

Roman Catholic Liturgical Renewal Forty-Five Years after Sacrosanctum Concilium: An Assessment

KEITH F. PECKLERS, S.J.

Next December 4 will mark the forty-fifth anniversary of the promulgation of the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, which the Council bishops approved with an astounding majority: 2,147 in favor and 4 opposed. The Constitution was solemnly approved by Pope Paul VI—the first decree to be promulgated by the Ecumenical Council.

Vatican II was well aware of change in the world—probably more so than any of the twenty ecumenical councils that preceded it.¹ It had emerged within the complex social context of the Cuban missile crisis, a rise in Communism, and military dictatorships in various corners of the globe. President John F. Kennedy had been assassinated only twelve days prior to the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.² Despite those global crises, however, the Council generally viewed the world positively, and with a certain degree of optimism. The credibility of the Church's message would necessarily depend on its capacity to reach far beyond the confines of the Catholic ghetto into the marketplace, into non-Christian and, indeed, non-religious spheres.³ It is important that the liturgical reforms be examined within such a framework.

The extraordinary unanimity in the final vote on the Constitution on the Liturgy was the fruit of the fifty-year liturgical movement that had preceded the Council. The movement was successful because it did not grow in isolation but rather in tandem with church renewal promoted by the biblical, patristic, and ecumenical movements in that same historical period. The Pauline doctrine of the church as the Mystical Body of Christ, recovered at Tübingen in the nineteenth century, offered the theological grounding for the movement's agenda. Speaking of the church as one body implied, and indeed demanded, an intimate link between worship and social concern. It was fitting, then, that the liturgical movement was founded in 1909 at a Catholic labor congress in Belgium, drawing on both the *motu proprio* of Pius X, *Tra le sollecitudini*, in which the Pope spoke of the liturgy "as the true and indispensable source for the Christian life,"⁴ and also on Leo XIII's social encyclical *Rerum novarum*. Equally significant is the fact that the movement was founded by a former labor chaplain turned Benedictine monk, Lambert Beauduin, who would later serve as a sort of mentor for the founder of the U.S. liturgical movement, Virgil Michel. The two met in the early 1920s when Beauduin was teaching on the faculty of the Collegio Sant'Anselmo in Rome, and the young German-American Benedictine was a student of philosophy.

The United States liturgical movement exhibited the same sorts of social concerns and bridge-building efforts as its Belgian forebear. In the years of the great economic depression of the 1930s the movement in this country found a natural affinity with the Catholic Worker Movement. Subsequently it forged relationships with Friendship House, Catholic Action, and the Grail Movement. Catholic social activists became promoters of liturgical renewal, while the liturgical journal *Orate Fratres* regularly defended the Catholic Worker Movement in its editorials. Columnists like H. A. Reinhold challenged racism and a preferential option for the rich in favor of a social transformation, both within the church and beyond, that found its origins in the liturgy.

The Liturgical Reforms of Vatican II

The major theological, historical, and pastoral themes that marked the pre-conciliar liturgical movement came to play a significant role in the shaping of the Constitution on the Liturgy, and then in the implementation of the reforms under the leadership of the international Consilium. Thus, Vatican II was as much the ratification of the efforts of the liturgical movement as it was a point of departure for the liturgical renewal that has led us to the present day. The Constitution on the Liturgy strikes a careful balance between historical and theological foundations, between “sound tradition and legitimate progress.”⁵ In many respects it was a *via media*, a compromise document that attempted to appease both conservative and progressive camps.

But *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was also much more than a *via media*. In some cases it called for a complete revision of liturgical books, not a superficial editing of what was present in the Tridentine liturgy.⁶ While the Constitution did not use the term “inculturation,” it does acknowledge the need to allow for “legitimate variations and adaptations to different groups, regions and peoples, especially in mission countries” (SC 37). Several paragraphs later the text is even more forthright: “In some places and circumstances, however, an even more radical adaptation of the liturgy is needed” (SC 40). In other words, simply adapting the Roman Rite to particular cultures and circumstances may not be enough.

With the desire to recover “full, conscious, and active participation in the liturgy” the Council took up once again discussion on the vernacular question that had first been introduced at the Council of Trent four centuries earlier. Argued in favor of the employment of local languages on the grounds of intelligibility,⁷ not surprisingly this proved to be one of the most hotly debated topics at Vatican II. Some bishops present at the Council contended that Latin, even if it was not understood by most, gave Catholics a special identity. Shifting to local languages, they argued, would be tantamount to abandoning Catholic orthodoxy. Cardinal Francis Spellman of New York was one such bishop. Speaking on the matter during one Council session he cautioned against “an exaggerated historicism and a zeal for novelties.” He suggested that “confusion, astonishment, and injury” could ensue when the faithful “see the unchangeable Church changing her rites.” In fact, the Cardinal was not exactly the best Latinist present. During Council sessions it became so painful when Spellman stood up to address his colleagues in Latin that Vatican staff members were assigned to another microphone with the task of correcting the Cardinal’s Latin so that he could be understood. The Cardinal proposed a compromise: he would accept the vernacular for praying the Breviary (Divine Office), since he himself had difficulty in grasping what he was praying, but the celebration of Mass should remain in Latin.⁸ Everyone breathed a great sigh of relief when the eighty-four year old Patriarch of Antioch, Maximos IV, addressed the bishops in French, arguing that he was Catholic but not Roman Catholic, and that Latin was not the language of his liturgical tradition.⁹

Undoubtedly the shift toward vernacular worship represented one of the most profound developments that came out of the Council. It received an extraordinary amount of attention in the secular press everywhere, from the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* to *Sports Illustrated* and *Time*. Catholic journalists voted the topic of “English in the Liturgy” the top religious story of 1964.¹⁰

The principle of collegiality among bishops was clearly operative in the Constitution: liturgical matters pertaining to the local church were best dealt with by episcopal conferences, or even by diocesan bishops themselves (see SC 22). Such liturgical de-centralization was justified by the

fact that the diocesan bishop is empowered to shepherd his local church, and not merely to serve as a sort of district representative or middle manager. Thus the diocesan bishop, or an episcopal conference, should have the authority to make appropriate liturgical decisions that pertain to the particular local church in question.¹¹ Nonetheless, an underlying tension around the issue of collegiality held sway during Council sessions, largely between bishops and cardinals of the Roman Curia suspicious of extending authority to episcopal conferences, as opposed to diocesan bishops, whose pastoral experience made them less threatened by such decentralization.

The division between the Roman Curia and diocesan bishops is well demonstrated in the recently published book by Archbishop Piero Marini, a former papal master of ceremonies. In his text, *A Challenging Reform*,¹² Marini argues that resistance to the liturgical changes was largely centered in the Congregation for Divine Worship, which sought to maintain a monopoly on liturgical reform and approval of liturgical texts, based on a bureaucratic desire for control and on a conservative theology that distrusted the reforms of the Council. This tension was made most explicit in a letter signed by all the episcopal members of the French Liturgical Commission on the 7 February 1964 and sent to several dicasteries of the Roman Curia. The letter addressed the subject of liturgical translation as an issue of collegiality:

The Council did not decide that the Assemblies would propose this or that concession for the vernacular to be approved by the Holy See.... Neither did the Council state that the bishops' conferences would submit translations for approval by the Apostolic See; it agreed that the translations would be approved by the bishops' conferences, that is all.... People are saying that just two months after its promulgation, that the Constitution is beaten in the breach, that the decisions made by episcopal assemblies may be effectively neutralized by the Roman Curia, that the role of the bishops' assemblies is being undermined at the very moment of its establishment by the Council, and that the decisions of the Council are being contested even before the Council has finished.¹³

The Current Liturgical Climate

There has been much "water under the bridge" since the French Bishops wrote their memorandum in 1964. How are we to interpret our post-Conciliar liturgical history as it has unfolded these past forty-five years? It has been argued that in the period immediately after the Council too much happened too quickly. Bishops returned home from the Council enthusiastic to put into practice the new liturgical norms and principles, but few were sufficiently prepared to lead their dioceses in implementing the reforms. Complex Latin liturgical texts were translated into English and other vernacular languages expeditiously, with an English edition of the Roman Missal produced in only four years. The church in North America breathed the *bon aire* of liturgical experimentation with home Masses, folk Masses, home-grown Eucharistic Prayers, and even liturgical texts sung to the tune of Bob Dylan's "Blowin' in the Wind"!

Much of the criticism of the liturgical experimentation of the 1960s and 1970s was not without justification; mistakes were made. Few liturgical scholars would argue that the 1973 *Sacramentary* was an adequate rendering in English of the Latin *editio typica* of the Roman Missal. Even today, forty-five years after the promulgation of the Council's Constitution on the Liturgy most of us can tell stories about places where all sorts of "liturgical experiments" continue to be conducted under the guise of "creativity," normally registering little success. As Cardinal John Henry Newman remarked after Vatican I, however, every church council has been

followed by a period of turmoil and unrest. Think of the aftermath of Nicea and Chalcedon; even the Council of Trent did not succeed in gaining unanimous adherence to its decrees. The church in France waited well into the seventeenth century to publish the Tridentine decrees, and largely ignored that Council's efforts at liturgical uniformity and centralization until well into the nineteenth century. In fact, when Prosper Guéranger arrived on the scene in 1832 and refounded the Benedictine monastery of Solesmes, most French dioceses were still using their own diverse liturgical books, celebrating liturgies with elements that differed from diocese to diocese. In Germany the Tridentine *Missal of Pius V* was implemented in Münster only in 1890, more than three hundred years after its promulgation in 1570. It was, however, part of the decrees of the Council of Trent that dioceses with liturgical traditions of a certain age could keep these instead of adopting the Tridentine Missal. Thus the existence of liturgies like the one in Münster did actually conform to the rulings of the Council.

As we reflect upon the liturgical renewal in the years since Vatican II we have much for which to be grateful. The Council's desire for full, active, and conscious participation has been realized in much of the North American Church; this is especially evident in the growth in lay ecclesial ministry and liturgical leadership. A concomitant growth has also been registered in liturgical formation, for laity as well as clergy. The church in the twenty-first century recognizes clearly that the handing on of the church's tradition through its worship necessarily involves more than the clergy. It is a partnership shared between women and men, involving a complimentary rather than competing exercise of ministry within the liturgical assembly as within the church itself. Baptism, not ordination, appropriately becomes the common denominator in this equation. Thus, at least ideally the implications for ecumenical liturgical cooperation are obvious.

Like other Christian churches, the Roman Catholic Church has made great strides in recovering the intrinsic relationship between liturgy and life: worship that flows into social outreach to the poor and disenfranchised. Questions raised by the social sciences, with new insights drawn from cultural and gender studies, have called our attention to the diverse dynamics at play when we gather for Christian worship, and the importance of worship that is contextualized according to the needs and parameters of the given celebrating community. Back in the 1970s some Roman Catholic liturgists in the United States called for an "American liturgy" that would reflect the genius of the North American cultural experience.¹⁴ Today we need to ask ourselves "which America?" since we are much more conscious than we were thirty or forty years ago of our multiracial, multicultural, diverse identity, and the effects of globalization on our worship. Of course much remains to be done in all these areas, but it must be said that the pluses far outweigh the minuses if we compare and contrast 1958 and 2008. Nonetheless, if we employ the solid principles of Vatican II as a barometer, and the clear Conciliar preference for collegial structures of leadership within local churches, then there appears to be more shadow than light in recent years.

Regardless of how we assess post-Conciliar history in the United States, however, the Roman Catholic Church—in this country and indeed throughout the world—has become increasingly polarized.¹⁵ When Archbishop Marini published his book on the Consilium in November 2007, conservative blogs immediately attacked it for opposing the liturgical reforms of Pope Benedict XVI despite the fact that the book actually deals with implementation of the liturgical reforms of Vatican II. Such blogs are indicative of a growing problem within the post-Conciliar church,

which detracts from efforts to attend to what lies at the heart of the church's mission in a postmodern and increasingly post-Christian society. Indeed, a Google search of the term "liturgy wars" reveals how widespread this term has become. Ironically, the liturgy—and especially the Eucharist, the source of our unity—has become the source of our disunity. Such division within the church is of course a scandal to those outside of it.

On 7 July 2007 Pope Benedict promulgated his *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* which granted permission for wider usage of the Tridentine Rite. While I believe that the Pope was genuinely trying to reach out pastorally to the fringe—albeit an extremely small minority on the far right—the *motu proprio* has been read as victory by the church's conservative wing, and a negation of what the Council stood for despite the Pope's statement to the contrary. Moreover, as has become clear in recent months, some significant ecclesiological problems inhere in the text that had not been envisaged beforehand. The widely-publicized reaction, both in Jewish and Christian circles, to the Prayer for the Jews in the Good Friday Liturgy as it is found in the 1962 Missal, which asks God to "lift the veil from their eyes so that they may come to accept Jesus Christ as the savior," led to an immediate condemnation from the Anti-Defamation League and other lobbyist groups, prompting the Vatican's revision of the prayer. While the revised prayer eliminates the language of "lifting the veil" it continues to pray for the conversion of the Jews, that they might come to accept Jesus Christ, and at least one Jewish group involved in dialogue with the Vatican has withdrawn as a result.

That Jews would not wish to participate in a dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church if they thought that the goal of the dialogue was to convert them to Christianity is perfectly understandable! Of course the Council's decree *Nostra Aetate* does not state that, and tremendous success in the Jewish-Christian dialogue of the past forty years can be attributed to mutual respect for the Judeo-Christian tradition. Clearly the easiest solution to the problem of the 1962 Good Friday prayer would have been to adopt the Latin text of the Good Friday prayer as found in the current *Missal of Paul VI*. That, in fact, had been the proposal of Cardinal Walter Kasper, president of the Pontifical Council for the Promotion of Christian Unity, whose office is responsible for the Catholic Church's relations with Jews. His proposal was not accepted by the Vatican's Secretariat of State.

Ecclesiological and canonical problems exist as well. Can two Roman rites co-existent in the one church? And what of the argument that the old rite was never abrogated? This is not a very defensible position since Pope Paul VI wrote, to the contrary, that the old rite was to be subsumed into the new as a continuation of the tradition.

Within the "ordinary" Roman Rite, as it is now being called, the current liturgical climate is far from serene. Conservative bloggers are rejoicing at the nomination of a new papal master of ceremonies in the autumn of 2007, as they hope he will further the efforts of what they call "Pope Benedict's liturgical reforms." They point to the fact that a cross and six candles are now found on the papal altar, obstructing, of course, the liturgical assembly's vision. They mention the Pope's return to more traditional vesture, both within the liturgy and outside of it, as well as his celebration of Mass in the Sistine Chapel on the feast of the Baptism of the Lord "*ad orientem*"—toward the East, his back to the faithful.¹⁶

Then there is the contentious subject of liturgical translation, thanks to the problematic 2001 document *Liturgiam Authenticam*. Peter Jeffery's superb collection of essays on that subject appeared in *Worship* and has now been published together by Liturgical Press.¹⁷ In his Aidan

Kavanagh lecture at the Institute of Sacred Music in October, 2006, the Lutheran liturgical scholar Max Johnson noted the serious ecumenical concerns and limits that that document now imposes, potentially impeding our future efforts at ecumenical liturgical cooperation.¹⁸ Similar concerns have been voiced by the Presbyterian liturgical pioneer Horace Allen¹⁹ and the Anglican canon Donald Gray, president of the Alcuin Club.²⁰ Language, of course, is itself symbolic, and having common liturgical texts communicates something profound about what we believe regarding our common baptism. In other words, even as we sadly remain divided around the table of the Eucharist, we need not be divided at the table of God's Word—both the Word proclaimed, and the texts we pray in common. It is lamentable that the Roman Catholic Church will soon have translations of the Gloria, Creed, and Sanctus that no longer match those of other churches—especially lamentable since those other churches generously adopted the Roman translations when revising their own liturgical books. Forty-five years after the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* it is difficult to see this as progress. If all this sounds rather disconcerting, my hunch is that the situation will actually get worse before it gets better—at least as far as the polemics are concerned.

Divergent Ecclesiologies

As we reflect upon the current liturgical climate I submit that the tensions of these post-Conciliar years point to a much deeper question than whether we pray in Latin or English, or in a more traditional or more contemporary manner. What the liturgical debates represent are competing ecclesiologies—how we view the Church, in other words: the relationship between church and Eucharist, for example, or between the local and the universal church. By and large, proponents of the Tridentine Rite never accepted the Council's ecumenical outreach, and its opening up to interreligious dialogue with Jews and Muslims. Nor have they approved of the increased role of the laity, both women and men, in the church's life and worship. Vatican II's vision of the church was radically different from what had preceded it; the Council was recovering the nature of the church's global dimension, its own self-realization as a world-church linked together as a communion of local churches under the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. Recent works by the retired archbishop of San Francisco, John Quinn,²¹ and the Jesuit theologian, Michael Buckley,²² have called for a return to the more ancient view of papal primacy, with its emphasis on collegial and synodal structures of church leadership, as continues to be the case today in the churches of the East. Such a re-thinking of our ecclesiological premises would, of course, have obvious implications for the church's liturgical life, as well.

Worship and the Mission of the Church

Meanwhile, as the liturgical debates rage on and a battle royal is waged over whether the Tridentine Missal of Pius V or the Vatican II Missal of Paul VI is superior, and debates ensue over issues of translation and which way we should be oriented at Mass, "Rome is burning," and the credibility of the church and the handing on of its tradition is at stake. Last year I had lunch with a bishop from Calcutta who told me that his diocese has nine and a half million people, of whom sixty thousand are Catholic. He has only thirty diocesan clergy serving there, along with another thirty priests from religious orders. The largest part of the diocese has no electricity, and is actually made up of a series of islands that he reaches by boat. Now, in addition to problems in that region of tremendous poverty, illness, and a lack of food and clean water, there will be new translations of liturgical texts, which his clergy have already told him they will refuse to implement.

In the West, a decline in church attendance continues to be registered, along with a concomitant decline in the number of ordained priests. This decline results in ever greater numbers of “priestless parishes,” even in Catholic Italy. In the concrete, this means that we will increasingly become a non-eucharistic church: the Mass will no longer be standard fare for significant groups of Catholics, but rather a service of the Word led by a layperson, at which communion is distributed from the tabernacle.

Sociological surveys and studies continue to be carried out in order to understand better the sharp decline in religious practice in Western Europe, North America, and Oceania. In North America and throughout much of the Western world increasing numbers of Catholics find themselves in what the Roman Catholic Church calls “irregular situations,” and many are in our assemblies on Sunday morning. Here we are faced with a host of new pastoral challenges begging our attention: how do we reach them—the divorced and remarried, for example? Do they recognize themselves in our words? In Latin America, over one hundred thousand people leave the Catholic Church each year in search of more intimate communities of faith; these they find in fundamentalist communities, as they lament the anonymity and lack of interest they experience in large urban Catholic parishes. These pastoral problems do not appear to be abating, and will become an ever greater reality in the Roman Catholic Church as it moves forward in the twenty-first century.

Globalization, of course, is having its own influence on twenty-first century life. Several years ago I attended a Christmas concert of the Vienna Boys Choir. As they came onto the stage it was immediately clear that the group was anything but classically Austrian. Much to my surprise, the Vienna Boys Choir now reflects the multicultural reality that is increasingly constitutive of the North American Church. The conductor is Peruvian, from Lima, and the choristers hail from Australia, Canada, Poland, Nigeria, Slovakia, Soviet Georgia, and even the United States! As globalization is changing the way we live, it is also changing the way we worship: we have indeed become a global village, and this multicultural gift continues to present fresh challenges for worship in all our churches.

The church is also radically different from forty-five years ago in terms of where it is growing exponentially, and this also has serious implications for our liturgical future. At the beginning of the twentieth century 80 percent of all Christians throughout the world were white, and lived in the northern hemisphere. By the year 2020 we are told that 80 percent of all Christians will be people of color who live in the southern hemisphere. In his book *The New Faces of Christianity*, Philip Jenkins writes: “The average Christian in the world today is a poor person, very poor indeed by the standards of the white worlds of North America and Western Europe. Also different is the social and political status of African and Asian Christians, who are often minorities in countries dominated by other religions and secular ideologies.”²³

Christian worship is always intended to lead to mission, and thus the liturgical polarization discussed earlier can easily distort our vision and impede our progress in linking what we do in church with what happens outside its borders. We must constantly resist the temptation to think that our liturgical celebrations are only about us, and our concerns, lest we celebrate nothing more than ourselves. By their very nature, our liturgical rites are celebrations of the world Church—the whole body of Christ. If our Catholic tradition as realized and celebrated in worship is to be credible, capable of reading the signs of the times in this postmodern age, then along with our counterparts in other churches Roman Catholics will need to be courageous in

asking difficult questions about where their worship is leading them and what it is demanding of them.

Forty-five years after the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, we are more aware than ever that Christian worship—the Eucharist in particular—is by its very nature linked to love of neighbor. In the concrete, this means that our worship necessarily unites us in solidarity with those who suffer in Darfur—with the two and a half million people who have been displaced because of the genocide, and with those who mourn the almost four hundred thousand who have lost their lives in that region of western Sudan. Whether Anglican or Methodist, Roman Catholic or Lutheran, authentic Christian worship means that we are not only inextricably linked to one another, but also intimately united with the people of Afghanistan and Gaza, Iraq and Pakistan, Congo and Zimbabwe—because authentic liturgy transcends human barriers of culture and social status, gender and race. The alternative is a sort of “liturgical isolationism” or self-sufficiency that runs counter to the Gospel of Christ.

Conclusion

We have all come a long way on our liturgical pilgrimage of forty-five years, and we have done so together, ecumenically. At a time when the Conciliar tradition is under siege it is more important than ever that we remain faithful to the vision of the Second Vatican Council, for much remains to be done. The newly-canonized Jesuit saint from Chile, Alberto Hurtado, often spoke of the “prolongation of the Mass in daily life”—similarly to what the late Jesuit theologian Karl Rahner referred to as the “liturgy of the world”—the liturgy lived on the streets, far beyond the confines of the church building.²⁴ It is not a coincidence that the word “Mass” comes from *missio*. *Ite missa est* literally means “Go, you are sent.” This sending forth, however, must necessarily be a being sent forth together as one church—one, holy, catholic, and apostolic—united in a common profession of faith and a common baptism. Getting lost in our liturgical debates, while ignoring that fundamental vision of the Second Vatican Council, will only perpetuate, and indeed augment, the divisions within the already wounded body of Christ as it cries out for healing in so many parts of the world.

Forty-five years after the Vatican II’s Constitution on the Liturgy, as we give thanks for the progress that has been made, we need to reawaken the intrinsic relationship between worship and mission that by its very nature underscores ecumenical liturgical cooperation as a non-negotiable matter. Put differently, how we understand worship will determine how we understand mission. The goal, then, is that the language of the Eucharist should become the language and pattern of our lives as we participate in God’s mission within human society.²⁵ Failure to do so ecumenically will be to our detriment. Indeed, if our worship is to be one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, as the Council desired and as the Gospel demands, then it must open wide to embrace the whole of God’s world, in all its need, as Christ would have us do.

ENDNOTES

1. See John W. O’Malley, S.J., *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

2. Nathan Mitchell, “The Council’s Call: On the 40th Anniversary of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,” *America* (January 19-26, 2004) 9.

3. John O'Malley, S.J. "Reform, Historical Consciousness and Vatican II's Aggiornamento," *Theological Studies* 32 (1971) 573.
4. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 36:28 (1904) 331, cited in *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*, ed. J. Neuner and J. Dupuis (New York: Alba House, 1982) 340.
5. The Constitution on the Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (=SC) 23.
6. Anscar J. Chupungco, "Sacrosanctum Concilium: Its Vision and Achievements," *Ecclesia Orans* 13 (1996) 500. See SC 50 on the revision of the Order of Mass. Quotations from SC are taken from *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery (Northport: Costello, 1996).
7. SC 36. On the vernacular debate at the Council see my *Dynamic Equivalence: The Living Language of Christian Worship* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003) 170-225.
8. Pecklers, *Dynamic Equivalence*, 180.
9. *Ibid.*, 185.
10. *The Register* (8 January 1965) 8, as reported in William E. Wiethoff, "Popular Rhetorical Strategy in the American Catholic Debate over Vernacular Reform 1953-1968." Ph.D.diss., University of Michigan, 1974, 96.
11. SC 41; Chupungco, "Sacrosanctum," 507-8.
12. Piero Marini, *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal, 1963-1975*, ed. Mark R. Francis, C.S.V., John R. Page, and Keith F. Pecklers, S.J. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007).
13. "Memorandum by the Liturgical Commission of the French Episcopate," 7 February 1964, in Marini, *A Challenging Reform*, 168-70.
14. The African-American composer Grayson Warren Brown and the Jesuit liturgist John Gallen were among those proposing such an "American liturgy." *Eucharistic Liturgies*, ed. John Gallen (Paramus: Newman, 1969) offers various examples of what was envisaged in those years.
15. For an excellent treatment of post-Conciliar liturgical tensions and the growing critique of Vatican II's liturgical reforms, see John F. Baldwin, S.J., *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2008).
16. See Keith F. Pecklers, S.J., "Vested in Symbolism," *The Tablet* (8 March 2008) 12-13.
17. Peter Jeffery, *Translating Tradition: A Chant Historian Reads Liturgiam Authenticam* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005).
18. Maxwell E. Johnson, "The Loss of a Common Language: The End of Ecumenical Liturgical Convergence?" *Studia Liturgica* 37/1 (2007), 55-72; an earlier version appears in this volume.
19. Horace T. Allen, Jr., "Common Lectionary and Protestant Hymnody: Unity at the Table of the

Word—Liturgical and Ecumenical Bookends,” in *Liturgical Renewal as a Way to Christian Unity*, ed. James F. Puglisi (Collegeville: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2005) 61-69.

20. Donald Gray, “The Birth of the Joint Liturgical Group and Its Contribution to the Concept of Ecumenical Liturgical Co-Operation,” *The Record: The Church Service Society* 41 (Winter 2005/6) 23-35.

21. John R. Quinn, *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (New York: Crossroad, 1999).

22. Michael J. Buckley, S.J., *Papal Primacy and the Episcopate: Towards a Relational Understanding* (New York: Crossroad, 1998).

23. Philip Jenkins, *The New Faces of Christianity: Believing the Bible in the Global South* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) 68.

24. See Michael Skelley, *The Liturgy of the World: Karl Rahner’s Theology of Worship* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1991).

25. Francis J. Maloney, S.D.B., *A Body Broken for a Broken People: Eucharist in the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1990, 1997) 155-59.

Keith F. Pecklers, S.J., is professor of liturgy at the Pontifical Gregorian University and professor of liturgical history, Rome. He has published six books, along with numerous articles and reviews. In addition to his academic responsibilities, he serves as a Vatican “on air expert” for ABC NEWS.