

## THE CONSTITUTION ON THE LITURGY The Debate at the First Session

On June 6, 1960, Pope John XXIII established the preparatory Commission on the Liturgy, naming Gaetano Cardinal Cicognani its President and, a month later, Annibale Bugnini to be its Secretary. The Commission began its work in November 1960 and had completed its text by mid-January 1962. Cardinal Cicognani signed the text for submission on February 1st, 1962, and died four days later. As Bugnini wrote: "If Cardinal Cicognani had not signed the Constitution, humanly speaking it would have been a disaster. Everything would have been up for discussion again. But 'Who knows the ways of God?'"<sup>1</sup>

Cicognani was replaced as head of the Commission on the Liturgy by Cardinal Arcadio M. Larraona, the newly named Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Rites. The appointment of this "great canonist of conservative tendency,"<sup>2</sup> made on the same day on which *Veterum Sapientia* was published, was interpreted as an attempt to restrain the reformist tendencies of the Commission. Herman Schmidt briefly and discreetly describes some of the difficulties:

It was no small thing at the age of 75 to have to assume such a role, without prior preparation, circumstances hardly having allowed it. The situation was further complicated by the fact that the new president received a heritage to defend and to take to heart, but which was unknown, strange to him and with which he did not have the time to familiarize himself. The preparatory Commission on the Sacred Liturgy had already finished its work, and it never had any personal contact with him. The Draft on the Liturgy was already distributed and its content known. Thus tensions, some of them shabby, had to arise. As every other human work, the Draft on the Liturgy also knew its own purgative way.<sup>3</sup>

The Draft on the Liturgy was discussed at the CPC from March 26th to April 2nd, 1962.<sup>4</sup> The debate was vigorous, with clear progressive and conservative positions made clear. In general, the judgement was positive, but many amendments were proposed. These were then sent to the Subcommittee on Amendments for review. When asked for replies to the suggestions of the CPC, Msgr. Bugnini gathered a group of the members and consultors of the Commission, but the final decision was in the hands of the Subcommittee.

While this work was going on, however, other emendations were also being made.

The text of the Constitution that had been signed by Cardinal Gaetano Cicognani did not please the new president who named a small and secret commission to correct it. Fr. Antonelli was part of this group, and he assigned the work to Fr. Giuseppe Loew. Thus at the same time two "secretariats" were at work on the Constitution, one not knowing about the other. There was the legitimate Secretariate, working in collaboration with the Subcommittee on Amendments to insert into the text the corrections asked for by the Central Commission, and there was the "secret" Secretariate which was supposed to restructure the Constitution

---

<sup>1</sup>Annibale Bugnini, *La riforma liturgica* (Rome: Ed. Liturgiche, 1983), p. 36n.

<sup>2</sup>Bugnini, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup>Herman Schmidt, *La Constitution de la Sainte Liturgie. Texte--Génèse--Commentaire--Documents* (Brussels: Ed. Lumen Vitae, 1966), p. 72.

<sup>4</sup>See *ADP*, II/III (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1968), pp. 96-144, 275-368, 460-92.

according to the wishes of the new president. He himself cleverly manoeuvred between the two, concerned that the ploy not be discovered.<sup>5</sup>

The amended text was approved by Pope John on July 13, 1962 and included in the texts sent to the bishops for discussion when the Council opened in October. Some important changes had been made in the text. The explanations which had been added to the text to help non-specialists understand the meaning of the reforms were dropped. The proposed decentralization of authority in liturgical matters had nearly disappeared. Several proposed reforms were diluted: communion under both kinds, concelebration, use of the vernacular for the liturgy, etc. Finally, a note appeared on the frontispiece of the document: "The exclusive purpose of this Constitution is to offer general norms and 'the great principles for a general reform of the Liturgy....The practical implementation of the particular cases must be left to the Holy See.'"<sup>6</sup>

The preparatory Commission then set about informing the members of the Council of what had happened. The bishop-members spread the word to the other Council members. Experts drew up in parallel columns the text presented to the CPC and that presented to the Council, to show what changes had been made, many of them, of course, matters on which the bishops felt very strongly. This is the background for the conciliar discussion of the text.

#### The Conciliar Discussion of the Draft on the Liturgy

The book in which the first seven Drafts to be discussed at the Council were sent to the Council-members placed the Draft on the Liturgy in the fifth place, after four doctrinal texts (On the Sources of Revelation, On the Deposit of Faith, On the Christian Moral Order, On Chastity, Marriage, the Family, and Virginity). To follow this order, Bugnini comments, would have meant getting lost "in a labyrinth of theological discussions."<sup>7</sup> Members of the Presidential Council and other bishops went directly to Pope John XXIII to request a different order. The Council of Presidents met with the Pope on October 15th and it was then decided to begin with the Draft on the Liturgy. Caprile offers the following explanations:

Why did they begin by discussing this Draft? Because it was the one on which fewer differences of opinion were expected. Most of the Fathers had received the preceding week a large typed fascicle containing

---

<sup>5</sup>Bugnini, p. 38. Caprile seems to confirm this story. The Subcommittee on Amendments discussed the Draft on the Liturgy on May 9, 1962 and reached unanimous agreement on the corrections. But besides the reply of the preparatory Liturgical Commission to the comments of the CPC, "the Subcommittee for Amendments also received other comments, of a private nature and quite different in orientation, from Cardinal Larraona. These comments, although announced beforehand, were delivered when the revision had already been completed" (Caprile, II, p. 114n). I am not sure if the last sentence means that Larraona's comments were then added, or if, because they came late, they were not added.

<sup>6</sup>Schmidt, pp. 75-76. Caprile (II, p. 69-70n) seems to make a good point when he notes that this statement is a more concise version of something said in one of the "Explanations" included with the Draft discussed by the CPC: "It is the intention of this Constitution only to propose general norms or the chief practical principles. It is left to the Holy See and to special Commissions to be set up for this purpose after the Council, composed of experts from all over the world, to implement the concrete particular decisions" (*ADP*, I/III [Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1968], p. 27). The shorter version, of course, does omit the reference to special post-conciliar Commissions with members drawn from all over the world.

<sup>7</sup>Bugnini, p. 40.

observations and criticisms of the Drafts already sent to the Fathers: *Animadversiones in "Primam Seriem" schematum constitutionum et decretorum*. Sub secreto, pp. 42. The text proposed that the Drafts be discussed in the following order: Liturgy, Instruments of Social Communication, Unity of the Church. Later the Council could address the remaining Drafts (Sources of Revelation, Deposit of Faith, Christian Moral Order, Chastity, Marriage, Family, Virginity), unless it was decided better "to rewrite" these texts "completely or *ab ovo*". It seems that this fascicle expressed the wishes of some Central European episcopates. It said of the Liturgy Draft that it was "a very outstanding document both in whole and in part" ....

The Presidential Council, therefore, judged rightly when it decided, by majority vote, to begin with the Liturgy, "because the Draft will be discussed more expeditiously." The decision, therefore, should not be attributed to John XXIII, as some reports have it (see, for example, G. Garrone, *Le Concile: orientations* [Paris, 1966], pp. 32-33); nor were the motives "mystical," as others maintained: to confirm the primacy of divine worship, etc.<sup>8</sup>

It is interesting to note that Cardinal Montini referred to this decision in the letter he sent to the Secretary of State on October 18, 1962, complaining about the lack of a coherent plan for the Council: "The announcement that the first Draft discussed will be that on the Sacred Liturgy, when it was not placed first in the volume distributed and is not called for by any primary need, seems to me to confirm the fear that the Council does not have a pre-established plan of work."<sup>9</sup>

The conciliar Liturgy Commission met for the first time on October 21st. Cardinal Larraona announced the appointments as vice-presidents of Cardinals Giobbe and Jullien, passing over Cardinal Lercaro who had seniority over them and also was the only Cardinal who had been elected a member of the Commission by the Council members and had a reputation as a liturgist. Larraona was also the only head of a conciliar Commission who did not reappoint as its Secretary the man who had served that role on the preparatory Commission. Bugnini's place was taken by Fr.

---

<sup>8</sup>Caprile, II, pp. 43-44n. Douglas Horton reports that Msgr. Willebrands said that "the matter of liturgics had evidently been chosen for the beginning of the discussion because it contained less controversial material" (*Vatican Diary 1962: A Protestant Observes the First Session of Vatican Council II* [Philadelphia: United Church Press, 1964], p. 30). The fascicle to which Caprile refers is not included in the bound text, Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II, 1a Periodus Concilii, *Opuscula, Circulares Litterae aliaque id genus Distributa in Aula Concilii sine Permissione Consilii Presidentiae. Exemplaria Photostatica* (with no date or place or publisher) which the CUA Library possesses bound in the same fashion (including the papal seal) as the Conciliar *Acta*. But this volume does contain another text, *Animadversiones in "Secundam Seriem" Schematum Constitutionum et Decretorum de quibus disceptabitur in Concilii sessionibus, De Ecclesia et De Beata Maria Virgine* (pp. 199-207), and this text is attributed to Edward Schillebeeckx. Ralph Wiltgen says that the first fascicle was also written by Schillebeeckx and that it originated at a meeting of seventeen Dutch bishops in July who were so opposed to the prepared drafts that they commissioned his commentary. It was then translated into Latin, English and French, and 1500 copies of it were printed in Rome and distributed to the bishops as they arrived (*The Rhine Flows into the Tiber: The Unknown Council* [New York: Hawthorn Books, 1967], pp. 23-24).

<sup>9</sup>Giovanni Battista Montini, *Arcivescovo di Milano, e Il Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II. Preparazione e primo periodo* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto Paolo VI, 3; Brescia, 1985), p. 420. Montini may have been making a discreet reference to the pressures to have the Liturgy Draft begin the discussion when he went on to say: "If this is the way things are, as it seems, the development of the Council will be dictated and perhaps compromised by reasons extrinsic to the topics with which the Council is to concern itself." In his next Letter on the Council, Montini said, "Although it had not been foreseen that this topic would precede the others, it at once appeared to be of great interest, not only because of its practical importance but above all because of the dignity of the matter it concerns: the Church's prayer" (p. 184).

Ferdinando Antonelli, the man who had made Larraona's secret modifications of the preparatory Commission's Draft.<sup>10</sup>

It will be impossible here to follow the debate on the Liturgy Draft in close detail, but the following were frequently mentioned themes in the discussion:

1. *The Style of the Text.* A few of the Council members found the language too poetical and ascetical, vague and inexact, verbose, exaggerated, not strictly theological or conciliar. An example is the speech of Archbishop Vagnozzi, who thought that the language of *Mediator Dei* was preferable.<sup>11</sup>

2. *Doctrinal Unclarity.* Several members proposed that the first chapter be submitted to theologians for amendment and correction. Vagnozzi proposed that it go to the Doctrinal Commission, but Cardinal Ottaviani thought there were good theologians on the Liturgy Commission who could see to it.<sup>12</sup>

3. *The Language of the Liturgy.* This was very vigorously argued. Cardinals Spellman, Ruffini, and McIntyre argued against introducing the vernacular, as did Msgr. Dante. Spellman argued that Latin was a great instrument of unity, particularly in the Eucharist. The vernacular might be allowed for the readings, the common prayer, and some songs, but not elsewhere in the Mass, which the people are able to follow well with the use of Missals. He did favor allowing more use of the vernacular in the other sacraments and in some sacramentals. On the other hand, he thought that priests should have the ability to say the Breviary privately either in Latin or in the vernacular, since "in the various parts of the world there are many clerics who scarcely understand what they are saying when they pray the Breviary in Latin."<sup>13</sup>

Cardinal Ruffini repeated many of these arguments in favor of Latin "lest there be lost or diminished that most beautiful unity of the many Christian peoples which is also founded on unity of Liturgy." He also raised the question of what would happen if many people of different languages attended the same Mass.<sup>14</sup>

Cardinal McIntyre attributed the universal use of Latin to divine Providence and proposed as an historical argument that "in the fourth century, the ecclesiastical Councils formulated the Church's doctrines and dogmas in precise Latin terminology!" "Attacking the Latin language in the sacred Liturgy," he went on, "indirectly, but truly, is attacking the stability of the sacred dogmas,

<sup>10</sup>See Bugnini, p. 41. At the same time Bugnini was removed from the faculty of the Lateran and an effort was made to remove him from the Urbaniana. The reasons given *sotto voce* were that he was a "progressive," an "extremist," an "iconoclast" (*Ibid.*, p. 41n; see also Caprile, II, p. 51n). When Bugnini was later suddenly transferred from Rome to Iran, the far right accused him of being a Mason (see Michael Davies, *Liturgical Revolution. Vol. II: Pope John's Council* (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1977), pp. 165-66).

<sup>11</sup>*Acta Synodalia*, I/I (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970), p. 325-26.

<sup>12</sup>*AS*, I/I, p. 326, 349-50. Archbishop McGrath vigorously opposed sending the text to the Doctrinal Commission, remarking that "no Commission at the Council has the authority to judge other Commissions" (*Ibid.*, pp. 515-17).

<sup>13</sup>*AS*, I/I, pp. 318-19; *Acta Synodalia*, I/II (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1970), p. 392.

<sup>14</sup>*AS*, I/I, pp. 366-67.

because the sacred Liturgy necessarily involves dogmas."<sup>15</sup> Later, he returned to the point to argue that the use of Missals and practice of vernacular sermons were sufficient to encourage the people's active participation. The chief thing needed for participation is internal, "contemplation of the mystery of the Eucharist." And then he added: "Thus it seems to me that active participation is receiving more consideration in these discussions than it deserves. The internal attention is frequently had by those whose intellectual capacity is not great. Besides, active participation is frequently a distraction."<sup>16</sup>

Archbishop Staffa in effect tried to call the bluff of the proponents of more use of the vernacular:

If the vernacular is truly necessary to nourish the piety of the faithful, who otherwise will desert the churches, if the use of the vernacular is certainly required for active and fruitful participation in the sacred Liturgy, the conclusion must be that it should be used not only for the readings and other parts but also for the Canon and the Consecration. For logic demands that the faithful fruitfully participate, understanding the words, in the whole of the Holy Sacrifice, especially in its apex, the Consecration. Anyone, therefore, who professes this argument should openly admit these consequences with that sincerity of mind which is quite required before God and the Church.

Forgive me, Venerable Brethren, if I make use of that sincerity to say that I have seen churches packed with people--for example, in the United States--where the whole Mass is celebrated in Latin, while in churches governed by some of the old precursors of liturgical reform, this unfortunately does not happen.<sup>17</sup>

Cardinal Bacci began his speech by saying he was not completely opposed to introducing the vernacular into the rites of the Church. But he did not want it used in the Mass. It would not achieve what is desired, greater participation and greater comprehension by the people. He adduced the example of the readings:

Through a simple and bare reading in the national language, the people will understand little or nothing, especially if it is about difficult matters, as, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the readings of the Old Testament, the Book of Revelation, etc. Indeed sometimes, especially for adolescents, doubts and disturbances of mind can be caused, for example, by the reading of the story of the lecherous old men who wanted to have intercourse with the chaste Susanna, or by that statement, "His left hand was under my head, his right arm was round me" (Cant. 2:6; 8:3). These things need a correct commentary, not just a bare translation.

Understanding is better achieved through a good sermon and by the use of Missals. Moreover, introducing the vernacular will cause new dangers and disputes, especially where there are several languages in use, as in Switzerland or Canada. There is a danger that nationalism will enter into the very celebration of

---

<sup>15</sup> *AS*, I/I, pp. 369-71.

<sup>16</sup> *AS*, I/II, p. 109. McIntyre's concern was echoed by Cardinal McQuaid of Dublin, who asked that it be made clear that the active participation desired, especially in the Mass, not be interpreted to "exclude or denigrate that active participation of the faithful" which Pius XII had referred to as "pious meditation on the mysteries of Christ or religious devotions or other prayers" (I/I, p. 414).

<sup>17</sup> *AS*, I/I, p. 428. After reporting on Staffa's intervention, Caprile (II, p. 79n) notes that in the first three days of discussion five members of the Roman Congregations had already spoken, Pope John "let it be known that perhaps it would be better if in the future those occupying such posts abstained from speaking at the Council."

the sacrament of unity. On the other hand, Bacci had no difficulty in admitting the vernacular into the other Sacraments and the Sacramentals.<sup>18</sup>

Francis Simons, the Dutch-born Bishop of Indore, made an effort to make the discussion concrete, by speaking about "the present state of the use of Latin."

It is not true that priests, with very few exceptions, communicate with one another in Latin. Indeed, it has happened that, realistically, in audiences with the Supreme Pontiff those who do not speak Italian or French communicate with him through an interpreter. Many of the bishops here, including myself, are now speaking Latin for the first time since they completed their studies, or are reading from a prepared text.

There was no need to use Latin at this Council. Many episcopates communicate with the Holy See in modern languages. Priests read Church documents in those languages. Most of the best theology today is being published in modern languages. Scholars need to know Latin, but priests do not. The problem of areas where several languages are spoken has already been met for preaching and catechesis. As for travellers, "for a few days they move from an unknown Latin language to some other unknown language," and some priests take a Missal with them along with their Breviary. As for the argument from unity:

So far from promoting unity, Latin has the opposite effect. It has become the cause of a division between clergy and people, between the Latin Church and non-Latin Christians, between the so-called western Church and the non-Christian world, for bringing people to the faith. As Christians and Catholics we are united not by any language, but by the worship of the one God and Lord, by charity, life, the Sacred Scriptures, doctrine, the sacraments, and governance. Let us not follow human traditions and impose this serious burden without any real need, especially in missionary lands and areas of non-Christian culture.<sup>19</sup>

The eighty-four year old Bishop of Agrigento used the occasion to indict the liturgical movement:

I don't like the anti-liturgical movement, because of its origin. It's always important to pay attention to the origins of families, institutions, realities, doctrines: who was the father, the mother, the teacher. If the source was sound from the beginning, it will be sound in the course of time. If the source was polluted, it will be hard for it to be purified. Relying on these principles, I look at the origin of the anti-liturgical movement: who were its fathers, its originators.

This movement began at the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth. The first anti-liturgists were the humanists, pagans in Italy, better in France and in the Nordic lands, led by Erasmus, but all of them insecure in the faith. They were followed by that large stream of our many separated brethren who later departed from the Catholic Church. Then there were the Jansenists, in Italy the followers of the Council of Pistoia, and the modernists. This is the group with which many speaking in the same way.

On the other hand, I find no saint who promoted this movement. From St. Charles Borromeo to St. Claret, from St. Francis de Sales to St. Alphonsus, old and new, they all clung to the Latin tradition. This fact should make us cautious about innovations. It is easy to leave the ancient, safe road; but to what an abyss may the paths bring us!

The bishop went on to cite the condemnation by the University of Paris of Erasmus' view on Latin and the fact that the Protestant use of the vernacular ended with their separation from the Church. He then quoted a sentence from Dom Guéranger:

---

<sup>18</sup> *AS, II*, p. 409-10.

<sup>19</sup> *AS, II*, pp. 586-87.

Almost always, for some inexplicable reason unknown to us, departure from the Latin language, even with the Supreme Pontiff's dispensation, led to schism and to full departure from the Catholic Church.<sup>20</sup>

4. *Communion under Both Kinds*. Here the argument in favor was based on the command of Jesus at the last Supper, on the fulness of the sacramental symbolism, and on the ecumenical benefits. The arguments on the other side invoked the Council of Trent's authority, the danger that the concession would be interpreted to mean the Protestants were correct, on the practical problems of it, and on questions of hygiene. Cardinal Godfrey added to the last of these another consideration:

If the sacred species is received from the chalice, everyone can see the difficulties and objections that can arise on account of hygiene. Furthermore, we ought to think about women or girls who come to the sacred synax with lips colored by those well known red ornaments of today. The difficulty is obvious.<sup>21</sup>

Ramon Iglesias Navarri, Bishop of Urgel in Spain, offered another reason for restricting communion under both kinds to ordination-Masses: "Our Redeemer himself, distributed Communion under both kinds only to those whom, at that first Mass, he made priests."<sup>22</sup>

5. *Concelebration*. The draft-text said:

44. Concelebration has remained in use till now in both the Eastern and the Western Church. The Council wishes to extend the faculty to concelebrate to the following cases:

- a) at the Chrism Mass on Holy Thursday;
- b) at meetings of priests, if other provisions cannot be made for individual celebrations and with the approval of the Ordinary.

45. It is up to the Ordinary to decide in individual cases whether concelebration is opportune and on the number of concelebrants.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>AS, I/I, pp. 594-95. The appeal to Guéranger, who was, of course, the great proponent of Roman uniformity in the liturgy, is still being made by Catholic traditionalists today. See, for example, Davies, pp. 220-21, 251, 297-300, "the anti-liturgical heresy."

<sup>21</sup>AS, I/II, p. 11. The Bishop of Syra and Santorino, George Xenopulos, also raised the problem: "Today the faithful, especially men, can be seen not to come forward to kiss a sacred relic because, among other things, they fear their lips will be colored by the red marks left by women on the glass of the reliquary. What will happen now when so many hundreds and thousands of dyed lips of women or perhaps hundreds of lips of men which are not proper and pure and sometimes are infected with base sicknesses are applied to the rims of the chalice? The result will be that many of the faithful will abstain from Communion" (I/II, p. 138). Francis Zauner, Bishop of Linz, offered a reply: "Some people fear hygienic reasons in concelebration. Let's look at the Orientals! If I look at those venerable Fathers in our own company, they seem to enjoy greater health than we westerners. None of them seems to be infected with bacteria" (I/II, p. 153).

<sup>22</sup>AS, I/II, p. 62. A little later, the same bishop also adduced "the obvious diatetic reasons, especially among peoples of higher culture," a consideration he did not explain.

<sup>23</sup>AS, I/I, p. 280. In the Draft presented to the CPC, the first of these paragraphs had extended concelebration, besides on Holy Thursday, (b) "to conventual Masses and to the principal Mass in churches where there are more priests present than are needed for the faithful, provided that the freedom of each priest to celebrate individually is always retained, but not in the same church at the same time; (c) to meetings of priests, such as retreats, courses of study, pilgrimages, etc., especially where individual Masses cannot be conveniently celebrated; (c) for extraordinary festive celebrations, for example, on the occasion of a diocesan synod or a pastoral visitation (concelebration of the bishop with the parish clergy (ADP, II/III, p. 107).

A number of bishops opposed this extension of concelebration because it would diminish the importance of private Masses and because it would cause problems with regard to stipends. Cardinal Ottaviani, for example, said:

I understand that it is an external, forgive me for saying it, even a theatrical form of the celebration of Mass, but there is also some danger of error. And the error sneaking around is this, that in a concelebrated Mass more glory is given and a greater efficacy is had than in a private Mass. You know that the Supreme Pontiff, Pius XII, in the Encyclical *Mediator Dei*, rejected the theory of those who diminish and are opposed to privately celebrated Masses.

He went on to address the question of stipends:

Allusion was made by Cardinal Godfrey to the stipend. There was a very intelligent Cardinal who at the Central Commission said--in the first Draft it was said that concelebrating priests could also receive a Mass offering. The members of the Central Commission asked that this phrase be removed, because that very intelligent Cardinal said: "Take that away and you will see that not many priests will want to concelebrate."<sup>24</sup>

The arguments in favor of extending concelebration were its value for symbolizing the unity of the priesthood and to avoid some of the disedifying aspects of multiplied private Masses where many priests are present.

*6. Authority over the Liturgy.* This theme was very hotly debated. The Draft presented to the Central Preparatory Commission had said:

The limits to be kept in making this adaptation are so to be determined by ecclesiastical legislation that, keeping in force the typical editions of liturgical books published by the Holy See, the Ordinaries of individual provinces or regions or even a national Episcopal Conference are given a larger faculty for regulating divine worship, especially with regard to the administration of the Sacraments and Sacramentals, processions, liturgical language, sacred music and the arts.

No. 22 spoke of the need for adaptations in missionary territories and said that adaptations considered useful or necessary by an Episcopal Conference or Liturgical Commission "should be proposed to the Holy See, to be introduced if it agrees." And the following paragraph calls for the Holy See to grant an Episcopal Conference the faculty to permit and supervise experimentation.<sup>25</sup> Later, in #24, a particular application is made with regard to the use of the vernacular:

It should be up to the Episcopal Conference in the various regions also, if it is called for, after consulting with neighboring bishops of the same language, to determine the limits within which and the fashion in which the vernacular is introduced into the Liturgy, provided that the Holy See reviews the decisions.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>AS, I/I, pp. 19-20. In the discussion at the CPC, several bishops voted to remove the paragraph on stipends (*ADP*, II/III, p. 118 [Frings], p. 124 and 138 [Doepfner], p. 130 [Micara and Pizzardo], p. 141 [Cheiko], p. 143 [Yago], p. 144 [Fr. Janssens]; but I have not been able to find a record of any Cardinal making the humorous point Ottaviani relates. It was while making this point that Cardinal Ottaviani, who had exceeded the allotted time, was asked to step down. "I'm finished, I'm finished, I'm finished!" replied Ottaviani, while members of the Council applauded. Karl Rahner commented: "Motto: *Schadenfreude* is the purest joy. Ottaviani is said to be asking everyone in the HO why people hate him so much. And Parente has already declared himself to be a martyr of the HO" (See Herbert Vorgrimler, *Understanding Karl Rahner: An Introduction to his Life and Thought* [New York: Crossroad, 1986], p. 158).

<sup>25</sup>*ADP*, II/III, pp. 36-37.

<sup>26</sup>*ADP*, II/III, p. 38.



The text revised after the CPC discussion and submitted to the Council itself made two changes in this text. The first moved from #24 to #21 the phrase, "provided that the Holy See reviews the decisions;" while the second, besides omitting that phrase, changes the verb, "determine," to "propose to the Holy See."<sup>27</sup> The effect of these changes, in the minds of the authors of the original Draft, was to dilute or to nullify efforts at decentralization.<sup>28</sup>

A number of the Council members asked that the greater freedom for adaptation given in the earlier text be restored,<sup>29</sup> while a number of others wanted the text to remain as it had been revised or even to be strengthened to insist on the final legislative authority of the Holy See.<sup>30</sup> Two Indian bishops, Gracias and D'Souza, particularly insisted on the fact that bishops in missionary territories are those best placed to judge what adaptations are needed for their lands.

It was in this context that criticisms of the Roman Curia were expressed which were taken very badly by some of the bishops. Bishop Carli of Segni commented:

Yes, we can reasonably ask for a greater "decentraliza-tion" of competence, we can reverently ask for a greater "internationalization" of the Roman Curia. But it is unpleasant to hear some things said which, surely against the mind and intention of those saying them, appear to indicate some lack of trust in the Holy See--and sometimes in the Pope himself.<sup>31</sup>

But Archbishop Parente had already spoken even more strongly, when he came to the defence of the Holy Office:

Many things have been said against it, not always fairly, nor always well informed, nor with knowledge of the method of the Holy Office. And we who are the martyrs of the Holy Office--it isn't those who are accused, but we who are the martyrs of the Holy Office--we know well with how much work, how much diligence, how much prudence matters are considered before warnings, decrees, etc. are issued.<sup>32</sup>

In the course of the debates there were also several calls that the "Explanations" given with the text to the CPC be restored for the sake of the Council members and that the brief statement about the purpose of the text be dropped.<sup>33</sup> Several bishops also argued that the text called for too many unnecessary reforms, Cardinal Ottaviani complaining about an "itch for innovations,"<sup>34</sup> and Cardinal Spellman about "historicism."<sup>35</sup>

<sup>27</sup> *AS, I/I*, pp. 271, 272.

<sup>28</sup> See Bugnini, p. 38, and Schmidt, p. 75.

<sup>29</sup> See *AS, I/I*, pp. 309 (Frings), 320-21 (Doepfner), 324 (Silva Henriquez), 358 (Mendez Arceo), 372 (Leger), 40-1-402 (Gracias), 497-98 (D'Souza). Gracias and Landazuri Ricketts (375-76) asked that the terms be clarified. Bishop Bekkers (p. 442-43) said that it was up to the Council to decide.

<sup>30</sup> See *AS, I/I*, pp. 316 (Spellman), 321 (Dante), 366 (Ruffini), 456 (Carli), 477 (Prou).

<sup>31</sup> *AS, I/I*, p. 456.

<sup>32</sup> *AS, I/I*, p. 425.

<sup>33</sup> See *AS, I/I*, pp. 309, 319, 321, 359, 372, 515, 602-603.

<sup>34</sup> *AS, I/II*, p. 18.

<sup>35</sup> *AS, I/I*, pp. 316, 599. Abbot John Prou also warned against letting legitimate and long-standing customs be judged solely by experts. "If the adaptations come only from some 'experts,' overly 'intellectual,' it is to be feared that the abstractions and

Two bishops used the occasion to promote the movement to introduce the name of St. Joseph into the Canon of the Mass,<sup>36</sup> the second of whom was treated rather rudely by Cardinal Ruffini who was presiding that day: "I ask you please conclude your very pious sermon. I am sure that we are all very devoted to St. Joseph and hope that in Yugoslavia there will be many saints who live in the world."<sup>37</sup> This treatment of a bishop who had suffered severely for the faith under the Communists is said to have prompted Pope John to announce three days later that he had decided that St. Joseph's name was to be inserted into the Canon.<sup>38</sup> Reactions to this move by the Pope were varied. One theologian is quoted as saying, "Half the world doesn't even believe in God and we worry about St. Joseph."<sup>39</sup> Yves Congar used it as an occasion to raise questions about modern Catholic devotionalism.<sup>40</sup> Karl Barth, however, had fewer difficulties, saying that he himself preferred to compare the Church to St. Joseph than to the Blessed Virgin.<sup>41</sup> Some jokes were also told about it:

One of the signs of the vitality of this old Roman church is (as I have observed before) the delight that its priests take in telling stories on themselves and the ways of Rome. The current saying that is floating about is to the effect that, now that St. Joseph's name has been included in the canon of the mass, we shall presently have promulgated a doctrine of the assumption of the blessed St. Joseph, to parallel the doctrine of the assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary--that is, of course, direct assumption into heaven--and this on the theological basis that the family that prays together stays together!<sup>42</sup>

More seriously, two interpretations were given of the Pope's action. On the one hand, it was thought astonishing that he should have acted in this way, alone, while the Council was discussing

---

concepts of some mind will be imposed on the faithful who don't need them and aren't asking for them, and this will do harm to the common good" (I/I, p. 477).

<sup>36</sup>AS, I/II, pp. 119-20 (Cousineau, Cap Haitien) and pp. 478-80 (Cule, Mostar, Yugoslavia). For the background of these interventions, see Wiltgen, pp. 45-46.

<sup>37</sup>AS, I/II, p. 480. Caprile, who here accurately quotes Ruffini's Latin comments, notes that there was laughter in the hall at his remark (*Il Concilio Vaticano II*, II, p. 142).

<sup>38</sup>AS, I/II, p. 644. Cardinal Cicognani, who made the announcement, noted that the Council was being celebrated under St. Joseph's patronage and that "this concession will remain as a *mnemosynon* and fruit of the Council itself." See Xavier Rynne, *Letters from Vatican City. Vatican Council II (First Session): Background and Debates* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Co., 1963), p. 129. But Wiltgen (p. 46) says that Fr. Edward Heston had been told on October 19th that the Pope had already made the decision. Perhaps the incident with Bishop Cule moved the Pope to announce it then.

<sup>39</sup>Robert Kaiser, *Inside the Council: The Story of Vatican II* (London: Burns & Oates, 1963), p. 142.

<sup>40</sup>Yves Congar, *Le Concile au jour le jour* (Paris: du Cerf, 1963), pp. 53-55. In an Appendix, Congar defended his comments, pp. 121-25.

<sup>41</sup>"Joseph, in my opinion, in his relation to Christ, played the same role as the Church should exercise. The Roman Church, I know, prefers to compare her role to that of Mary, which was more glorious. She brings the Gospel message to the world in the same way that Mary gave us the Christ. But the comparison is fallacious. The Church cannot give birth to the Redeemer, but she can and must serve Him with discreet and humble zeal. This was specifically the role of Joseph, who always remained in the background, leaving all the glory to Jesus. This must also be the role of the Church if we want the world to rediscover the splendor of the Word of God" (quoted in Antoine Wenger, *Vatican II. Volume I: The First Session* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1966), p. 72

<sup>42</sup>Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, p. 128.

these matters.<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, many read it as a sign that at least as far as the Pope was concerned, the Canon of the Mass could indeed be changed.<sup>44</sup>

It was also in the midst of the discussion of the text on the Liturgy that an important theme was first raised in the Council, that of the Church of the poor. The Bishop of the Canary Islands, Anthony Pildain y Zapiain raised it first in asking that if the text was to mention praying for kings (#40), some notice should also be taken of the poor, which led him to urge the need to consider matters of social justice for the poor.<sup>45</sup> His argument was later taken up by the Bishop of Fort Rosebery, Rhodesia, Rene Pailloux, who also was asked to desist for speaking of topics not under consideration.<sup>46</sup>

Finally, the course of the discussions on the Liturgy had revealed the need to introduce some mechanism for closure of a debate. On November 6, 1962, the Council members were told that the Pope had agreed to grant the Council Presidency the ability to propose the termination of debate on an issue when the topics had seemed to have been sufficiently discussed. Cardinal Tisserant immediately asked the Council Fathers whether they wished to terminate the discussion of the third chapter of the Draft. Almost everyone arose to agree.<sup>47</sup> And from then on, the debates could be moved along.

The discussion of the Liturgy text came to an end on November 13th. The following day, the Council was asked to give a yes or no vote to the following questions:

The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, having seen and examined the schema of the sacred Liturgy, approves therein the general directives which, with due prudence and understanding, tend or aim to make the various parts of the sacred Liturgy more vital and more instructive for the faithful in conformity with the pastoral needs of our day.

The changes proposed in the conciliar discussions, as soon as they are examined and compiled in due form by the conciliar commission on the liturgy, will be submitted with due care to this general session, so that by their votes the Fathers may assist or direct the commission in preparing a definite, revised text, which again will be submitted to the general session.<sup>48</sup>

In the middle of the session, Archbishop Felici announced the results of the vote:

Present and voting.....2215

Two-thirds majority...1476

*Placet*.....2162

*Non placet*..... 46

<sup>43</sup>See Congar, p. 54, who asks whether the Pope did not want to recall by this act that he possesses sovereignty independent of the Council.

<sup>44</sup>See Hans Küng, *The Council in Action: Theological Reflections on the Second Vatican Council* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), p. 143.

<sup>45</sup>*AS*, I/II, pp. 156-58. He, too, was rather rudely interrupted, perhaps because he had exceeded the permissible time.

<sup>46</sup>*AS*, I/II, pp. 190-92.

<sup>47</sup>*AS*, I/II, pp. 159-61.

<sup>48</sup>*AS*, I/III (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1971), pp. 9-13.

Void.....7.<sup>49</sup>

This vote indicated, more clearly than the discussion had, that an overwhelming majority (97.6%) of the bishops at the Council were interested in genuine reform and renewal.

---

<sup>49</sup>*AS*, I/III, p. 55.