

The field of tension between liturgical restoration and reform¹

Gerard Lukken

The beginning of the twentieth century saw the emergence of a movement that would have far-reaching consequences for the Christian ritual. In Christian churches, and especially in the Catholic Church, there was a growing awareness of the unique place of the liturgy and of the fact that it had degenerated into a *mysterium depopulatum*, a ritual in which the congregation hardly participated.² Liturgy had become the exclusive affair of the priest, leaving no room for believers to contribute: they were only passive spectators, mere consumers of the ritual. This Liturgical Movement gradually grew into a widespread Church faction which, in the middle of the 1940s and 1950s, also had an important influence on the centre of the Church. Under Pius XII, the first tentative revisions in the liturgical books were made.

1. Second Vatican Council: comprehensive reform of the liturgy

In 1959, shortly after his election, Pope John XXIII announced the Second Vatican Council. Without any doubt this Council was a breakthrough: the focus was now on a comprehensive reform and an *aggiornamento* of the Christian ritual. At the same time, it was also a culmination of what had been set in motion by the Liturgical Movement with the support of extensive research from the field of liturgical studies. It was for a good reason that the *Constitution on the sacred liturgy* was the first document, issued by the Second Vatican Council: the time was more than ripe for it. The document was approved in 1963 by an overwhelming majority, with just four votes against.³

¹ Introduction on the symposium *Worship wars. Contested ritual praxis* (November 26, 2010). I would thank Ineke Smit for translating my Dutch text. For a more extensive discussion, see G. LUKKEN: *Met de rug naar het volk. Liturgie na Vaticanum II in het spanningsveld van restauratie en vernieuwing* (= Meander 13) (Heeswijk/Averbode 2010); IDEM: 'Liturgie in het spanningsveld van restauratie en vernieuwing', in *Tijdschrift voor liturgie* 95 (2011) 209-226.

² A.L. MAYER: 'Liturgie und Geist der Gothik', in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 6 (1926) 93.

³ E. CATTANEO: *Il culto cristiano in occidente. Note storiche* (= Bibliotheca ephemerides liturgicae 13) (Roma 1978) 634.

In a nutshell, the principal characteristics of the reform were the following:

Liturgy is not solely the work of the office holders, but fundamentally belongs to all those who believe; they are all active participants in the ritual. It is not the priest's private celebration of Mass that should be its basic form, but the communal celebration of the Eucharist. This applies to all Christian rituals, from birth to death. There are various liturgical services and, in principle, there is a division of roles. Accessibility and participation can be enhanced by the use of the vernacular, simplification of rites, and by granting a measure of autonomy to bishops' conferences.

An extremely important point is the rediscovery of the value of the Scripture and the Word in all parts of the liturgy. The Liturgy of the Word as such is expressly considered a liturgy in its own right. In carefully chosen words the Constitution also opens the door to a decentralization of the liturgy and its adaptation to different countries and cultures, provided that the authentic Roman tradition is preserved. All official liturgical books will need to be revised in the spirit of the Constitution.

The implementation of the *Constitution on the sacred liturgy* was entrusted to the post-conciliar Commission for the Liturgical Reform, led by Cardinal Lercaro and with Annibale Bugnini as its secretary, and at a later stage to the Congregation for Divine Worship. They approached the reforms energetically, with the support of liturgical and pastoral experts from all over the world. In just over ten years practically all books of the Roman liturgy were revised. These were published as standard editions in Latin by Rome, and translated and adapted in the different countries within the limits set by Rome. Much progress was made in a short time, and the renewal was widely welcomed by those at the base of the Church.

2. From 1975: stagnation of the reform and increasing restoration

However, from the beginning the reform was accompanied by serious tensions. On the one hand, there were some Curia bodies that did not want to relinquish control. Also, a small minority wanted to maintain the status quo and found support within the Curia for their opposition. Detailed information on this can be found in Piero Marini's book *A challenging reform*.⁴ On the other hand, the

⁴ P. MARINI: *A challenging reform: realizing the vision of the liturgical renewal* (Collegeville 2007); Dutch translation: IDEM: *Een uitdagende hervorming. De droom van de liturgische vernieuwing* (Averbode/Heeswijk 2010). This book is a significant supplement of A. BUGNINI: *Die Liturgiereform. 1948-1975. Zeugnis und Testament* (Freiburg 1988) 114; original Italian edition: IDEM: *La riforma liturgica (1948-1975)* (= Bibliotheca ephemerides liturgicae, subsidia 26) (Roma 1983). New edition: IDEM: *La riforma liturgica (1948-1975)*.

need for further-reaching inculturation pushed the advocates of renewal at the grassroots level to sometimes run ahead of things. This tension was there from the start, particularly in our country; I witnessed it from close by.

The post-conciliar commission showed itself open to these developments. Bugnini visited our country several times, and intensive deliberations took place in Rome as well. But this openness also meant that Bugnini's opponents, and, increasingly, the traditional Curia bodies, started to regard him with suspicion.⁵ In fact, a battle of ideologies soon broke out between those who wanted to consistently implement the Council's reforms, and those who rather wanted to put the brake on the process. Pope Paul VI eventually opted for a conservative line, also regarding the liturgy. The Congregation for Divine Worship was accused of causing a rift in the Church. According to the Curia, the Congregation was too tolerant with regard to the question of translations and new Eucharistic prayers, and in allowing communion in the hand. It was probably the issue of adding new Eucharistic prayers – in which the Netherlands played an important role – that made tensions reach boiling point. Ultimately, Bugnini's courage was not rewarded and Paul VI gave in.

In 1975, Bugnini and his direct collaborators were dismissed, the staff was downsized and much expertise was lost. Financial resources were also reduced to a minimum.⁶ 'What direction will liturgy take now?', was the desperate question asked in liturgical circles.⁷ In 1973, Bugnini had already put inculturation on the agenda as an urgent item for the 'next ten years'.⁸ In 1974 he referred to this as the phase of the 'incarnation' of the Roman form of the liturgy into the customs and mentality of each individual church.⁹ Unfortunately, nothing ever came of such a further *aggiornamento*. On the contrary, with Bugnini's discharge a period of stagnation set in, followed by an increase in the support for restoration rather than reform.¹⁰

Nuova edizione riveduta e arricchita di note e di supplementi per una lettura analitica (Roma 1997); English edition: BUGNINI: *The reform of the liturgy 1984-1975* (Collegeville 1990). For a critical review of these memoirs of Bugnini with innumerable detailed corrections and supplements, see E. LENGELING: 'Liturgiereform 1948-1975. Zu einem aufschlussreichen Rechenschaftsbericht', in *Theologische revue* 80 (1984) 265-284.

⁵ For the details, see G. LUKKEN: 'De oorspronkelijke toonzetting van de liturgievernieuwing. Leven en werk van Annibale Bugnini (1912-1982)', in M. HOONDEERT, I. DE LOOS, P. POST & L. VAN TONGEREN (red.): *Door mensen gezongen. Liturgische muziek in portretten* (= Meander 7) (Kampen 2005) 234-256.

⁶ For literature, see BUGNINI: *Die Liturgiereform* 114.

⁷ S. MARSILI: 'Dove va la liturgia', in *Rivista liturgica* 62 (1975) 622-625.

⁸ A. BUGNINI: 'Progresso nell'ordine', in *Osservatore Romano*, 12 December 1973.

⁹ A. BUGNINI: 'La riforma liturgica, conquista della chiesa', in *Notitiae* 110 (1974) 126.

¹⁰ For details, see LUKKEN: *Met de rug naar het volk*.

3. The Society of Pius X: opposition of an extreme traditionalist movement

Earlier I mentioned the opposition emerging after Vatican II from a minority which received support from the Curia. This opposition had actually already started during the Council. It originated with Cardinal Ottaviani, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and the Vatican's Latin expert, Cardinal Bacci. They signaled a break with the Council of Trent. Soon after, in 1964, the association *Una voce* was founded, which opposed any type of reform; in its wake all sorts of other radical groups under many different names sprang up.¹¹ The 'Society of Pius X', which under the leadership of the French (mission) Bishop Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1991) was to break with Rome, was a continuation of this development.¹² Lefebvre belonged to the group of French Catholics that saw religion, State and society as one inseparable whole. In the spirit of Pope Pius X (1903-1914), they challenged the so-called 'modernism' of the beginning of the twentieth century, which explicitly included the dimensions of human experience and history in theological thinking. More and more, Lefebvre emerged as the leader of a traditionalist movement against Vatican II and its reforms. He was convinced that a modernist conspiracy had taken place there, led by Jews and Freemasons. Especially from 1974 onwards, the old liturgy became a distinguishing mark of the Society of Pius X. In his 1974 *Declaration* Lefebvre characterizes the Tridentine Mass as the 'eternal' Mass.¹³ In France, the Tridentine Mass was openly celebrated at meetings of the National Front party of Le Pen. Tensions led to an overt schism with Rome in 1986.

In order to make sure that his work would be continued, Lefebvre consecrated four bishops without the Vatican's permission in 1988, when he was 83 years old. One of them was Richard Williamson (born 1940), an Englishman who was later to create quite a stir with his denial of the Holocaust. Lefebvre and his four new bishops were immediately excommunicated. With regard to the Tridentine Rite, Rome had so far only allowed its celebration in exceptional cases through the issuing of so-called indults. But in 1988, the year of the excommunication, permission to celebrate it was substantially extended: the Holy See no

¹¹ BUGNINI: *Die Liturgiereform* 300.

¹² See LUKKEN: *Met de rug naar het volk* chapter 1, sub 1.2.

¹³ In 1969 the cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci protested in a letter to Paul VI against the new *Ordo Missae*. They referred to a little book of 25 pages, *Breve esame critico del Novus Ordo Missae*, written by a group of theologians, liturgists and pastors, obviously under the leadership of Lefebvre. About this see: E. CATANEO: *Il culto cristiano in occidente. Note storiche* (Roma 1978) 648 ff.; C. VAGAGGINI: 'Il nuovo 'Ordo missae' e Portodossia', in *Rivista del clero italiano* 50 (1969) 688-699 (= *Rivista liturgica* 96 (2009) 449-459); W. HAUNERLAND: 'Die Messe aller Zeiten. Liturgiewissenschaftliche Anmerkungen zum Fall Lefebvre', in R. AHLERS & P. KRÄMER: *Das Bleibende im Wandel. Theologische Beiträge zum Schisma Lefebvres* (Paderborn 1990) 51-85, especially 55, note 12.

longer required priests who rejected Lefebvre's schism to formally agree with the principles of Vatican II, and allowed them to continue to celebrate the Tridentine Mass. This was a far-reaching concession.¹⁴ The Vatican continued its negotiations with the Society of Pius X also after 1988,¹⁵ and it is interesting to note that the then Cardinal Ratzinger was always closely involved in these negotiations. He showed his affinity with the Tridentine Rite in several of his publications, and celebrated the Tridentine Mass with sympathizers a number of times.¹⁶

Lefebvre's movement can be characterized as that of the extreme traditionalists. They reject any openness to modernity on the part of the Church, and want to return to the lost divine order that knows no dualism between Church and State, between religious and secular power, and in which faith and Church are completely interwoven with society. This order they see, on the one hand, as supra-temporal; on the other hand, they identify it with historical-political configurations in the nineteenth and twentieth century.¹⁷ In this context they see the Tridentine liturgy as the ultimate expression of the unchanging symbolic order created by God, in which Church and society are inextricably linked. As regards the number of uncompromising supporters of the Tridentine Mass, it is an extremely small percentage of Catholics: no more than 0,0008333 percent (less than a thousandth of a percent).¹⁸ But this small group is supported by trends in the policies of the Roman Curia and a number of Episcopal Curias, which makes it much more powerful than it deserves; its force is also supported by the great combativeness of minority groups and conservative media.¹⁹

¹⁴ See P. HÜNERMANN: 'Exkommunikation-Kommunikation. Schichtenanalyse der Fakten – Theologische Beurteilung – Wege aus der Krise', in P. HÜNERMANN (Hg.): *Exkommunikation oder Kommunikation? Der Weg der Kirche nach dem II. Vatikanum und die Pius-Brüder* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien 2009) 31 ff.

¹⁵ L. RING-EIFEL: 'Der Papst und die Traditionalisten', in W. BEINERT (Hg.): *Vatikan und die Pius-Brüder. Anatomie einer Krise* (Freiburg im Breisgau 2009) 19 and 23.

¹⁶ For instance in Le Barroux in 1988 and 1995. In 1990 he celebrated the Mass of Easter in Wigratzbad, the head office and settlement of an international seminary of the Society of Pius X (see www.fssp.org/de/ratzwig1990.htm [November 26, 2009]) and in 1999 in Weimar he celebrated a pontifical Mass at the annual session of the Society *Pro Missa Tridentina* (see www.pro-missa-tridentina.org/galerie/galerie_4_2.htm [November 26, 2009]). Via references on the key site www.pro-missa-tridentina.org/index.htm one can find percentages of the Tridentine liturgy in Germany, Switzerland and Austria and also further links with other analogous societies etc. elsewhere.

¹⁷ W. DAMBERG: 'Die Piusbruderschaft St. Pius X. (FSSPX) und ihr politisch-geistgeschichtlicher Hintergrund', in HÜNERMANN: *Exkommunikation oder Kommunikation? Der Weg der Kirche nach dem II. Vatikanum und die Pius-Brüder* 121.

¹⁸ See LUKKEN: *Met de rug naar het volk* Chapter 1, sub 1.4.

¹⁹ So in 2009 the Italian Institute for statistic research *Doxa*, on behalf of the on internet very active defenders of the Tridentine Mass *Messainlatino* (Italy) and *Paix liturgique* (France), examined the opinion of the Italians about the 'old mass'. According to this

4. The neo-traditionalist movement of the ‘Reform of the Reform’ and the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum*

In addition to the extreme traditionalist movement, another movement gradually emerged after Vatican II, namely that of the ‘Reform of the Reform’. Rouwhorst characterizes this movement as belonging to the neo-traditionalists.²⁰ They do recognize in part the importance of the liturgical reforms of Vatican II, but consider those reforms too radical, and believe that more connection with the past should be sought. From the start the opinion leader of this movement was undoubtedly Cardinal Ratzinger, who was elected Pope Benedict XVI in 2005. This group has also gained more and more influence within the decision-making bodies of the Curia and the bishops, also in our country.

On 22 December 2005, shortly after his election, Benedict XVI addressed the Curia, underlining the unbroken line between Vatican II and the tradition. His message was that it is wrong to emphasize discontinuity, as if Vatican II was a new beginning rather than part of the tradition.²¹ In his speech he also pointed to the importance of continuity in the liturgy. According to Benedict XVI the new liturgy often seemed to be the cause of discontinuity, especially in practice.²² Prior to his *Declaration* he had already criticized the reforms after Vatican II repeatedly and in no uncertain terms, raising a finger in warning at the liturgy professors and the mainstream of liturgical studies. He did not spare Bugnini either in this respect.

examination two thirds of the practicing Catholics in Italy would at least once a month participate in a Tridentine Mass, when this would be possible. And nine millions would at least once a week celebrate an ‘old mass’. One can expect that these groups will use this kind of examination as pressure. Compare: <http://blog.messainlatino.it/2009/10/risultati-del-sondaggio-assolutamente.html> (November 18, 2009).

²⁰ See (more extensive and very informative): G. ROUWHORST: ‘Bronnen van liturgie-hervorming tussen oorsprong en traditie’, in *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 20 (2004) 7-24; IDEM: ‘Historical periods as normative sources. The appeal to the past in the research on liturgical history’, in J. FRISHMAN, W. OTTEN & G. ROUWHORST: *Religious identity and the problem of historical foundation. The foundational character of authoritative sources in the history of Christianity and Judaism* (Leiden 2004) 495-512; IDEM: ‘Liturgie en constructie van het verleden’, in *Tijdschrift voor liturgie* 92 (2008) 308-310.

²¹ For Ratzingers view on the problem of continuity and discontinuity of the second Vatican Council, see J.A. KOMONCHAK: ‘Erneuerung in Kontinuität. Papst Benedikt’s Interpretation des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils’, in BEINERT: *Vatikan und die Pius-Brüder* 163-174; H.J. POTTMEYER: ‘Streitpunkt Konzil und Traditionsbruch. Papst Benedikt und die Traditionalisten’, in BEINERT: *Vatikan und die Pius-Brüder* 207-212; M. GERWING: ‘Konzil im Blick vom Klaus Wittstadt’, in C. BÖTTINGHEIMER & E. NAAB (Hgs.): *Weltoffen aus Treue. Studientag zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil* (Sankt Odilien 2009) 42-50 (with literature).

²² For Ratzingers view on liturgy, see more extensively: LUKKEN: *Met de rug naar het volk*, Chapter 2.

Underlying Benedict's criticism is his belief that Greek metaphysics is the optimal setting for the Christian message; in fact, he views all subsequent developments that abandon the Hellenistic paradigm as a degeneration into unbelief. Thus, Ratzinger is very pessimistic with regard to contemporary culture, which no longer perceives the reflection of the divine. What is needed is a re-sacralization of the liturgy. Liturgy, in his view, is the sensory mirror of the divine world, transcending our human condition, sacral, God-given, not created. Just as a plant, a living organism, it continually develops and renews itself organically from within, without any discontinuity. In this essentially Platonic and timeless perspective of liturgy, any further developments are seen, as it were, as being outside historical contingency, with its instability and moments of discontinuation with the past, and as withdrawn from the active contribution of people and cultures.²³

This is undoubtedly a contestable point of view. Those in favor of the new developments in Vatican II with its *aggiornamento* point out that the past itself also shows moments of discontinuation. This is already evident from the history of theology as such: think for instance of the condemnation of Galileo, now repealed; of the revision of the theory that all people are descended from Adam and Eve; and of the anti-modernist oath, still firmly held on to by the Society of St. Pius X, but no longer compatible with the teachings of Vatican II. In addition, liturgical studies show that over the centuries one can indeed find substantial contributions from theologians, poets, musicians, masters of ceremony, experts and other specialists in ritual. Councils, monastic orders and committees have also been responsible for contributions and interventions, of a sometimes revolutionary nature. Also, discontinuations often come to light with the publication of new books, which usually start with the comment that they signal a revision.²⁴ And in ritual studies, too, it is assumed on the one hand

²³ For the movement of the 'Reform of the Reform', see also A. HÄUSSLING: 'Nachkonziliare Paradigmenwechsel und das Schicksal der Liturgiereform', in *Theologie der Gegenwart* 32 (1989) 243-254; P. POST: 'Over de historische referentie in de rooms-katholieke 'Hervorming-van-de-Hervormingsbeweging'', in *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 20 (2004) 73-88; M. KLÖCKENER: 'La dynamique du mouvement liturgique et de la réforme liturgique. Points communs et différences théologiques et spirituelles', in *La Maison-Dieu* 260 (2009) 92-106; J.F. BALDOVIN: 'Idols and icons: reflections on the current state of liturgical reform', in *Worship* 84/5 (2010) 386-402.

²⁴ M. KLÖCKENER: 'Wie Liturgie verstehen. Anfragen an das Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum* Papst Benedikts XVI', in M. KLÖCKENER, B. KRANEMANN & A. HÄUSSLING: *Liturgie verstehen. Ansatz, Ziele und Aufgaben der Liturgiewissenschaft* (= Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 50; Jubiläumssband) (Fribourg 2008) 294-295; M. KLÖCKENER & B. KRANEMANN (Hgs.): *Liturgiereformen: Historische Studien zu einem bleibenden Grundzug des christlichen Gottesdienstes*. 1. Biblische Modelle und Liturgiereformen von der Frühzeit bis zur Aufklärung; 2. Liturgiereformen seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart (= Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 88) (Münster 2002); A. ANGENENDT: *Liturgik und Historik. Gab es eine organische Liturgie-Entwicklung?* (=

that rituals sometimes develop and grow without any intervention, but on the other hand the contribution of ritual experts is also recognized.²⁵ There is certainly more to liturgy than the anonymous organic growth suggested by Benedict XVI.

In 2007, Benedict XVI issued the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum*, by no means an innocuous document.²⁶ This decree affects the essence of the whole post-conciliar liturgical reform: all books from before Vatican II are again allowed, as ‘extraordinary form’. As was to be expected, the document elicited many protests, particularly from within the mainstream of liturgical studies and from countries such as Germany, France and Switzerland, which had been confronted head-on with the ideas of the Society of St. Pius X. According to the *Motu Proprio*, the reintroduction of the Tridentine liturgy as ‘extraordinary form’ means that from now on there are two forms within one and the same rite. The same rite? This may be the case when viewed from a purely speculative and abstract theological perspective, but certainly not from an empirical point of view and in liturgical or ritual terms. There are definitely two different forms of *lex orandi*, which cannot be easily reconciled. Benedict’s radical intervention strikes at the base of the Second Vatican Council and threatens to discredit the Council’s first document, the *Constitution on the sacred liturgy*, and its implementation. The *Motu Proprio* undoubtedly adds to the tensions and polarizations within the field of liturgy, these days also referred to as a ‘battlefield’.²⁷ This

Quaestiones disputatae 189) (Freiburg/Basel/Wien 2001); A. ANGENENDT: ‘Wie im Anfang, so in Ewigkeit? Die tridentinische Liturgie. Die Liturgiereform: Beharren oder verändern?’, in A. GERHARDS (Hg.): *Ein Ritus – Zwei Formen. Die Richtlinie Papst Benedikts XVI zur Liturgie* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien 2008) 122-143.

²⁵ G. LUKKEN: *Rituelen in overvloed. Een kritische bezinning op de plaats en de gestalte van het christelijk ritueel in onze cultuur* (Baarn 1999) 54-55 and 186-188; IDEM: *Rituals in abundance. Critical reflections on the place, form and identity of Christian ritual in our culture* (= *Liturgia condenda* 17) (Leuven 2005) 48-49, 213 and 291-294; C. BELL: *Ritual theory, ritual practice* (New York/Oxford 1992) 130-140; IDEM: ‘The authority of ritual experts’, in *Studia liturgica* 23 (1993) 98-120 and 101-103; IDEM: *Ritual. Perspectives and dimensions* (Oxford 1997) 223.

²⁶ BENEDICTUS XVI: *Litterae Apostolicae motu proprio datae Summorum Pontificum* (July 7, 2007); IDEM: *Epistola ad Episcopos ad producendas Litteras Apostolicas motu proprio datas, de usu Liturgiae Romanae instaurationi anni 1970 praecedentis* (July 7, 2007).

²⁷ K. VAN SETTEN: ‘Spreekt onder elkaar in lofzangen. Een belichting van de onlangs verschenen ‘Evangelische Liedbundel’’, in *Eredienstwaardig* 16/4 (2000) 152-155; R. WEAKLAND: ‘The liturgy as battlefield’, in *Commonweal* (New York, January 11, 2002) = IDEM: ‘Liturgie zwischen Erneuerung und Restauration’, in *Heiliger Dienst* 56 (2002) 83-93 and *Stimmen der Zeit* 220 (2002) 475-487; T.W. YORK: *America’s worship wars* (Massachusetts 2003) x; N. VAN ANDEL & M. BARNARD: ‘Discourses in liturgy. De totstandkoming van het nieuwe protestantse liedboek (2012) vergeleken met de totstandkoming van het *Liedboek voor de Kerken* (1973) – een onderzoeks-presentatie’, in *Jaarboek voor*

battlefield is now the arena for the restorative movements of the extreme traditionalists and the neo-traditionalists with their own theological premises.

Besides these, there is the large influx of those who – in varying degrees – support the *aggiornamento* of Vatican II and wish to continue in Bugnini's footsteps, with an open mind to contemporary culture and the pluriform contributions of the local churches and communities. This influx, too, covers a number of specific theological choices.²⁸

5. Instead of battle preference for a dialogue about the tension between a bottom-up and top-down approach

For the discussion of those theological choices I prefer an open dialogue to a battle, but with the restriction that no concessions are made with respect to the principles of Vatican II – which are precisely those called in question by the Society of St. Pius X. In my opinion, it is essential that this dialogue starts from the theological premise that liturgy is always about sensory rituals that occur in the tension field of mediated transcendence. These rituals are not eternal, but are always interwoven with history and culture. The traditionalists erroneously speak of the time-determined Tridentine form of the liturgy as the 'eternal' liturgy. The question is whether the neo-traditionalists do not over-sacralize the form of the liturgy as well. Do advocates of the 'Reform of the Reform' not have a too divine view of its form?

On this subject John Baldovin correctly observes that we always have to ask ourselves what it is that we venerate and worship: the liturgy, or the God that it

liturgieonderzoek 25 (2009) 60-61. For a more extensive survey, see B. AULAGNIER: *La bataille de la messe, 1965-2005* (Versailles 2005).

²⁸ The tensions also refer to psychological dimensions that can be clarified from the ritual studies. There is the fact that rituals seem more reliable, as they are older. Hence the concern to conserve the form of the rituals in exquisite detail and regulated by refined rules (ANGENENDT: *Liturgik und Historik* 186-190; IDEM: 'Wie im Anfang, so in Ewigkeit?' 122-123). But on the other hand there is the fact that rituals, as soon as they are celebrated with heart and soul, and thus subjectivity enters, should also express the sincere heart of man. Then rituals will change. This is a known tension. Moreover, the perception of the invariability of rituals can be connected with the search for security and stability, especially in difficult circumstances and uncertain times. The more threatening the life or culture is, the more one looks for a stable ritual (ANGENENDT: *Liturgik und Historik* 186-188). Then to some it is of little importance whether these rituals are inculturated or comprehensible. They are in search of a sacred supernatural atmosphere. But this transcendent atmosphere, pleaded by the movement of the 'Reform of the Reform', may also be reflected in the new liturgy as such. In that liturgy pluralism certainly is possible.

focuses on.²⁹ The form of liturgy, however divine and God-given, is incarnated in history. It is not like a static whole that exists completely outside history. The dialogue should be about the tension between the bottom-up or top-down approaches, between *transascendence* and *transdescendence*, which each can have different accents. In our culture, however, we look for and discover the transcendent divine world rather from the bottom up, in a *transascendent* way starting from God's immanence, and discovered as that which transcends us, and as a fullness that comes to us and is received by us. That is why, in agreement with Vatican II, the advocates of *aggiornamento* emphasize a bottom-up approach to liturgy, associated with a similar bottom-up Christology, ecclesiology and view of holy office, and embedded in contemporary culture and the dynamics of history.³⁰ The day before the conclusion of the council on December 7, 1965, the most intensive and longest document of the council was accepted: the pastoral constitution on the Church in today's world, *Gaudium et spes*. That Constitution is explicit on the need to complete the perspective from inside, the approach from above and from the tradition with that of the outside perspective, from below and from the present. In our country, that change of perspective was taken seriously early on; it was actualized already in the sixties, also with regard to the Christian ritual.³¹

The advocates of *aggiornamento* are looking for a liturgical form which is accessible and credible, and which can be experienced by a contemporary audience. This bottom-up approach undoubtedly makes us also more responsive to the pluriform possibilities of the Christian ritual in our culture. Such a contemporary empirical ritual form by no means needs to be at the expense of its Christian identity. On the contrary, it is precisely in this inculturated liturgy that the ritual can be celebrated as a saturated phenomenon, that – according to the phenomenology of Jean-Luc Marion – is 'saturated' with 'givenness', comes from elsewhere, is irreducible, and precedes us. In this phenomenon an abundant and empathetic 'other side', oriented towards us, is revealed, and ultimately

²⁹ J.F. BALDOVIN: 'Klaus Gamber and the post-Vatican II reform of the Roman liturgy', in *Studia liturgica* 33/2 (2003) 229-230.

³⁰ Compare in this context C. BÖTTIGHEIMER: 'Koreferat zu Manfred Gerwing. Zur Würde der menschlichen Person im Zeugnis der Pastoralkonstitution *Gaudium et spes*', in BÖTTIGHEIMER & NAAB: *Weltoffen aus Treue* 75-80 and IDEM: 'Nicht von dieser Welt? Von der Kommunikationsfähigkeit der Kirche in der Bedeutung der Pastoralkonstitution *Gaudium et spes*', in *Ibidem* 81-113, p. 94 and 96-100 (Innen- und Aussenperspektive).

³¹ G. LUKKEN: 'Een kritische blik op het hedendaagse rituele landschap met het oog op het christelijk ritueel', in *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 22 (2006) 113-133; IDEM: 'Kritische Sichtung der heutigen rituellen Landschaft, im Blick auf das christliche Ritual', in B. KRANEMANN & P. POST (eds.): *Die modernen ritual studies als Herausforderung für die Liturgiewissenschaft / Modern ritual studies as a challenge for liturgical studies* (= *Liturgia condenda* 20) (Leuven 2009) 87-110.

a personal God, even the God of the Christian tradition, whose love precedes us.³²

Some will prefer to take the *transcendent* road and this is a legitimate choice. But they should be mindful of the tension with the anthropological basis of the liturgy. That basis, with all its resulting contingencies, cannot be excluded. God and man do not have to compete, not in any culture, and that includes our own. Time and again, it is a question of 'keeping on top' of the tension between the *Jenseits* and the *Diesseits* that occurs within the sensory immanence, both as regards ritual in general and the specific Christian ritual.³³ And in the dialogue it remains important to emphasize that the *transcendent* way seems to be more in keeping with the spirit of Vatican II.

Gerard Lukken (1933) studied at the Diocesan Seminary in Haaren (Noord Brabant) (1951-1957), the Pontificia Università Gregoriana in Rome and the Institut Supérieur de Liturgie in Paris (1959-1964). He was pastor and teacher of religion (1957-1959), professor of liturgy and theology of the sacraments at the Diocesan Seminary in Haaren (1964-1967) and at the Theological Faculty of Tilburg, (at present part of the department Cultural Studies, School of Humanities, Tilburg University) (from 1967), and director of the Liturgical Institute at the same Faculty (from 1992) until his retirement in 1994.

E-mail: g.m.lukken@gmail.com.

³² G. LUKKEN: 'De *overkant* van het menselijk ritueel. Herbezinning vanuit fenomenologie en semiotiek op antropologische en theologische lagen in het christelijk ritueel', in *Tijdschrift voor theologie* 40 (2001) 145-166 = IDEM: 'L' *autre côté* du rituel humain : reconsideration à partir de la phénoménologie et la sémiotique sur des couches anthropologiques et théologiques dans le rituel chrétien', in *Questions liturgiques* 83/1 (2001) 68-91; IDEM: 'De liefde gaat ons vooraf. De onherleidbare overkant van het ritueel als *prolegomenon* van het christelijk ritueel', in *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 23 (2007) 147-175. See further: J.-L. MARION: *Étant donné. Essai d'une phénoménologie de la donation* (Paris 1997); IDEM: *De surcroît. Études sur les phénomènes saturés* (Paris 2001); IDEM: *Le Phénomène érotique. Six méditations* (Paris 2003); IDEM: *Le visible et le révélé* (Paris 2005). And also BALDOVIN: 'Idols and icons' 386-402.

³³ G. LUKKEN: 'Rituelen: een dynamisch grensgebied', in *Tijdschrift voor geestelijk leven* 63/2 (2007) 59-68.

