

THE REFORM OF THE REFORM: AN EXAMINATION OF JOSEPH RATZINGER'S VISION OF LITURGICAL RENEWAL¹

Idahosa AMADASU

INTRODUCTION

The Second Vatican Council's call for the reform of the liturgy has aroused much discussion and conflicting opinions. A leading voice in this discussion is Joseph Ratzinger, who became Pope Benedict XVI in 2005 and resigned from his Petrine ministry in 2013. Unlike the exceptions he takes to certain formulations of some of the conciliar documents, like *Gaudium et spes*, for example,² Ratzinger is not known to have expressed any reservation about the conciliar document on the liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. In fact, in his early and later writings, he is full of praise for this document. However, what becomes increasingly pronounced in his later writings is his criticism of the way the conciliar reform was implemented. He sees the liturgical abuses in post-conciliar times as manifestations of the deficiencies in the implementation of the conciliar reform. He particularly finds the promulgation of the new order of mass and some of the changes it called for problematic because it gave the impression of a break with the past in the

Church's liturgical life. Such implementations were informed by a hermeneutics of rupture, that is, a break with past that undermines the organic development of liturgy in the Church.

For Ratzinger, it is this kind of hermeneutics that has given the impression that one could easily formulate the liturgy according to pastoral expediency. Such formulations are often based on a selective reading of history that is informed by an antiquarianism which romanticizes the early Church in a way that precludes its later historical developments. The consequence of hermeneutics of rupture is that the place of God is marginalized in the liturgy and an undue attention is given to our human actions and creativities. It is from this perspective that Ratzinger expressed reservation about the way that the conciliar call for active participation in the liturgy has been understood, for example, the change in the liturgical celebration from *ad orientem* to *versus populum*, the use of certain kinds of music in the liturgy etc. In contrast to the traditionalists who reject the conciliar call for reform and the progressives who see the post conciliar changes as advancing the conciliar reform,³ Ratzinger's liturgical vision sees some gap between the conciliar call for reform and its implementation. He would, therefore, call for a reform of the reform so that the reform which was carried out after the council can conform to the council's true intention.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the plausibility of Ratzinger's call for the reform of the reform. His proposal cuts across a range of liturgical issues. But for the limited scope of our presentation, we will briefly examine few of these areas. More specifically, we will examine Vatican II's notion of active participation and the change from *ad orientem* to *versus populum*. We will take our discussion further to examine Pope Benedict XVI's liberalization of the celebration of the mass according to the 1962 missal. From these discussions, our evaluative conclusion will show whether Ratzinger's call for the reform of the reform has any hope for the revival of the Church's liturgy today.

RATZINGER'S LITURGICAL VISION OF THE REFORM OF THE REFORM

In his report on the Vatican II, Ratzinger praised the conciliar constitution on the liturgy for its solid achievements. He wrote that the text recommended a profound change which was informed by an integral understanding of the Christian faith that did “not restrict itself to mere changes in individual rubrics.”⁴ It marked a return to the “sacramental origins” of the faith against a limited “hierarchical narrowness.”⁵ He thereafter enumerated some basic traits that characterized the recommended reforms of the conciliar document on the liturgy as follows: i) The ritual rigidity which undermined the meaning of individual actions in the liturgy was defrosted. This restored the priority of Sunday liturgy over the feast days of saints and the priority of mystery over devotion. Such prioritization would return the Church to the origins of the Christian faith and prune the accretions that have concealed the nucleus of the liturgy. Later in a monograph on the liturgy, he describes these accretions with the metaphor of a whitewash that has overlaid a fresco.⁶ ii) A stronger emphasis on the liturgy of the Word. iii) A more active participation of the laity in the liturgy. iv) A decentralization of the liturgical decision making. v) More place to vernacular in the liturgy against an exclusive use of Latin.⁷

In 1964, Pope Paul VI established a committee for the implementation of the conciliar reform called the *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia* (Consilium for the Implementation of the Sacred Liturgy). The committee (which was commonly referred to as *Consilium*) was headed by Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro and the secretary was Father Annibale Bugnini, a Vincentian, who later became Archbishop. In his account of the activities of the *Consilium*, Pierro Marini notes that Pope Paul VI had created the *Consilium* because he was unwilling to entrust the implementation of the conciliar reform to the Congregation of Rites, which was established to implement the reforms of the Council of Trent, due to the fact that it was still wedded to an antiquated mode of thought that was unsuited for the implementation of the Vatican II's liturgical reform. In its

modus operandi, the *Consilium* allowed for experimentation in some proposed areas of liturgical reforms before a definitive missal was promulgated in 1970.⁸ In his memoirs Ratzinger wrote that he welcomed the promulgation of the new missal, though not without reservation, noting that the Church now “had a binding liturgical text after a period of experimentation that had often deformed the liturgy.”⁹ His reservation becomes pronounced when he notes that, the publication of the new missal was accompanied by an “almost total prohibition” of the old missal. Furthermore, speaking as if the missal was actually prohibited, he adds, “But I was dismayed by the prohibition of the old missal, since nothing of the sort had ever happened in the entire history of the Church.”¹⁰ Later in an interview he advocated that “the proscription against the form of liturgy in valid use up to 1970 should be lifted.”¹¹

There have been some debates on the canonical and theological status of the old missal. Nicola Bux makes a distinction between the prohibition and the abolition of the old Mass.¹² In fact, he notes that Pope Paul VI never abolished the Old mass; rather he only restricted its usage. But there are others who hold that the old mass was abrogated with the promulgation of the new missal. Such positions would argue that there would not be any need to promulgate a new missal if the old one was still valid.¹³ One could reason from this perspective that if the law of belief and the law of prayer are mutually reinforcing, then it is normal that the renewal of the faith and a renewed ecclesiological understanding should also warrant a new missal that replaces the old. But if the new missal replaces the old, does it then mean that the old missal is no longer valid? For Ratzinger, to hold such an opinion is to create a rupture with the past, which also renders the foundation of the present fragile. Ratzinger's perspective is informed by his understanding that the liturgical rites are of divine origin and no power, even that of the pope, can abrogate them. Thus, he makes a distinction between the renewal of a liturgical book and the abolition of an old missal.¹⁴ But critics of Ratzinger would tend to see this standpoint as an attempt to place too much emphasis on the

Church's liturgical tradition in a way that undermines her contemporary needs. His view is also seen as a way of seeking for the solution to the problems of present liturgical abuses only by a return to the past.¹⁵ We will come back to this discussion, but for now, let us see some of the areas that Ratzinger thinks are in need of reform and the solution he proposes for the reform.

ACTIVE PARTICIPATION AND *AD ORIENTEM*

Ratzinger holds that there was a need for reform of the pre-conciliar liturgy because like a fresco it had become tainted with a whitewash that needs to be removed. He uses the same metaphor of a fresco to explain how this very reform called for a new reform. The liturgy, like a fresco covered with whitewash, was laid bare by the pre-conciliar Liturgical Movement, and this uncovering achieved a definitive form in Vatican II. While the colors of the uncovered fresco are captivating, it has again been left exposed and “has been endangered by climatic conditions as well as by various restorations and reconstructions. In fact, it is threatened with destruction, if the necessary steps are not taken to stop these damaging influences.”¹⁶ By the metaphor of the fresco, Ratzinger meant to explain the way the conciliar reforms have been carried out and the understanding of the liturgy that it gave birth to. One area that he has found often misunderstood is the conciliar call for active participation, *actuosa participatio*. Ratzinger thinks that the word has often been reduced to the external form of participation, as if the liturgy is what we do, rather than what we participate in. The liturgy is first an action of God that we participate in. John Baldovin comments that the “greatest strength of his [Ratzinger's] analysis of liturgy and sacrament today is his insistence on keeping God at the centre of the liturgical celebration”¹⁸ Baldovin continues that this marginalization of God in the liturgy today is often the result of a superficial understanding of the etymological meaning of liturgy, which is sometimes translated as 'work of the people.' But in its true meaning, rather than the work done by the people, the liturgy actually refers to the 'work done for the people.'¹⁹ It is the false etymological meaning of the liturgy as 'the work of the

people' that Ratzinger objects to in the post conciliar liturgical celebrations, which has often led to a reductive understanding of community celebration.

The fundamental idea here is that the liturgy is a community celebration, an act in which the community forms and experiences itself as such. In fact this means that the liturgy more and more acquires a 'party' character and atmosphere, as we see for instance in the increased importance attached to the words of greeting and dismissal and in search for elements with 'entertainment' value. A 'successful' liturgical celebration is judged by the effects achieved in this way. Liturgy is thus dependent on the 'creativity', the ideas of those who organize it²⁰

In a critical evaluation of Ratzinger's monograph on the liturgy, Pierre-Marie Gy raised doubts about the former's faithfulness to the council in the way he understands active participation as autocelebration. He thinks that Ratzinger's criticism does not pay adequate attention to article 48 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* which calls on the faithful not to assist at mass as dumb spectators, but to actively take part in the sacred action. Gy also questions Ratzinger's objection to *versus populum* in the liturgy. He thinks Ratzinger's criticism is based on an incorrect reading of history and an inadequate appreciation of how *versus populum* spontaneously became a common practice as a consequence of the celebration of mass in the vernacular. It subsequently gained magisterial approval in the first document that was published on the implementation of the conciliar liturgical reform, *Inter Oecumenici*.²¹ In response to Gy, Ratzinger denied that he understands active participation as autocelebration. He explains that his criticism was not directed to the conciliar phrase, but rather to its interpretation which simply understands it as "assigning specific active functions to each of the faithful gathered for the celebration of the Eucharist." He thinks active participation as understood by the council means something more. Indeed, it primarily refers to an inner participation that informs the external activity.

It requires, in the first place, that one is really

familiar with the shape of the liturgy and its texts. Liturgical formation is what I mean, without which purely external actions remain empty and meaningless. Liturgical formation is a fundamental prerequisite for, and indeed an essential form of, active participation in the celebration of the mass. But such participation which allows an inner adherence to the liturgy with one's whole being, one's thinking and activity, must of course also be expressed externally, with our bodies.²²

On the issue of *versus populum*, there have been much discussion on whether the council or the documents that heralded the liturgical implementations actually warranted the *versus populum* as Gy claims.²³ Ratzinger's basic reservation is that *versus populum* gives the impression that the community is in a closed circle in which the priest presides over the assembly. It has, for him, further helped to reinforce a false understanding of active participation.²⁴ But when Ratzinger does speak of reforming the reform, since the practice of *versus populum* has become conventional in the celebration of the *novus ordo*, what then does such a reform call for in this case? Does it mean returning to the pre-conciliar liturgical form of *ad orientem*, which most current Church architectures no longer favor? If the liturgy can be compared to a fresco in which the reform called by the council was meant to remove the whitewash that covered it, and if the fresco has become once more 'endangered' how can it be protected and at the same time made captivating again? For Ratzinger, "Of course, there must be no question of its being covered with whitewash again, but what is imperative is a new reverence in the way we treat it, a new understanding of its message and its reality, so that rediscovery does not become the first stage of irreparable loss."²⁵

Hence in calling for a reform of the mistaken impression that *versus populum* may have created, Ratzinger thinks that because the essential element of the *ad orientem* is its Christ-centeredness, this Christocentricity can be rediscovered even in the *versus populum*. Consequently he proposes three steps for a greater emphasis on this Christocentricity in the liturgy: i) A proper space should be arranged around the ambo for the dialogue of proclamation and response that goes with the

liturgy of the Word. ii) Altars should be constructed near the people in Churches where they are too far from the people. iii) A visible cross should be placed on the altar that would be the focal point of the priest and the faithful at liturgical celebrations.²⁶

We now move to examine one more area in Ratzinger's program of reform before drawing our conclusion.

SUMMORUMPONTIFICUM

This idea of the reform of the reform has also shaped Pope Benedict XVI's liberalization of the old missal by the *motu proprio*, *Summorum Pontificum*.²⁷ At the promulgation of the new missal, only the elderly priests who could not easily learn the new form were permitted to still celebrate mass with the old missal. Later in 1984, Pope John Paul II granted the indult (*Quattuorabhincanno*) in which bishops were to permit those who request to celebrate mass according to the old missal. The establishment of *Ecclesia Dei*, with the *motu proprio*, *Ecclesia Dei Adflicta* in 1988, was to further strengthen this indult and take care of those who wished to celebrate the mass according to the old missal. *Summorum Pontificum* builds upon the foundation of these two documents and describes the celebration of the mass according to the 1962 missal as the extraordinary form of the Roman rite, while the celebration according to the *novusordo* is described as the ordinary form of the rite. These two uses of the Roman rite means that any priest could celebrate mass in the extraordinary form without any need for permission, and it also allows it to be offered for any 'stable group of the faithful', *coetus fidelium* that requests it. In a letter he wrote to Bishops on the promulgation of *Summorum Pontificum*, Pope Benedict noted that his intention for the *motu proprio* was to bring about "an internal reconciliation in the heart of the Church."²⁸ According to Nicholas Bux, the pope's statement "implies not only healing the formal schism of the Lefebvrists, but also overcoming the break brought about during the reform of the liturgy, opposing the new and the old rite"²⁹ But there are others who doubt whether this reconciliation can be achieved by the *motu proprio*. Baldovin finds it troubling that the document does not insist that those

who celebrate with the 1962 missal should show due allegiance to Vatican II. He continues that if the mass according to the *Missal of Paul VI* is not celebrated with reverence, then the pope should have focused on how to ensure this reverential celebration with the new missal instead of restoring the pre-conciliar liturgy. He adds, “(m)any people have not accepted the Second Vatican Council and the renewal and reform of the church that have sprung from it. This document will only give them hope that the last forty years can be reversed.”³⁰ Thus, while Pope Benedict XVI thinks of bringing about reconciliation within the Church with the *motu proprio*, scholars like Baldovin see a potential reversal of council's gains.

Opinions like those of Baldovin might have been informed by the different ecclesiological emphasis that underline the old and the new missal. According to Peter Jeffery, on the one hand, for those who are more attuned to the new form of the mass, it offers a model of the Church as a community, with the priest and people united together in prayer.³¹ For such people 'Tridentine mass' cannot bring out this communitarian aspect of the liturgy, for the architecture of the Church effectively demarcates the clergy and the faithful, making the latter look like dumb spectators during liturgical celebrations.³² On the other hand, Jeffery notes that for those who favour the pre-conciliar mass, it depicts a more contemplative model of the Church.³³ For such persons, the new mass appears to place a superficial emphasis on the horizontal dimension of our being in a way that virtually evacuates the mystery of celebration and the trials of life.³⁴ Considering the fact that the positive dimensions of both celebrations have a legitimate place in Christian life and worship, in contrast to Baldovin's assessment of *Summorum Pontificum* as having little hopes for addressing the problems of the liturgy today, Jeffery thinks that the document calls us to widen our hearts (Cf. I Cor. 6:11-13) so that positive emphases of both forms can enrich our liturgical celebration.³⁵

Jeffery's evaluation of *Summorum Pontificum* shows that the task before us today is to appreciate the strengths of the ordinary and extraordinary forms of the Roman rite, and to

see how they mutually reinforce each other. Since the liturgy is a living reality, it is when both rites are alive that they can grow and learn from each other. It is in this respect that one could perhaps see the positive effects of the liberalization of the extraordinary form of the mass. For the interior reconciliation which the pope calls for to be achieved, it means that those who celebrate in the new order of mass should not see it as a rupture from the old form, just as those who celebrate in the old form as Baldovin advocates should also be open to celebrating mass in the new form. This will help to ensure that the liberalization of the extraordinary form of the Roman rite promotes the right hermeneutics for interpreting the council. Such a hermeneutics would ensure that continuity with the past does not stifle development, just as the development of the liturgy, even as it calls for some discontinuities with the past, is not a rupture. This reconciliation that the pope desires would be further advanced if there are greater efforts made not simply to describe both forms from the abuses one sees in their celebration, but rather to see how they can promote good liturgical celebrations in their authentic meaning. Thus the two forms of the Roman rite can enrich each other with their different emphases, correct their shortcomings, and bring about a more healthy liturgical celebration in the Church.³⁶

CONCLUSION

From Ratzinger's proposal of the reform of the reform, it is clear that left to him, some of the changes that came about from the implementation of the conciliar reform should not have been made because they did not represent an organic gradual change that is proper to liturgical development. Hence these changes have also resulted in losing some of the precious liturgical practices that the missal of the 1962 mass embodies. This has informed his idea of the reform of the reform so that the lofty values of the past are not lost in the liturgy's openness to changes and development. But the fear that has often been expressed about Ratzinger's idea is that it is an attempt to draw the clock back. This is evident in the criticism that greeted the publication of *Summorum Pontificum*. However, a careful study of Ratzinger's proposal

shows two characteristic traits that might suggest otherwise. First, while he regrets the changes that were made in the post-conciliar reform, his proposal for a reform of these changes is not always an exact return to pre-conciliar practices, as seen in his proposal to place a cross at the centre of the altar to achieve the *ad orientem* status of liturgical celebration, rather than reconstructing the Church altar according to its pre-Vatican II architecture. Second, while he still desires some past liturgical practices, like the silent recitation of the canon, he is not known to have departed from the current practice of the loud recitation of the canon, even as pope.³⁷ While certain practices like kneeling for communion, reception of communion on the tongue, the use of old vestments were conspicuous during his papal liturgical celebrations, these too, have not been made universal laws. It is for this reason that Mariusz Biliniewicz comments that the “reform of the reform” is mainly an educational process consisting of explaining, showing good examples and encouraging good practices. Benedict does allow liturgical pluralism and does not impose his style on anyone.” Biliniewicz continues, “I think that it is quite clear to those who look closely that the imposition, disciplinary compelling and limitation of post-Vatican II liturgical pluralism are not Benedict's method in introducing his reform of the reform”³⁸ In this light, we think that when the reform of the reform is understood as attempt to find a balance between the past and the present, a balance that gives room for liturgical pluralism, then it has much hopes for the revival of the liturgy in the Church today.

ENDNOTES

1. A shorter version of this paper was presented at the Leuven Encounters in Systematic Theology, LEST IX, at the Catholic University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium on October 23, 2013.
2. See Joseph Ratzinger, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 1966. Reprint, 2009), 231-235, Joseph Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology*, trans., Mary Frances McCarthy (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius, 1987), 378-393

3. For an overview of the different positions of the traditionalists and the progressives on liturgical issues, see Thomas Kocik, *The Reform of the Reform* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2003)
4. Ratzinger, *Theological Highlights*, 31.
5. *Ibid.*, 32.
6. Joseph Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans., John Saward (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius 2000), 7-8
7. Ratzinger, *Theological Highlights*, 32-37.
8. Pierro Marini, A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal. (Minnesota: Liturgical Press 2007), 139-143. For other accounts of the activities of the *Consilium*, see Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy (1948-1975)*, (Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1990), Nicola Giampietro, *The Development of the Liturgical Reform as seen by Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli from 1948-1970*, (Colorado: Fort Collins, 2009) and Laszlo Dobszay, *The Bugnini Liturgy and the Reform of the Reform*, (Hungary: Church Music Association of America, 2003)
9. Joseph Ratzinger, *Milestones: Memoirs 1927-1977*, trans., Erasmo Levia-Merikakis (San Francisco, CA: Ignatius 1998), 146.
10. *Ibid.*, 146.
11. Joseph Ratzinger, *God and the World : Believing and Living in Our Time. A Conversation with Peter Seewald*, trans., Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002), 417.
12. Nicola Bux, *Benedict XVI's Reform: The Liturgy between Innovation and Tradition* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012), 104.
13. For Peter Jeffery, to claim that the old rite was never abrogated “looks like a case of historical revisionism” See Peter Jeffery, Widening Our Hearts: The Latin Mass is Back.” *Commonweal* 134, (2007): 10. Available online at <https://www.commonwealmagazine.org/widening-our-hearts>. (accessed on January 30, 2014). See also Nathan D. Mitchell, “The Amen Corner: *Summorum Pontificum*”, *Worship* 81 (2007): 556-558. John Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Minnesota: Liturgical Press Collegeville, 2008), 131.
14. Joseph Ratzinger, *Milestones*, 147-148
15. See John Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 89
16. Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 8.
17. Joseph Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith: Approaches to a Theology of the Liturgy*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco CA: Ignatius, 1986), 70
18. John Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 67
19. *Ibid.*, 68.
20. Joseph Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 62
21. Pierre-Marie Gy, "Is Cardinal Ratzinger's 'l' Esprit de la liturgie Faithful to the Council?," *Doctrine and Life* 52, no. (2002): 426-429. See Sacred Congregation of Rites, *Inter Oecumenici*. Published on March 7, 1965. Available at www.ewtn.com/CURIA/CDWINOEC.HTM. Accessed on October 31, 2014.
22. Joseph Ratzinger, "The Spirit of the Liturgy or Fidelity to the Council: A Reply to Pierre-Marie Gy, OP," *Doctrine and Life* 52, no. (2002): 494.

- ^{23.} According to Peter Jeffery, "The most familiar visual symbol of liturgical renewal the altar facing the people is not mandatory in the new missal, and was not forbidden in the old. Both the 1570 and 1962 rubrics expressly permit the early medieval practice of celebrating *versus populum*." See Peter Jeffery, "Widening our Hearts..." See also Uwe Michael Lang, *Turning Towards the Lord: Orientation in Liturgical Prayer*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), John Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 108-113
- ^{24.} Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 80.
- ^{25.} *Ibid.*, 8.
- ^{26.} See Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy or Fidelity to the Council*, 497-498. Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, 83-84.
- ^{27.} See Benedict XVI, "Summorum Pontificum" http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/motu_proprio/documents/hf_ben-xvi_motu-proprio_20070707_summorum-pontificum_en.html (accessed September 17 2013).
- ^{28.} Benedict XVI, "Letter to Bishops Accompanying the Publication of Summorum Pontificum" http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/letters/2007/documents/hf_ben-xvi_let_20070707_lettera-vescovi_en.html (accessed September 17 2013).
- ^{29.} Bux, *Benedict XVI's Reform*, 57
- ^{30.} Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy*, 132.
- ^{31.} "The new Mass, to many of its supporters, offers a model of the church as a united assembly, priests and laity gathered as one around a central altar, confessing our sins, hearing the Scriptures, praying for the needs of the world, greeting each other in peace, receiving the sacrament of the Lord's presence, and carrying that graced presence out into the world as we disperse. The congregation participates by listening and responding to the prayers and readings. Many of those who yearn for such a "church as community" ideal also hope for greater lay participation in the life of the church: more consultative and collaborative forms of leadership, more responsiveness to the new problems of today's world. From the perspective of a "community" ecclesiology, with clergy and laity united in hearing the Word of God (and keeping it!)" Peter Jeffery, "Widening our Hearts..."
- ^{32.} "...the Tridentine Mass seems to offer a poor substitute: The altar is three steps up from the rest of the church's floor, separated from the congregation by a railing, approachable only by the ordained, who turn their backs to the assembled people and mumble an ancient tongue. The congregation's deepest involvement in the proceedings takes the form of merely looking at the host when it is elevated after the consecration. To some, the whole thing looks like an enactment of monarchical right-wing political values masquerading as the Christian gospel." *Ibid.*
- ^{33.} "the Mass celebrated before Vatican II focused sharply on the central moment of transubstantiation; all that comes before and after is preparation or aftermath. This liturgy depicts a more contemplative model: a church on its knees before the awe-filled mystery the Son of God come among us in the broken flesh and spilled blood of an innocent

human being who was killed yet lives eternally with the divine life of God he wills to share with us. In the presence of that incomprehensibility, bells tremble, incense smokes, candles burn, hearts quake, choirs echo the heavenly host in the same words that inspired our ancestors in the faith for centuries, suggesting the unchanging quality of eternity.”

- ³⁴. “For those who desire this kind of church a secret place where Almighty God dwells hidden in our world, a foretaste of heaven amid the trials and disappointments of earthly mortality the new Mass seems a tawdry affair indeed: an undisciplined burst of feel-good spirituality that evades the real difficulties and sacrifices of a committed Christian life; a cheap dose of “relevance,” designed to make the Mass seem entertaining so that people of little faith will not flee out of boredom; even, to some, a deliberate effort to confuse the faithful by disguising left-wing egalitarian political and social agendas as Christian values. Many people who favor the more “contemplative” ecclesiology long for clearer structures of authority, more emphasis on doctrinal accuracy, greater trust that contemporary issues can be addressed with the wisdom of tradition.” Ibid.
- ³⁵. “If the 1970 Mass promotes an outward-looking spirituality that cares for the suffering as Mother Teresa did, the 1962 Mass asks us to embrace the suffering human condition with a more inward spirituality like Padre Pio's. The day may come when all this can somehow be encompassed in a single order of Mass, but that day is not yet here, and I think we should expect more liturgical transitions in the years to come. The task now is somehow to recover what was left behind without losing what has been gained, like the householder who brings forth both new and old (Matthew 13:52).” Ibid
- ³⁶. Perhaps it is in this respect that one could understand Ratzinger's statement some years back: “The difference between the liturgy according to the new books, how it is actually practised and celebrated in different places, is often greater than the difference between an old Mass and a new Mass, when both these are celebrated according to the prescribed liturgical books.” Joseph Ratzinger, “Ten Years of Motu Proprio, 'Ecclesia Dei'” (October 24, 1998). Available at <http://web.archive.org/web/20020702085721/http://www.latin-mass.org/ratzinger.html>
- ³⁷. Joseph Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith*, 72.
- ³⁸. Mariusz Biliniewicz, *The Liturgical Vision of Pope Benedict XVI: A Theological Inquiry*. (Switzerland: Peterlang, 2013), 289-290