

The Worship of God in the Beauty of Holiness
A Presentation of *Divine Worship*

Most Rev. Steven J. Lopes, STD

The Liturgical Institute, Mundeline
June 21, 2017

I am delighted for the invitation to offer this Hillenbrand lecture here at the Liturgical Institute at the University of Saint Mary of the Lake. My purpose today is quite consonant with the aims of this Institute: to offer a theological reflection on the worship of God in the beauty of holiness. My specific contribution to this noble enterprise will be struttred as a presentation of *Divine Worship*, the liturgical rites for the Holy Eucharist and other Sacraments for the use of the Personal Ordinariates established under the 2009 Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus*. As I am sure you all are aware, the Ordinariates spring from the ecumenical vision of Pope Benedict XVI as a concrete way for inviting formerly Anglican parishes and communities into full communion with the Catholic Church. The Apostolic Constitution itself revolves around a very clear and important ecumenical principle: the unity of faith allows for a vibrant diversity in the expression of that same faith. Three Ordinariates have thus-far been established in England, in North America, and in Australia and, over the course of the last six years, we have worked to develop our own ecclesial life and structures even as we continue to invite new persons and communities to join us in the adventure of Catholic communion.

Pope Francis has taken the principle of the unity of faith allowing for a diversity of expression and given it even more concrete parameters. It is Pope Francis who promulgated *Divine Worship: The Missal* for the celebration of Holy Mass for the Ordinatee communities. During the same week in 2015 in which the *Divine Worship* Missal was first authorized for use, the Holy Father appointed me Bishop of the Ordinatee of the Chair of Saint Peter in the United States and Canada, thereby demonstrating that the Ordinariates are truly Particular Churches, equivalent to Dioceses, although organized on the canonical principle of personality rather than territory. It is my privilege to present the Missal to you today and, in so doing, highlight the particular liturgical patrimony of the Ordinariates, a beautiful example of the realization of the ecumenical vision of Pope Saint John Paul II, Pope Benedict, and Pope Francis.

Let me begin by articulating something of a thesis statement. I would like to state at the outset that our Ordinatee liturgy is often misunderstood and therefore not described correctly. Because our liturgy shares many traditional elements and gestures in common with the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite, it is thought to be a type of “subset” of that form: “the Extraordinary Form in English” as it is sometimes called. But this is neither accurate nor, honestly, helpful. For one thing, the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, a principal source for the Ordinatee Missal, is older than the Missal of Saint Pius V, and has its own origins in the Sarum Missal, a variant of the Roman Rite going back to the eleventh century. My first goal today is for you to understand *Divine Worship* on its own terms, to see the historical and ritual context out of which it develops, and in that light to recognize how it might contribute to the ongoing renewal and development of the Roman Rite.

And so my thesis: *Divine Worship* is more than a collection of liturgical texts and ritual gestures. It is the organic expression of the Church's own *lex orandi* as it was taken up and developed in an Anglican context over the course of nearly five-hundred years of ecclesial separation, and is now reintegrated into Catholic worship as the authoritative expression of a noble patrimony to be shared with the whole Church. As such, it is to be understood as a distinct form of the Roman Rite. Further, while *Divine Worship* preserves some external elements more often associated with the Extraordinary Form, its theological and rubrical context is clearly the Ordinary Form of the Roman Rite. That I situate *Divine Worship* within the context of the Ordinary Form becomes a fact more discernable when one considers the dual hermeneutic of continuity and reform, which informs the project. All of this I will attempt to unpack in the course of this presentation.

A Preliminary Consideration: What is Patrimony?

Divine Worship — expressed in the Missal, in a ritual book called Occasional Services, and in the Divine Office — is the concrete realization in Catholic worship of the liturgical and spiritual patrimony of Anglicanism. In making provision for the incorporation of this patrimony into Catholic life, the Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus* specifies that “the Ordinariate has the faculty to celebrate the Holy Eucharist and the other Sacraments, the Liturgy of the Hours and other liturgical celebrations according to the liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition, which have been approved by the Holy See, so as to maintain the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church, as a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared.”¹

Understanding what patrimony is and how it “works” is a necessary first step before we are able to articulate something more about the liturgical expression of that patrimony. From the outset, the Constitution itself articulates the necessity of the approval by the Holy See for any liturgical provision. This fact itself indicates that the Church is the ultimate arbiter of what is or is not to be considered patrimony. Let's call this the **first key** to unlocking the concept of patrimony. It is not what you or I, or this scholar or that community says it is, but involves discernment by the Church, which is then confirmed by the exercise of ecclesiastical authority.

In this age in which liturgical matters are more likely to be debated on blogs rather than in scholarly journals, the judgment of legitimate ecclesiastical authority becomes increasingly important. Indeed, the very affirmation that there is such a thing as an Anglican liturgical and spiritual patrimony, which enriches the whole Church as “a treasure to be shared” enters the Catholic lexicon in 1970. On October 25 of that year, Pope Paul VI canonized forty English and Welsh martyrs. In his homily, the Holy Father praised “the legitimate prestige and worthy patrimony of piety and usage proper to the Anglican” Communion, words that were viewed both as a crucial validation of the special relationship between Catholics and Anglicans and as a

¹ Pope Benedict XVI, Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus*, Art. III.

confirmation of the existence of an Anglican patrimony worthy of preservation.² By his authority, Pope Paul articulated a principle: for whatever other ecclesial deficits resulting from the lack of full communion between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion, the Catholic Church acknowledges the work of the Holy Spirit in this body of separated brothers and sisters so as to be able to say that the manner in which the faith was nourished, proclaimed, and celebrated in the Anglican Communion these past 500 years adds to the vitality of the Church and enriches the body Catholic.

In *Anglicanorum coetibus*, we see Pope Paul's insight framed in Pope Benedict's concern "to maintain the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church" not only "as a precious gift nourishing the faith of the members of the Ordinariate," but also importantly "as a treasure to be shared." Concretely, then, the interdicasterial Commission charged with preparing the *Divine Worship* was not given the task of composing a new liturgical text or devising new liturgical forms, but rather of identifying the patrimony from "the liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition."

This mention of Anglican liturgical books naturally invites the question: which books? Liturgy is one of the most tangible forms of patrimony, one expressed in a variety of texts, rituals, devotions, and customs over the course of the near 500-year history of Anglicanism. And that history has not always been serene in its unfolding! To summarize briefly:

- Though Henry VIII will always be known for the break with Rome, there was actually little doctrinal and liturgical alteration in the English Church during his reign. The rest of the Tudor period is marked by the introduction of more clearly Protestant theology and liturgy under Edward VI (1547-1553), a brief Catholic restoration under Queen Mary (1553-1558), and the settlement of the long reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603), during which time Calvinist accents and emphases came to the fore, even as these coexisted uneasily with Catholic habits of worship that had also been retained.³
- The pendulum swings widely during the period of the Stuart kings (1603-1688), beginning with both James I and Charles I gesturing toward the possibility of reunion with the Holy See, and ending with an 11-year Puritan Protectorate after the civil war in which the Church of England and its liturgy were outlawed.⁴ Not only does the political situation have enormous ramifications for Anglican worship, but this is also the period of the "Caroline Divines" who sought to provide an authoritative foundation for the teaching of the Church of England based on patristic sources for Catholic traditions and institutions. They ensured, for example, that the *Book of Common Prayer* retained elements such as an ordered liturgy, the liturgical calendar, the indissolubility of marriage, the sacramental character of priestly absolution and Confession, and the retention of a three-fold sacrament of Orders.

² Pope Paul VI, Homily at the Canonization of Forty Martyrs of England and Wales, St. Peter's Square, October 25, 1970. The homily was spoken largely in Italian; the words quoted here were pronounced at the conclusion of the homily in English as part of Pope Paul's prayer for the unity of Christians. A full text is available at: https://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/it/homilies/1970/documents/hf_p-vi_hom_19701025.html

³ For a fuller treatment of the Tudor Reformation, see S. Neill, *Anglicanism* (London: Pelican, 1958, 1977), 34-133.

⁴ Cf. Neill, *Anglicanism*, 133-168.

- From 1688-1833, different “streams” or parties form within the Church of England — “latitudinarian” broad church, an evangelical low church, and a mildly Catholic high church — each bringing different emphases and approaches to the celebration of the liturgy, at times so distinct one from the other that it would be difficult to see them as expressions of the same ecclesial communion.⁵
- The mid 19th century sees the revival of Catholic faith in Anglicanism, notably with the conversion of Blessed John Henry Newman and others, the Oxford Movement, and the parallel development of Victorian ritualism.⁶ In the early 20th century, another small group emerged who styled themselves as Anglo-Papalists who understood themselves as working for the corporate unification of the Church of England with the Holy See.⁷ These would adopt many of the ritual gestures, observances, and practices of the Roman Rite (prior to the reforms of the Second Vatican Council, of course). The Anglican or English Missal tradition has its beginning here.

In all of this, the *Book of Common Prayer* is the point of departure for any understanding of Anglican worship. The Prayer Book itself has experienced several revisions since its first appearance in 1549, some of these quite notable. Given the historical arc and development of Anglican liturgical worship, both in its more Protestantizing reforms and its more conservative tendencies to retain Catholic elements, how does ecclesiastical authority — in this case the Holy See — identify what truly constitutes patrimony? Put another way, when faced with the great variety of forms and texts in Anglican worship, how is the Church to discern what might be incorporated into Catholic worship?

We need, it seems, more keys to unlock the concept of patrimony: two more, I would propose. A **second key** has been articulated by Archbishop J. Augustine DiNoia, OP, who was intimately involved both in the process that led to *Anglicanorum coetibus* and in his leadership of the commission which produced *Divine Worship* for the Ordinariates. Let us consider the Archbishop’s definition of patrimony:

“The liturgical books comprised by *Divine Worship* arise from an exercise of Peter’s authority over the churches that recognizes the authentic faith of the Church expressed in Anglican forms of worship and confirms that expression as a treasure or patrimony for the whole Church. In other words, the Church recognizes the faith that is *already hers* expressed in a new idiom or felicitous manner. The elements of sanctification and truth that are present in the patrimony are recognized as properly belonging to the Church of Christ and thus as instruments of grace that move the communities where they are

⁵ A robust treatment of the development of these three movements or parties within Anglicanism is given by Aiden Nichols in his book *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

⁶ Cf. Neill, *Anglicanism*, 254-261.

⁷ Few Anglicans actually espoused the claim to papal authority. Much more prevalent was the so-called “branch theory” which proposes that Rome and England were parts or branches of the one Catholic Church. See, for example, A. Nichols, “Anglican Unitism: A Personal View,” *The Messenger of the Catholic League* 292 (2010) 13-20. This theory even enters official Anglican parlance, as three Lambeth Conference resolutions (in 1867, 1920, and 1930) refer to the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church.

employed towards the visible unity of the Church of Christ subsisting in the Catholic Church.”⁸

If the first key is the external authority of the Holy See which chooses and confirms liturgical texts, the second key is the internal authority of Catholic truth to which these liturgical forms give voice; elements of sanctification and truth which ultimately impel towards the fullness of Catholic communion.

There was — and I suppose there continues to be — great confusion caused by the tremendous variety of liturgical forms in the Anglican world, each of which advances a competing claim to patrimony and to authority as “Anglican use.” Even following the publication of *Anglicanorum coetibus*, no less than six different liturgical books were being used for the celebration of the Eucharist by Ordinariate communities at the time the liturgical Commission began its work. The task of the Holy See’s Commission was to extract out of this disorientating variety a *lex orandi*, the systematic presentation of Christian faith, nourished and preserved in the classical Prayer Books and Anglican Missals, in order to provide the sure doctrinal foundation that makes a diversity of liturgical expression possible. The search for the authentic faith of the Church within Anglican worship allows us to situate *Divine Worship* firmly within the shape and context of the Roman Rite so that it might be approached in a manner that respects its own integrity and authority. But there I am getting ahead of myself!

A **third key** is pastoral in nature as evidenced by the Holy See’s concern for those parishes and communities entering into the Ordinariate. What was their formative liturgical experience? How has the manner of their worship and prayer sustained and nurtured their faith, prompting them towards Catholic unity? If there are rituals, liturgical postures, gestures, and vesture common to all of the Ordinariate communities, then the pastoral good of leading these communities into full communion should respect that insight, and the liturgical provision make allowance for continuity in those practices which, consonant with the Catholic faith and sacramental understanding, impel towards Catholic unity (and here I fully intend the allusion to *Lumen gentium* number 8: *Elementa...ad unitatem catholicam impellunt*). Entrance into full communion involves an act of the will, but it is not merely an intellectual exercise.

An example may help: in the United States and Canada, all but a very small handful of our communities celebrated Mass *ad orientem* as Anglicans and desire to continue doing so as Catholics. Well, this is certainly consistent with the faith of the Church! Further, forcing these communities to adopt an entirely foreign orientation in prayer during that vulnerable time of coming into full communion is, to say the least, pastorally unnecessary and disadvantageous. And so Mass according to *Divine Worship* is normally celebrated *ad orientem*, with allowance made in the proper rubrics for *versus populum* celebration if the architecture or a parish’s particular experience suggests that it is more appropriate.

To conclude this preliminary reflection on patrimony, let me offer that these three keys to “patrimony” as enunciated here are not meant as an exclusive list. To these, one might rightly

⁸ J. Augustine DiNoia, “*Divine Worship* and the Liturgical Vitality of the Church” in *Antiphon* 19 (2015), 113. Cf., also, Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen gentium* (21 November 1964) 8.

add an evangelistic key, or the interiorization of the mission to spread the Gospel. Nevertheless, the dual dynamic of authority and right concern for the pastoral good of people are absolutely foundational for the incorporation of this form of worship in the Catholic Church. In an Ecclesial Communion that eschewed both a Magisterium and the exercise of papal authority, one can argue that it was the *Book of Common Prayer* itself that ensured a *lex orandi*, the systematic presentation through liturgical expression of the Christian faith. With the establishment of the Ordinariates, it is an exercise of Peter's authority over the Churches which *recognizes* the authentic faith of the Church expressed in Anglican forms of worship, which *confirms* that expression as a treasure or patrimony for the whole Church, and which *orders* that expression in such a way as to favor the forms and rituals that have given rise to the desire for *communio*. In the movement into full communion, this liturgical treasure is further enriched by access to the Magisterium, which authentically interprets the Word of God, preserves Christian teaching from error, and assists the faithful and their pastors in the delicate task of expressing timeless truths in a way which is fresh, beautiful, and attractive. This is not to impose a Roman perspective on this liturgical prayer, but to draw out of these rich sources an authentic expression of the faith so that they might continue to provide the *lex orandi* to the nourishment of this and future generations.

Divine Worship: The Ordinariate Form of the Roman Rite

We can now move beyond the background of patrimony to a more specific consideration of *Divine Worship*. I have already proposed that it is to be understood as a distinct form of the Roman Rite — an Ordinariate Form, if you will. Tracing its relationship to the other two Forms of the Roman Rite is not at first glance obvious. Although *Divine Worship* preserves some ritual elements and traditional gestures associated with the Extraordinary Form, its theological and rubrical context is the Ordinary Form of the Roman Rite. This is demonstrated by the fact that the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* is printed in its entirety at the beginning of the *Divine Worship* Missal. Further, the particular Rubrical Directory of *Divine Worship: The Missal* states: “The liturgical norms and principles of the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* are normative for this expression of the Roman Rite, except where otherwise stipulated in this Directory and in the particular rubrics of *Divine Worship*. This present Directory is intended to provide instructions for those areas in which *Divine Worship* diverges from the *Roman Missal*.”⁹

On one hand, this is an understandable canonical framework, since the *General Instruction* is one of the highest expressions of law in the Church, “ranked” alongside the *Code of Canon Law*. The particular rubrics that govern *Divine Worship* are a derogation from that universal disposition (and hence it is called a Rubrical Directory). This also implies an understanding of the *General Instruction* as something more than a “road map” of rubrics, but rather unfolding the shape and logic of Catholic worship. So even if there is divergence in some of the rubrical practices, there is a much more important theological unity of the Roman Rite that informs this Missal.

To understand the right relationship between *Divine Worship*, the Extraordinary Form, and the Ordinary Form, it will be helpful to consider some of the hermeneutics that guided the development of this Missal. The hermeneutics of “continuity” and “reform” are familiar enough

⁹ *Divine Worship: The Missal*, Rubrical Directory, no. 7.

terms and I will use them here, though only to illustrate that the *pastoral hermeneutic* is the overarching structure determining when continuity is best preserved and when reform is best applied. When we hear “hermeneutic of reform,” most of us will immediately think of the reforms of the sacred liturgy that followed the Second Vatican Council, although these certainly had their antecedents in the reforms of previous Popes. In the case of *Divine Worship*, there is what I would call a dual hermeneutic of reform, one arising out of the reform of the Roman Rite undertaken in Anglicanism — especially by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in the development of the first Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 — and only then the reforms of the Roman Rite following the Second Vatican Council. Both of these have important implications for the structure and content of *Divine Worship*.

Let me first give two examples of the adaptation of the Roman Rite in Anglicanism which were guided by the theological emphases of the English Reformation:

- 1) *Emphasis on the proclamation and preaching of the Word of God.* This finds expression in certain Collects composed by Cranmer himself that petition for the efficacy of God’s Word, as well as in ritual elements of the Mass which favor the biblical formation of the assembly. According to *Divine Worship*, the Gospel is ordinarily proclaimed in the midst of the congregation (i.e. in the nave), which is itself evocative of the ecclesial context for the liturgical proclamation of Scripture. The Penitential Rite is transposed from its familiar Roman position as an introductory rite to the conclusion of the Liturgy of the Word just prior to the Offertory. It is the proclamation of the Word of God, in the Scriptural lessons, in preaching, and in the response of faith that is the Creed and Prayers of the People, that convicts us of our sins and brings us to repentance and contrition prior to offering our gift on the Altar. The penitential act itself is one of Cranmer’s longer compositions said by priest and people together in an attitude of penance (the people kneeling).
- 2) *Emphasis on liturgy as the prayer of the Church, head and body.* Cranmer apparently had a healthy disdain for the so-called “secret” prayers of the Mass said silently by the priest alone, perhaps particularly the practice of the “whispered Canon.” He eliminated secret prayers completely from the Prayer Book, replacing them with original compositions said by priest and people together. These too are preserved in the *Divine Worship* Missal and, at least from the experience of the worshipping faithful, are three of the most notable transitions in the Mass. We have already mentioned the Penitential Act. After the *Agnus Dei*, the priest’s private prayers of preparation for receiving Holy Communion are replaced by a very public, corporate act of preparation in the Prayer of Humble Access. This prayer, said by all who will receive the Sacrament, has long been noted for the richness of its Eucharistic theology as well as the beauty of its rhetoric. Finally, at the conclusion of the Communion Rite, the Missal preserves the General Thanksgiving, again said by priest and people together as a corporate act of Thanksgiving for the gifts received. This prayer is concluded by the priest singing or saying the proper Postcommunion prayer for the given Mass.

If we were to set *Divine Worship* within the overall context of the development of the Roman Rite, these two “Cranmerian” emphases, already expressed in the first Anglican Prayer

Books, are the reason for the clearest ritual differences between *Divine Worship* and the Roman Missal. To these — again, along the lines of the reform/development of the Roman Rite — we must add the insights of the liturgical reform following Vatican II. These contemporary emphases can be seen in the *Divine Worship* Missal in terms of the structure and rubrics of the Sacred Triduum, the inclusion of proper Masses for 17-24 December, the Calendar of Saints, votive Masses, and the inclusion of several Masses (16 in all) for various pastoral and spiritual necessities.

Thus far, I have mentioned several ways in which reforms of the Roman Rite, both historical and contemporary, have influenced the structure of the Missal. What about examples of continuity with the more ancient form of the Roman Rite? That is certainly present in the Missal too, although the line between the celebration of Mass prior to the English Reformation and its expression in the *Divine Worship* Missal is neither straight nor without interruption. This is where some of the history of Anglicanism I described earlier becomes important. It is a history of tension between more Catholic sensibilities on one side, and more Protestant leanings on the other. It is a tension between the Caroline Divines and the Puritan Protectorate, between the Oxford Movement and broad-church liberalism.

The 1662 Book of Common Prayer, which, note, is still the authoritative version, still contains vestiges of Catholic ritual and practice that were present in the 1549 Prayer Book, though to a lesser extent in the 1552 Book of Common Prayer. There is a clear rupture between what has become a clearly Protestant Prayer Book and its Catholic roots. It is not until the early Twentieth Century that the situation changes in substantive ways. The emergence of the Anglo-Papalists with their explicit desire for reunion with the Holy See prompts a significant liturgical renewal in at least that small portion of Anglicanism. Through the development of the English Missal and the Anglican Missal, the form of worship takes on the outward appearance of what we would now call the Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite, though with the Collects, prefaces, and some other elements of the *Book of Common Prayer* folded in. To a great extent, this liturgical expression achieves its desired effect: Anglo-Catholics who worship according to the Missal *do* understand themselves as the Catholic party within Anglicanism, and it is many of these same clergy and faithful who sought full communion with the Holy See both before and after the publication of *Anglicanorum coetibus*.

So, with this in mind, let us return to the recent work of the Commission tasked with developing the liturgy for the Ordinariates. One of that body's principal objectives was "to propose an Order of Mass at once distinctively and traditionally Anglican in character, content, and structure, while also being clearly and recognizably an expression of the Roman Rite, in both its ordinary and extraordinary forms."¹⁰ Many of the parishes and communities coming into the Catholic Church (notably in North America and Australia) were indeed formed in the Anglican Missal tradition, and so things such as prayers at the foot of the Altar, the traditional form of the Offertory, communion at the rail, the Last Gospel, were all familiar, regular aspects of their worship. Other parishes and communities (notably in England) did not share this experience, since their worship over the course of the last 40 years as Anglicans mirrored the modern Roman

¹⁰ For a detailed presentation of the objectives and work of the Commission, see my article "A Missal for the Ordinariates: The Work of the Anglicanae Traditiones Interdicasterial Commission in *Antiphon* 19 (2015) 116-131.

Rite, and many of these Anglican communities would have even directly used the Roman *Sacramentary*.

The Commission was therefore faced with a dilemma. On the one hand, though there was tremendous agreement on the essential *content* of the Prayer Book, which should be preserved in the Catholic Church (collects, prefaces, hieratic English, etc.), there was simply not the liturgical uniformity *in practice* throughout the three Ordinariates that would allow one agreed-upon form or structure. It seemed counterintuitive, even absurd, to apply a strict hermeneutic of reform, as conforming their liturgy to the reforms of Vatican II would, in effect, disallow the very traditional liturgical practices and gestures which sustained the Catholic faith of so many people and even prompted the desire for unity at the heart of *Anglicanorum coetibus*. At the same time, it seemed counterintuitive, even absurd, to force more traditional rituals and gestures on communities which simply had no experience of them at all.

The Commission therefore decided for what at the time we called a “flexible” approach. The Rubrical Directory of the Missal describes it this way: “The rubrics of the *Divine Worship* Order of Mass aim to preserve traditional customs of Anglican Eucharistic worship with respect to orientation, postures, gestures, and manual acts, while also permitting the celebration of Mass in a manner similar to that of the *Roman Missal, Third Typical Edition*. This rubrical flexibility provides for the variety of liturgical traditions and experiences among the parishes and communities of the Personal Ordinariates.”¹¹ The aim, therefore, is pastoral accommodation. The Missal is structured in such a way so as to accommodate those communities who, professing the same Catholic faith, come from the Anglican Missal tradition, the Prayer Book tradition, and even the tradition of using the Roman *Sacramentary*.

Structurally, this means that many traditional elements are given as options in *Divine Worship*, particularly through a series of appendices. Appendix one supplies the prayers of preparation (Psalm 43, *Confittor*, vesicles), which may be said in the sacristy or at the foot of the Altar. Appendix two has the forms of the *Asperges* and *Vidi aquam*. Appendix six is the Last Gospel, which may be used at the conclusion of Mass at the discretion of the priest and is even recommended in Christmastide. Two forms of the Offertory are given, the first drawn out of the Anglican Missal tradition while the second form reflects the *Roman Missal* as revised following the Second Vatican Council.

The particular rubrics of the *Ordo Missae* also reflect this pastoral accommodation of varying experiences. The rubrics both in the introductory rites and during the concluding rites make reference to the priest’s location and actions at the Altar, but they are introduced by this general note: “Where appropriate, [these rites] may take place at the sedilia, omitting in that case the rubrics hereafter referring to the Altar.”¹² Other traditional gestures are rubricated with the permissive “may” rather than the prescriptive “is.” In this way, allowance is made for particular custom, not in order that there be novelty or variety from week to week, but out of respect of the custom which has arisen in the context of a particular parish or community of the Ordinate.

¹¹ *Divine Worship: The Missal*, Rubrical Directory, no. 10.

¹² Cf. *Divine Worship: The Missal*, pgs. 560, 656.

Let me offer an example or two. I have already mentioned that, in the parishes of the North American Ordinariate, all but three of our parishes celebrate Mass *ad orientem* — and this was really never a question but a simple reflection of the liturgical practice of these communities even prior to entering full communion with the Catholic Church. Consequently, though it is possible according to *Divine Worship* to preside from the sedilia as is common in the Ordinary Form, the vast majority of our priests preside from the Altar and go to the sedilia only for the readings. Of our forty-seven parishes, perhaps fifteen have the custom of the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar and the Last Gospel every Sunday. A dozen more would take a seasonal approach, using the Last Gospel during Christmastime, for example. Those who come from strongly Anglo-Catholic parishes that use the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar would also use Offertory Form One almost exclusively, or at least Form One on Sundays, Form Two during weekday Masses.

Again, the point is that *Divine Worship*, as a form of the Roman Rite, must be approached and considered in its own integrity. It is certainly possible to see the influences of the traditional Roman liturgy, as well as many insights of the reforms of Vatican II. Understanding the particular insights of Archbishop Cranmer and the English Reformation is important in order to visualize the overall structure of the Order of Mass. The generous accommodation of custom is intentional, and reflects a pastoral hermeneutic faithful to Pope Benedict XVI's principle of diversity in unity that is at the very heart of *Anglicanorum coetibus*.

Distinctive Elements of *Divine Worship*

Allow me to present a brief overview of some of the elements of the Missal. These not only give a sense of the structure and content of the celebration of Mass in the Ordinariate, but I hope will illustrate some of the principles we have been speaking about today.

The Liturgical Year

Generally speaking, the flow of the Proper of Time in the *Divine Worship* Missal is in harmony with the Roman Rite. The Calendar of Saints, for example, is identical to the General Roman Calendar, though it incorporates the national calendars of England, Wales, the United States, Canada and Australia, as well as celebrations of Saints special to the Ordinariate. One distinction between *Divine Worship* and the Typical Edition of the Roman Missal is that the category of “Ordinary Time” does not have any resonance in our communities. Following Christmas, *Divine Worship* observes Time after Epiphany or Epiphanytide, which lasts until pre-Lent (the three so-called “Gesima” Sundays). Whereas the Extraordinary Form counts Sundays after Pentecost, *Divine Worship* follows the traditional Anglican practice of numbering Sundays after Trinity Sunday. Trinitytide concludes with the celebration of Christ the King on the Sunday prior to the first Sunday of Advent.

Eucharistic Prayer

The Roman Canon is the privileged Eucharistic Prayer of the Missal. Its use is obligatory on all Sundays and Solemnities. An Alternative Eucharistic Prayer, which corresponds to the

Second Prayer of the Roman Missal, is also given for pastoral reasons. It may be used on weekdays or in Masses with children. Its use on Sunday is explicitly prohibited.

Advent, Ember Days, and Rogation Days

The typical edition of the *Roman Missal* focuses on Christ's second coming in glory and, during the days of 17-24, provides a more intense preparation of Christmas. The inclusion of these additional Masses has meant, at least in practice, the loss of the Ember Days.¹³ The Commission was faced with a two-fold desire: (1) to maintain the Ember Days and their proper seasonal context as expressive of a venerable element of Anglican worship; (2) to appreciate and incorporate the richness of the proper Masses for December 17-24 in harmony with the Ordinary Form of the Roman Rite. The problem is that the two overlap, since the Advent Ember Days have been celebrated beginning on the Wednesday "following St. Lucy's Day" since the time of Pope St. Gregory VII. The Advent context of the December Ember Days was judged to be the factor of importance, not the location of the celebration in the third week of Advent. In the Missal, the Ember Days have been located in the first week of Advent, and the proper Masses for December 17-24 have likewise been incorporated into the Missal. The other Ember Days are maintained in their traditional locations in Lent, in conjunction with Pentecost, and in September.

In light of what has just been said about the Ember Days, a word about Rogation Days seems in order. These days had a particular resonance in medieval English piety, litanies and processions forming a principal expression of English spiritual life, notably the pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady at Walsingham. These expressions endured in Anglicanism, particularly in those communities that did not disdain their Catholic roots. In the *Divine Worship* Missal, the Rogation Days are in their traditional Roman location preceding Ascension.

The Paschal Triduum

By way of introducing the Paschal Triduum, it may be worth noting again that no less than six different liturgical books were being used by Ordinariate communities at the time the Commission began its work. When looking at Holy Week in particular, the variety was rather disorienting. I don't mind saying that this is a point where the Holy See "steered" the work of the Commission in setting the parameters for the celebration of the Paschal Triduum within the Ordinariates. This is understandable if you approach liturgy not as the expression of personal preference or insights, but as a fundamentally ecclesial act.

The Missal attempts to achieve balance: balance between essential unity and legitimate diversity, between the universal and the particular, between Roman patrimony and Anglican patrimony. This desire for balance is reflected in Rome's decisions regarding the rites for the Paschal Triduum. On the one hand, it was decided that Catholic unity would be best expressed if the overall shape and structure of the Triduum is simply that of the normative Roman Rite. Ordinariate parishes and communities celebrate the central liturgy of the Passion, Death, and Resurrection of the Lord *in communion* with the universal Church. On the other hand, diversity and patrimony is expressed in these rites in that the texts themselves are drawn

¹³ Though, as the *General Instruction on the Roman Missal* makes clear in nos. 394 and 397, there was never an intention to disregard the tradition of Ember Days entirely.

from the Anglican sources and therefore enrich the celebration. The result is an integral whole and not simply a shuffling together of pieces from various sources. Most of the rubrics which guide the liturgies of Holy Thursday, Good Friday, and in the Easter Vigil will be nearly identical to those of the *Roman Missal*, third typical edition. The sequence of scriptural readings, notably those of the Easter Vigil, have been harmonized with the Lectionary. Some flexibility has been worked into the rubrics to take account for local traditions (musical options and vestment color, for example). Great care was taken that there be an integrity and internal coherence to the shape of the celebration of the Paschal Triduum so that it exemplifies essential ecclesial unity, while allowing some legitimate diversity, in the fullness of Catholic communion.

Minor Propers

For each celebration of Mass, the *Divine Worship* Missal provides full texts of the minor propers (Introit, Gradual, Alleluia/Tract, Offertory and Communion). As noted in the *Praenotanda*, these texts are provided in service to the musical patrimony of the Anglican tradition and so it is specified: “The given texts of the chants may be substituted by the chants of the *Graduale Romanum* or by musical settings of the *Graduale* which rely on a different translation of the same texts. The Gradual and Alleluia may be substituted for the Responsorial Psalm and Alleluia of the Lectionary. In addition to, or in place of, the Introit, Offertory, and Communion, an appropriate hymn may also be sung. Likewise, the given text of a Sequence may be replaced by another translation of the text.”¹⁴

The presence of the minor propers in the *Divine Worship* Missal is motivated by three factors:

- 1) This is clearly part of the Anglican liturgical tradition as the chants are present in so many of the sources. The Coverdale translations of Psalm texts in the chants are common to the Anglican Missals and Anglican translations of the *Graduale Romanum*.
- 2) Much like the King James version of the Bible, the Coverdale translation of the Psalms has played a formative role in English language, culture, and religious imagination.
- 3) Again, authority is important. There are various hymnals, graduals, prayer books and ritual books out there that present the same basic texts but with all sorts of little variations. The Missal, as a liturgical book promulgated by the Holy See, establishes *with authority* the texts of the minor propers on the basis of which other musical settings and books can be developed.

Consistently and from various sources both Anglican and Catholic, historical and contemporary, one finds the assertion that the Anglican liturgical tradition has been distinguished by the prominence it gives to Scripture in the conduct of public worship and in the promotion of biblical piety. Scriptural words, and images are almost a default starting position, a fact that no doubt bears witness to the hallowed tradition of English monasticism, which informs so much of Anglican worship. The minor propers beautifully rendered in “Prayer Book English” allow for a greater inclusion of Scripture in worship. It is about reading the Bible liturgically, allowing the

¹⁴ *Divine Worship: The Missal*, Rubrical Directory, no. 13.

words and poetic cadences to linger, penetrate, and take root in the soul as a sustained, communal *lectio*.

Conclusion

By way of conclusion, let me mention to the famous and often-cited passage in the correspondence between Pope St. Gregory the Great and St. Augustine of Canterbury, which has taken on new resonance in the liturgical project of the Ordinariates:

Augustine's Second Question: Since we hold the same Faith, why do customs vary in different Churches? Why, for instance, does the method of saying Mass differ in the holy Roman Church and in the Churches of Gaul?

Pope Gregory answers: My brother, you are familiar with the usage of the Roman Church, in which you were brought up. But if you have found customs, whether in the Roman, Gallican, or any other Churches that may be more acceptable to God, I wish you to make a careful selection of them, and teach the Church of the English, which is still young in the Faith, whatever you can profitably learn from the various Churches... Therefore select from each of the Churches whatever things are devout, religious, and right [*quae pia, quae religiosa, quae recta*]; and when you have arranged them into a unified rite, let the minds of the English grow accustomed to it.¹⁵

From the first evangelization of England down to the present day and the publication of *Anglicanorum coetibus*, there is an overarching concern of the Church to place sacramental formulae and traditions of worship at the pastoral service of the People of God. Such liturgical “inculturation” is only good if, as Pope Gregory says, it nurtures faith and results in something devout, religious, and right. This is the context in which I would situate the *Divine Worship* Missal and ritual books. Again I quote Archbishop Augustine DiNoia: “*Divine Worship* is not a museum piece, but rather the Holy See’s prudent grafting of proven Anglican shoots on the rooted, living trunk of the Roman Rite to promote new and healthier growth.”¹⁶ That is ultimately the point. The beautiful expression of these prayers, the rich tapestry of the English language they preserve, even the emphasis on transcendence in worship is not really worth preserving *in itself*. Rather, the pastoral contribution to the vitality of Catholic life is the goal. This is expressed in the growth of Ordinariate communities, both through inviting other people to enter into full communion and by inviting other Catholics to reengage with their faith and their Church at a deeper level. It is also expressed in the ongoing, ever-deepening conversion, which is the hallmark of true discipleship. In other words, the value of *Divine Worship* is measured to the degree it positively contributes to making more Catholics and better Catholics.

And in this, I believe the Ordinariate liturgy is a great treasure. Thank you for the opportunity to present the Missal, both in this lecture and in the Holy Mass we have celebrated

¹⁵ Saint Bede the Venerable, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, trans. Leo Sherley-Price (London – New York, Penguin Books: 1990) I, 27.

¹⁶ DiNoia, “*Divine Worship* and the Liturgical Vitality of the Church,” 112.

together. I ask your prayers for the clergy and faithful of the Ordinariates, that they may grow in holiness and bear witness to the great adventure of Catholic communion.