard W. Pfaff, "Liturgical Studies Today: One Subject or Two?," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994): 325–32. The production of a critical text is not an entirely neutral undertaking, as Pfaff seems to think. The process may not be driven by theological or pastoral concerns, but it is not necessarily without an agenda.

[35] R. F. Taft, "The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," *Worship* 52 (1978): 314–29.

[36] R. F. Taft, *Through Their Own Eyes: Liturgy as the Byzantines Saw It* (Berkeley, CA: InterOrthodox Press, 2006).

construct the past only from the top down. What we find in liturgical manuscripts was embedded in a socio-cultural ambiance outside of which it cannot be understood as liturgy, something that real people did. Furthermore, such literary monuments are a product of high culture, and hence only half of the story."[37]

Historians and musicologists have also rediscovered the importance of liturgy, and the late classical and medieval eras have proved particularly fruitful for interdisciplinary studies. Éamonn Ó Carragáin has woven together explorations of the Ruthwell Cross, the poetry of the Dream of the Rood, and the liturgical themes central to Lent and Easter as celebrated in the seventh and early eighth centuries, which were adapted by the Ruthwell community for their own local needs.[38] His work is an outstanding example of interdisciplinary methods. Carolyn Marino Malone decoded the façade of Wells Cathedral in relation to the reforms of the Fourth Lateran Council, the homilies of the period, and the liturgical processions described in the Sarum Customary, which Wells had adopted under Bishop Jocelyn. She brought together architecture, decoration, homiletic material, and liturgy.[39] Susan Boynton explored the monastic community at Farfa in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, arguing that it can be adequately perceived only by taking into account the centrality of liturgical performance in shaping and reflecting its identities. Changes in liturgical chant are a central facet of her study.[40] Helen Gittos has interlaced Anglo-Saxon architecture, archeology, and the Anglo-Saxon liturgical text, explaining processions between buildings in the same compound and giving context to the rites for dedicating churches.[41] Owen

[37] Ibid., 7.

[38] Éamonn Ó Carragáin, *Ritual and the Rood: Liturgical Images and the Old English Poems of the Dream of the Rood Tradition* (London: The British Library; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).

[39] Carolyn Marino Malone, *Façade as Spectacle: Ritual and Ideology at Wells Cathedral* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

[40] Susan Boynton, *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000–1125* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

[41] Helen Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture, and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Phelan has explored Alcuin's teaching on *sacramentum* and baptism and the implications of a binding oath of political allegiance in the Carolingian Kingdom.[42] In all these studies, liturgical scholars can recognize a grasp of the liturgical materials that has been given deeper and richer meaning through engagement with cognate disciplines.

In a variety of ways, the faculty of Yale Institute of Sacred Music (ISM), past and present, have attempted in their own works to exemplify the fruits of modern historiography and interdisciplinary approaches in their study of liturgy. Former faculty member Lester Ruth wrote in his introduction to worship at early Methodist quarterly meetings:

> A new portrayal of early American Methodists at worship, listening to their voices and accepting them on their own terms, is the goal of this book. To pursue this end, I will use a wealth of materials dating from before 1825: journals, diaries, letters, liturgical fragments, hymns, circuit records, histories, and autobiographies. Much of this material is unpublished and has been little considered by liturgical historians. I also give careful attention to distinctive elements of Methodist polity since it provides the flavor and context for other aspects of Methodist life, including worship. In the end, the reader must judge whether I succeed in giving voice to these early Methodists, for I believe people truly are the primary liturgical documents.[43]

In assessing worship and sacramental theology in England and Scotland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in addition to published and unpublished liturgical documents, I drew on contemporary accounts of worship as well as catechisms, sermons, theological works, and hymns to give a thicker description of worship and sacramental understanding in that period, adding views from the pew.[44] Former ISM director Margot Fassler has combined

[42] Owen M. Phelan, *The Formation of Christian Europe: The Carolingians, Baptism, and the Imperium Christianum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

[43] Lester Ruth, *A Little Heaven Below: Worship at Early Methodist Quarterly Meetings* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon/Kingswood Books, 2000), 14.

[44] Bryan D. Spinks, *Liturgy in the Age of Reason: Worship and Sacraments in England and Scotland 1662–c. 1800* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008).

musicology, liturgy, sermons, and architecture to reconstruct processional liturgies in Chartres through the central *Portail Royal*. The meanings of the liturgy—its tropes, hymns, and prayers—can be correlated with the imagery that marks out liturgical pathways, both outside and inside the church. The introit tropes find their visual echo in sculpture.[45] Vasileios Marinis has examined the interchange between ritual and architecture in the late Byzantine churches of Constantinople, employing archeological data, liturgical texts and commentaries, and monastic *typika*.[46] Teresa Berger has begun to fill a huge vacuum in liturgy and gender studies. Drawing on historical case studies and focusing particularly on the early centuries of Christian worship, she has lifted a veil on liturgy's past to allow for a rich and diverse notion of gender difference and has asked whether we can assume that the struggle for holiness was so unevenly and gender-specifically successful.[47] Melanie Ross has utilized ethnographical studies to illuminate worship in evangelical congregations and drew on historical analysis, systematic theology, and the worship life of two congregations to show the common ground occupied by evangelical and so-called liturgical churches.[48] Markus Rathey's two forthcoming books on J. S. Bach combine the study of oratorios, passions, and the B-minor Mass with eighteenth-century Lutheran liturgy and theology to give a richer contextualization of Bach's music.[49] Henry Parkes has examined the writing and design of four important manuscripts from the city of Mainz—a musician's troper, a priest's

[45] Margot E. Fassler, *The Virgin of Chartres: Making History through Liturgy and the Arts* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010).

[46] Vasileios Marinis, *Architecture and Ritual in the Churches of Constantinople: Ninth to Fifteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[47] Teresa Berger, *Lifting a Veil on Liturgy's Past: Gender Differences and the Making of Liturgical History* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

[48] Melanie Ross, *Evangelical versus Liturgical? Defying a Dichotomy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014).

[49] Markus Rathey, *Johann Sebastian Bach's Christmas Oratorio: Music, Theology, Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming 2016); *Bach's Major Vocal Works: Music, Drama, Liturgy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, forthcoming 2016).

ritual handbook, a bishop's pontifical, and a copy of the enigmatic compilation now known as the Romano-German Pontifical—to open up new ways of understanding how religious ritual was organized, transmitted, and perceived in early medieval Germany and, by implication, elsewhere.[50]

All this is to say that we believe that the ISM already exemplifies many of the current major trends in liturgical studies. Having made such a claim, I also acknowledge that the present faculty all seek to learn more from others in affiliated fields. Such exploration was one purpose of the ISM's 2014 conference titled "Imagining Liturgies Past/s." We invited leading liturgical scholars together with historians who have pioneered interdisciplinary studies and who themselves have made significant contributions to liturgical subjects to present papers bringing new light to old subject matter and showcasing new material. Many of those papers are included in this collection. We hope that we can all learn from one another's insights, methods, and methodologies, discovering new keys we can use to unlock the liturgical past. And we remain aware that both our own shortcomings and our present concerns will sooner or later be exposed by those who will come after us. As Cannadine so rightly observed, "We are ourselves both agents and victims of the historical process."[51] That process encompasses *our* imagined past/s of liturgy. Since liturgical scholars are only human, we will continue to imagine.

[50] Henry Parkes, *The Making of Liturgy in the Ottonian Church: Books, Music and Ritual in Mainz, 950–1050* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

[51] Cannadine, *What Is History Now?*, xii.