

of the 1970s there were those who objected to the idea of liturgy as “action” because they thought it placed an undue emphasis on human activity instead of on God’s work through the means of grace.⁴ Obviously, liturgy is a work performed by a person or a community, so human action is unavoidable. It is a human act to read scriptures, preach sermons, baptize, or proclaim the words of institution, even though we confess that the Holy Spirit works through these means of grace to create or awaken faith. One may also say that liturgy, like all the activities of the church, is inspired or engendered by the Holy Spirit. For this reason the chief service has been called “the divine liturgy” (e.g. the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom). I hope this dead-end intra-Lutheran debate of the 1970s doesn’t rear its head again, but since theological controversies never go away but just lie dormant for a while, I’m not optimistic we won’t have to expend energy on it again as the ELCA’s Renewing Worship resources are published.

The term liturgy was widely defined in the 1960s and 1970s as “the public work of the people of God.” The term “liturgy” was preferred to “worship” since it refers to rite, which is a more comprehensive term than prayer for what the community does when it gathers to do its work before God, the world, and with one another.⁵

Liturgical renewal, in this sense, means the renewal of the acts of assembling, of hearing the word of God, of praying for the needs of all, of celebrating the sacraments of Christ, and of being dismissed into the world to live and share the gospel. Since the church is defined in Reformation confessions as the assembly for word and sacraments, the renewal of the church’s liturgy is also the renewal of the church as *ekklesia*—the assembly “called out” of the world to do the divine liturgy “for the life of the world.”⁶

⁴See Oliver K. Olson, “Liturgy as ‘Action,’” *dialog* 14 (1975): 108–13.

⁵See Aidan Kavanagh, *Elements of Rite: A Handbook of Liturgical Style* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1982).

⁶Let me note in passing that this year is also the fortieth anniversary of the first publication of the little book by Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1973), which was written as a study book for the National Student Christian Federation in 1963. Father Schmemmann’s book was a polemic against the theologies of secularism prevalent at that time as well as a liturgical theology. Harvey Cox’s *The Secular City* and the “death of God” theologies of the 1960s are no longer read, but Schmemmann’s book has become a beloved classic.

Renewal required both retrieving and creating liturgical material suitable for the church's life together before God and the world. Much had been recovered during the century of liturgical scholarship that preceded the Second Vatican Council. One thinks of the recovery of Gregorian chant and the revitalization of the church year in the nineteenth century associated with Dom Prosper Guéranger and the Benedictine Revival, the fostering of congregational participation in worship (especially in singing) in the *Motu Proprio* of Pope Pius X in 1903, and the restoration of the liturgies of the Triduum to their proper times of celebration in 1956. (Remember that by the end of the Middle Ages and up until the 1950s the Liturgies of Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and the Easter Vigil of Holy Saturday were celebrated in the mornings of those days!) In Catholicism there was some reform in practice well before the Second Vatican Council was convened.

In Lutheranism, one thinks of the liturgical recovery in the nineteenth century, the remarkable achievement of the Common Service of 1888 and its inclusion in the English language worship books of various Lutheran church bodies in North America, and the fact that the people learned to participate in the service by singing the chants and hymns in a way that would have put sixteenth-century Lutheran worshipers to shame. The *Service Book and Hymnal* of 1958 was both a culmination of this movement and a real transitional book. It was the high water mark of the recovery of historic Lutheran liturgical orders and practices, but it was also an introduction to the ecumenical dimensions of the liturgical recovery in the twentieth century.

“The Public Work of the People” before and after CSL and LBW

The point of this recovery of liturgy as “the public work of the people” was to engender a more corporate sense of worship and of life together in the community of faith that would combat the individualism that had pervaded modern Western culture since the Enlightenment. The individualistic spirit of modern Western society and the communitarian spirit of the liturgy are antithetical. This is why the liturgical movement was initially a counter-cultural movement, especially in North America.⁷

Liturgical spirituality is essentially a corporate or ecclesial spirituality. It is not surprising that liturgical recovery went hand-in-hand with the recovery of ecclesiology, the doctrine of the church. The twentieth century

⁷See Frank C. Senn, “What Has Become of the Liturgical Movement? Its Origins, Current Situation, and Future Prospects,” *Pro Ecclesia* 6 (1997): 319–32.

has been called in the history of Christian thought the age of the church. In the last volume of his history of the development of Christian doctrine, Jaroslav Pelikan entitled the last chapter “The Sobermost of the Body of Christ” and highlighted the renewal of ecclesiology, the theological resources for Christian unity (including liturgical renewal), the struggle for the redemption of society, and *The Constitution on the Church* of the Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium*.⁸ Corollary with this, Ernest B. Koenker, in his definitive (and prescient) study of the liturgical movement in the Roman Catholic Church, documented the relationship of liturgical renewal to the struggle for a sense of community in the modern world and the new, organic concept of the church as the mystical body of Christ.⁹ As part of this effort I would include the fascination liturgists developed for the study of ritual, because these studies demonstrated the significant role ritual played in establishing community identity and cohesion. I remember attending the conference on “The Roots of Ritual” sponsored by the Murphy Center for Liturgical Research at the University of Notre Dame in 1973.¹⁰ Liturgists have been concerned to understand better how ritual works in order to engage worshipers more consciously and actively in the act of liturgical worship.

It was felt that ways had to be found to engage people more actively in worship because people began dropping out of church life in droves during and after the 1960s, both in Europe and in North America. Some left as a matter of principle; many more left simply because they found something more exciting, and worship was boring in comparison. Here’s a voice from the 1960s:

One fine Sunday some of us stopped going to Mass, not because Catholic dogma seemed to us, all of a sudden, false, but because the people who went began to bore us and we were drawn to the company of those who stayed away ... What characterized our revolt was the choice of comrades ... Without the slightest attempt at resistance, indeed with the well-known fervor of neophytes, one accepts the language, symbols, organization, discipline, tactics, program and doctrine of the party to which one’s new comrades belong. It is hardly surprising that rarely should anything learned in the catechism and schoolbooks hinder one’s docile acceptance

⁸Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (since 1700)*, vol. 5 of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 282ff.

⁹ Ernest Benjamin Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church*, 2d. ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), 32ff.

¹⁰See James Shaughnessy, ed., *The Roots of Ritual* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973).

of the new orthodoxy. Indeed, one does not even feel the need of refuting them, because all of that has become part of the world one has left behind. They are neither true nor false; they are “bourgeois,” dead leaves....¹¹

While Ignaz Silone and millions of others were leaving the church because they were bored, the great liturgical theologian Romano Guardini was asking his famous question,

Is not the liturgical act ... so bound up with historical background—antique or medieval or baroque—that it would be more honest to give it up altogether? Would it not be better to admit that man in this industrial and scientific age, with its new sociological structure, is no longer capable of the liturgical act? And instead of talking of renewal, ought we not to consider how best to celebrate the sacred mysteries so that the modern man can grasp their meaning through his own approach to truth?¹²

How can the liturgy be celebrated so that modern people can understand it in terms of their own approach to reality? This was an issue that engaged the leaders of liturgical renewal in the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Anglican Churches during the last forty years (we should include the Anglicans in this discussion since *The Book of Common Prayer* of the Episcopal Church will be twenty-five years old next year). Part of the strategy of making liturgy “relevant” to “modern man” was peeling away centuries of development in order to allow the basic liturgical tradition to stand in clearer relief and to give the liturgy a more streamlined and “intelligible” shape. The schismatic Hippolytus, if indeed he was the author of *The Apostolic Tradition*, became a source of Christian unity as his order of initiation and eucharistic prayers were repristinated in twentieth-century worship books. What we have learned since the work of Josef Jungmann and Gregory Dix is that early Christian worship was more diverse than we imagined. We cannot point to just one “early church.” Nor did liturgy develop in a linear or unidirectional way.¹³

Not only were we interested in recovering aspects of early Christian worship; we also had to deal pastorally with the profound cultural changes

¹¹Ignaz Silone, *This Is My Philosophy*; quoted by Edgar S. Brown, Jr., “The Worship of the Church and the Modern Man,” in *Liturgical Renewal in the Christian Churches*, ed. Michael J. Taylor (Baltimore: Helicon, 1967), 199.

¹²Quoted by Clement J. McNaspy, *Our Changing Liturgy* (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday Image Books, 1967), 13–14.

¹³See Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2d. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Western societies were experiencing in the 1960s and 1970s when it was difficult to achieve consensus on anything. How could the cultures of which twentieth-century worshipers were a part find expression in our liturgies? We must honestly admit that the changes sought in liturgical language to avoid artificial euphony, the uses of more popular musical styles, and experiments with liturgical space in the 1960s and 1970s were not designed primarily to connect with the unchurched. For many people in the church the old words had become stale, the music lugubrious, and the spaces constrictive. We were looking for ways to bring the liturgy to life, for which the former Bishop of Woolwich, John A. T. Robinson, had written a manifesto even before the Second Vatican Council was convened: *Liturgy Coming of Life*.¹⁴

This slender work aimed at a more action-oriented liturgy by popularizing the so-called “four-fold shape” of the eucharistic liturgy proposed by Dom Gregory Dix and enshrined in several denominational worship books. We were bidden to gather around a table rather than before an altar, take real bread and a loving cup of wine, give thanks over them using early Christian patterns of prayer, break the bread, distribute the elements to one another, and then be dismissed into the world to do the mission of God. We saw a connection between liturgical action and social action, between doing the politics of the kingdom of God in the liturgical assembly and pursuing our political responsibility in the world. Liturgical renewal not only went hand-in-hand with church renewal but also with the renewal of society. As time went on we came to understand that responding to the cries for justice in society had to be matched by instances of justice enacted in our liturgy, especially in terms of racial and gender equality in the liturgical assembly as well as the inclusion of the marginalized, such as children and the poor. Holy Communion was “social dynamite.”

CSL and LBW: Promoting the Agenda of Renewal

Both *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* and *Lutheran Book of Worship* projected a vision of the people of God exercising their baptismal priesthood by participating actively in the liturgy of the church. The constitution was a set of principles projecting a unified vision of the church’s liturgical life; it was not a liturgical book. The principles expressed in CSL needed to be incarnated in liturgical books, such as the

¹⁴See John A. T. Robinson, *Liturgy Coming to Life* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960).

Roman Missal: Sacramentary and Lectionary (1969, 1970), the Breviary, and the rites of the Ritual and the Pontifical (Lutherans would call these “Occasional Services”). An impressive array of talent worked on the Roman Catholic rites on the global, international, and national levels. *Lutheran Book of Worship* was a liturgical book, not a set of principles. But its notes, rubrics, orders, and texts also projected a vision of the church’s liturgical life. The ILCW enlisted the participation of a wide spectrum of Lutheran liturgical, theological, and musical talent. While CSL and LBW attended to the needs of the church body for which it was intended, they also shared in common certain principles and practices.

One of the constitution’s primary principles was the promotion of liturgical instruction and active participation in the liturgy. The implementation of CSL spawned a growth industry of liturgical research and the training of liturgical professionals so that Roman Catholic seminaries had competent liturgy teachers. This has also been the case in Lutheran seminaries in North America. The hope was that better trained pastors would also provide liturgical instruction for the laity and help them to participate more knowledgeably and actively in the liturgical rites. The LBW also provided for the use of assisting ministers who might be lay persons. This practice fostered an awareness of the priesthood of believers, and the use of multiple roles gave the liturgy a more corporate character.

The rites themselves, said the constitution, “should be distinguished by a noble simplicity. They should be short, clear, and free from useless repetitions. They should be within the people’s powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation.”¹⁵ Liturgy should be accessible to the people whose public work it is. Its shape should be clearly discerned. Perhaps most significantly, “since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended” (36:2). The Constitution opened the door to the use of vernacular languages in Catholic worship. So completely has the vernacular been extended that Latin Masses are hard to find, even though Latin remains the *editio typica*.

This situation indicates that the implementation of CSL sometimes went beyond (and some would say in directions different from) what the constitution envisioned. For example, to facilitate the participation of the

¹⁵*The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, I.34 in *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, 12.

people, music of a folk character was quickly developed. It must be admitted that the music was not always of a high quality, at least in the first decades into the reform. Mistakes were made that Roman Catholic worship is still paying for: many choirs felt that they no longer had a role in the liturgy and disbanded; classically trained musicians, especially organists, wondered if their years of preparation were worth anything; Gregorian chant was treated as something only right-wing recalcitrants would be interested in. Yet this was all quite different from what the constitution envisioned in terms of preserving the treasury of sacred music, promoting choirs, noting the high esteem in which the pipe organ was held in the Latin church and the pride of place given to Gregorian chant in Roman Catholic music. Nevertheless, recognition of the need to develop the use of indigenous music in mission lands opened the door even in North America to the musical development we have seen in the Roman Catholic Church.

The worship wars over what music to sing really began in meetings of Roman Catholic liturgy teams before they hit Protestant churches. The disagreements in these parish committees reflected, as Aidan Kavanagh lamented, “not so much a theological or liturgical rationale as a certain American middle-class attitude, which is more-or-less continually distrustful of expertise, experience, authority, and tradition.”¹⁶ The situation hasn’t been much different in Lutheran congregations.

It must also be admitted that the vision of LBW has not been fully implemented in many Lutheran congregations, and the inroads of the church growth movement since the 1980s has not helped this situation. Certainly one can find many congregations in which the vision of liturgical life projected in LBW has been put into practice. But in other congregations the LBW orders were simply accommodated to existing liturgical patterns. With the onslaught of the church growth movement, the place of the historic liturgy in many congregations has become tenuous, if not non-existent. As we survey the current liturgical scene, baptism is still not always accorded its premier place of celebration within the Service of Holy Communion or its prime time of celebration on major festivals such as Easter (the Vigil), Pentecost, and the Epiphany (The Baptism of our Lord). The triunity of church, Sunday, and the Eucharist has still not been reconnected in many congregations. I don’t know how widespread the practice of weekly celebration of Holy Communion is, but I would hazard

¹⁶Aidan Kavanagh, “Reflections on the Study from the Viewpoint of Liturgical History,” in *The Awakening Church: 25 Years of Liturgical Renewal*, ed. Lawrence J. Madden (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 85.

the guess it has not yet passed fifty percent of our congregations. Pastors feel free to chop up the liturgical order in ways that pay no attention to the sound suggestions of the Notes on the Liturgy on how to utilize built-in options and variations for seasons and occasions. After twenty-five years, the liturgies of the Triduum (buried away in the Ministers Desk Edition) have not yet been tried in some congregations. Instead of the Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter Vigil liturgies, we find christianized Passover Seders,¹⁷ ersatz Good Friday Tenebrae services, and Easter sunrise services.

In some ways and in some parts of the Lutheran church, liturgical life was more solidly established before than since the publication of LBW. This is not the fault of LBW. It is a reflection of such factors as the increasing lack of denominational loyalty and discipline since the 1960s, which is partly the result of religious as well as social mobility; the rise of the authority of subjectivity since the 1950s, which in liturgical matters allows local options generated by committee or sheer pastoral whim to trump the consensus of the church catholic; and the use of the liturgy to serve non-liturgical purposes, such as Christian education programs, evangelism strategies, stewardship campaigns, social action, and other worthy causes. Again, these cultural realities have also had an impact on Roman Catholic parochial worship. In the light of this situation we may well ask whether what has been accomplished in the past generation of liturgical renewal that can serve as the basis for future liturgical work.

Past Accomplishments as the Basis for Future Liturgical Work

This will obviously be my own assessment of the major accomplishments in liturgical reform and renewal since CSL and LBW as well as what *should* serve as the basis of future liturgical work. I will try to identify those accomplishments that Roman Catholics and Lutherans share in common, and where necessary, note differences both in what has been achieved and what must yet be done.

The recovery of the Paschal Mystery as the heart of Christian liturgy and life, including the priority of Sunday as the day of resurrection, should rank as a major achievement. In the future we will need to reassess the Lutheran practice of replacing “ordinary Sundays” with lesser festivals,

¹⁷See Frank C. Senn, “Should Christians Celebrate the Passover?” in *Passover and Easter: The Symbolic Structuring of Sacred Seasons*, vol. 6 of *Two Liturgical Traditions*, ed. Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 183–205.

which Roman Catholics and Episcopalians no longer do. Lutherans and Roman Catholics also need to find more appropriate ways to identify those Sundays.

Related to this, the recovery of the Triduum (the liturgies of Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and the Easter Vigil) as the high point of the liturgical year has been a significant development for both Roman Catholics and Lutherans. Lutherans had these liturgies in a supplement to the *Service Book and Hymnal* as early as 1962, so they were not new in LBW Ministers Desk Edition. But in the future, further work needs to be done on many minute details related to the structures and texts of these liturgies.

Our traditions have recovered Lent as a time of catechesis as well as a time of penitence (the focus on the Passion belongs to Holy Week). I would list as next in importance the restoration of a full ritual process of Christian initiation based on ancient models. This proved to be the “sleeper” among the reformed Roman rites. Intended for use in the mission churches, the Rite for the Christian Initiation of Adults (1972) has proven valuable for the mission field in North America as well. It has taken North American Lutheranism more than twenty years to discover this liturgical answer to the church growth movement. The LBW Order for Baptism, inspired by the so-called *Apostolic Tradition*, was a splendid contribution to the revision of the Liturgy of Holy Baptism and needs only moderate tinkering to make it better. We also need hymns appropriate to Lenten themes of conversion, pilgrimage, and repentance.

The three-year Roman Lectionary for Sundays and festivals has been Catholicism’s greatest gift to Protestant biblical preaching. We are aware, however, that European Lutherans have not adopted a version of the Roman Lectionary and that the Revised Common Lectionary has created a divergence in the Old Testament readings and psalms on the Sundays after Pentecost even among North American churches. The likelihood of the Roman Church embracing the Revised Common Lectionary for ecumenical purposes seems remote.

Related to the lectionary, I welcome the fact that both Roman Catholic and Lutheran working groups are developing a three-year series of prayers of the day to correlate with these readings, although it is unlikely that we will share the same texts.

The development of common texts that have been shared in several Christian traditions has been an important ecumenical achievement. In the 1970s the International Consultation on English Texts provided common English translations of canticles, prayers, and responses that were adopted

and used in the worship books of several denominations and throughout the English-speaking world. Not only did this make it possible for Christians to be more comfortable worshipping with one another, but it was possible to borrow one another's musical settings. This consensus is now threatened by the fact that churches are now working independently of each other on their own revised liturgical books. *Liturgiam Authenticam* calls for translations that are more literally faithful to the Latin archetype, largely ignoring vernacular cultural nuances, and non-Roman churches are requiring that texts use inclusive or expansive God-language. ELCA and ELCiC Lutherans and English-speaking Roman Catholics will find their liturgical speech moving farther apart rather than closer together.

After nearly fifteen hundred years of using one eucharistic canon or order, the provision of multiple eucharistic prayers was a significant area of reform for both Roman Catholics and Lutherans. Both the Roman Missal and LBW, in their several editions, provide multiple eucharistic prayers. In the future we need to explore various traditions of eucharistic praying. For the Roman Catholic Church this would include the West Syrian anaphora tradition that has so much influenced Protestant eucharistic prayers. *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* says that "in faithful obedience to tradition, the sacred Council declares that Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully recognized rites to be of equal right and dignity; that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way."¹⁸ In a remarkable application of this principle, a document entitled "Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist Between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East" prepared by the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (July 20, 2001), the Eucharist celebrated by these historic churches of the East which use the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, was approved. Since this ancient Semitic eucharistic tradition does not include the Words of Institution, we can only imagine what a theological bomb has been set off with regard to established scholastic theories of eucharistic consecration.

The recovery of "cathedral" forms of Morning and Evening Prayer, especially Vespers, has been a great contribution of LBW that yet needs to be considered by Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, whose orders of

¹⁸*The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, Introduction, 4 in *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, 2.

daily prayer still betray a monastic influence.¹⁹ We still need a refinement of the course of psalms and readings for the daily prayer of the church.

The acceptance of a variety of musical styles was a giant step forward for Lutherans. LBW offered three complete musical settings of the Service of Holy Communion. Additional musical settings in a variety of styles have followed. Many musical settings have been published in various Catholic hymnals. In addition, we have all become accustomed to singing hymns written in different styles as well as multicultural songs (African-American, Hispanic, African, etc.), as well as the psalms, canticles, and liturgical mantras from the Taizé Community in France. In North America we sing one another's liturgical songs. In the future, however, I would hope that there would be some effort to recover and adapt a common core of Western liturgical chant that can provide an ecumenical form of Christian music.

Finally, the use of lay assisting ministers remains one of the great achievements of LBW. Unfortunately, we have not always been diligent in discerning the gift of public presence or in honing the skills that are needed for the competent performance of this ministry. Moreover, the Roman Catholic Church now experiences the widespread use of lay *presiding* ministers in the absence of priests. This is an ominous situation for the future of Roman Catholic liturgy since, at least in this country, it portends a Protestantization of worship practices with an emphasis on Services of the Word and hymn singing and a reduced appeal to sacramental reality. While communion can be administered from the reserved sacrament, the eucharistic heart of Christian life is in danger of being lost. David N. Power has recently suggested that Catholics might experiment with forms of popular religious devotion that have often been lay-led and that appeal to Roman Catholic religious identity and sensibility as a counter to the tendency to retreat from the apprehension of sacramental reality.²⁰

By laying out items I believe are solid foundations on which to build for the future, I hope I have demonstrated that I have no interest in returning to some liturgical "golden age" of the past when I raise the last question in this address. It would be a mistake for Lutherans to return to the *Common Service Book* or for Catholics to return to the Tridentine

¹⁹I devoted a whole chapter to the distinction between "cathedral" and "monastic" offices in *The Pastor As Worship Leader: A Manual for Corporate Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing Company, 1977), 31ff.

²⁰See David N. Power, "Worship in the Absence of a Priest," *New Theology Review* 15/4 (2002): 29–40.

Mass and Rituale. If the reforms of the Second Vatican Council and the renewal represented by the LBW have suffered from reductionism, misinterpretation, and poor implementation in actual practice, the same may be said of earlier manifestations of Roman Catholic and Lutheran liturgy. Even those of us who grew up in congregations that used *Service Book and Hymnal* seldom tapped into its riches. Its Elizabethan/Jacobean language makes some of its treasures irretrievable. Nevertheless, the question must finally be asked as we move on to the next generation of liturgical resources: What has been lost that needs to be retrieved in the next generation of liturgical life?

Retrieving the Lost for the Next Generation

This list could be as long as the list of achievements, and perhaps even more subjective. So let me instead limit myself to one idea: that what must be retrieved is a memory that honors the past and prepares us for the future.

Certainly CSL defended the role of “sound tradition” in the liturgy, but it largely envisioned a repriming of the Roman rite to, as it says, “the vigor they had in the days of the holy Fathers.”²¹ Just where the patristic age ended has never been agreed upon by church historians. Yet, combined with an emphasis in adjacent clauses in the constitution on simplification of rites, and the discarding of duplications or superfluous later additions in the work of the Concilium for Implementing the Constitution, this reference to “the time of the holy fathers” served to provide a normative standard for liturgical reform. This need not be taken merely as the triumph of the spirit of the Enlightenment in the modern Catholic Church, as Aidan Nichols suggested;²² all reform movements have been animated by a desire to return to origins. But the leap-frogging behind the Middle Ages into the first millennium, with pride of place given to the third and fourth centuries, constituted, in retrospect, too much sanitization of liturgical development. To the extent that Lutheranism followed suit, at least in LBW, this created a problem since classical Lutheran liturgy at its best (e.g. Luther’s *Formula Missae*) is a reverent critique and reform precisely of the Western medieval liturgy. We could not eschew medieval liturgy without forsaking our own tradition.

²¹*The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, II.50 in *Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, 17.

²²See Aidan Nichols, *Looking at the Liturgy: A Critical View of Its Contemporary Form* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996).

The demedievalization of the Western liturgy has created a problem of historical amnesia of giant proportions for the generation that has grown up since 1963 and 1979. To a great extent, this generation has been cut off from what went before it in order to be in touch with a time that can never be their own in anything other than an artificial sense. Is this generation better off liturgically, theologically, or spiritually because they don't know what an Introit was or the corresponding Latin names of the Sundays (especially of Advent, Lent, and Easter), or that the psalms were concluded with the *Gloria Patri* (except during Holy Week, when it was suppressed), or that the presence of Christ's body and blood sacramentally united with bread and wine on the altar (as signaled by the elevation) should reduce one to an attitude of profound reverence? It's no wonder that many post-modern youth are now searching for what they think they missed in the rationalistic worship in which they grew up. They know they won't find it in Willow Creek-style contemporary worship.

If CSL was guilty of the "archaeologism" Pope Pius XII warned against in his 1947 encyclical, *Mediator Dei*, it did offer a memory of the future *parousia* of Christ—that is, a memory that this is what Christians gather to celebrate and anticipate. The Vatican II document declares: "In the earthly liturgy we take part in a foretaste of that heavenly liturgy which is celebrated in the Holy City of Jerusalem towards which we journey as pilgrims, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of God, Minister of the holies and of the true tabernacle. With all the warriors of the heavenly army we sing a hymn of glory to the Lord; venerating the memory of the saints, we hope for some part and fellowship with them; we eagerly await the Saviour, Our Lord Jesus Christ, until he our life shall appear and we too will appear with him in glory."²³ There are eschatological aspects in the LBW eucharistic liturgy, including a new canticle based on Revelation 4-5, the offertory song "Let the vineyards be fruitful," and the memorial acclamation and *mananatha* in Great Thanksgivings I and II.²⁴ Jean Corbon's *Liturgie de Source* (1980), translated into English as *The Wellspring of Worship*, can be regarded as a sustained commentary on the eighth section of *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. Corbon's presentation of future eschatology is not set over against the realized eschatology one often finds in liturgical theology, especially in the East, because, as Corbon puts it, "we are 'already' in the eternal liturgy, its

²³*The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, I.8 in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, 5.

²⁴Eugene L. Brand, "New Accents in Baptism and the Eucharist," in *Worship: Good News in Action*, 73f., 87f.

current carries us the more impatiently to its consummation.”²⁵ In the Apocalypse of St. John, the prayers of the martyrs beneath the heavenly altar is precisely: How long? How long before the parousia comes upon us for which the Spirit and the bride call “Come!”? It is because the earthly liturgy is even now the breakthrough of the heavenly liturgy that the church is propelled, in word and sacrament, toward her final encounter with her Lord.

Even apart from the yearning of the younger generations for more of a sense of mystery and transcendence, of mysticism and ecstasy, perhaps even of fantasy in worship than has been evoked in much of modern Western (especially suburban) liturgy, our liturgies ought to reflect theologically and ritually something of that glorious consummation of all things when Christ “comes again as victorious Lord of all.” When we enter the place of the assembly and participate in the divine liturgy there should be a sense that we are crossing the threshold from one reality to another. This should be reflected in the ambience of the place, the sense of procession into the dimension of the kingdom of God, the enduring quality of the language, and the ethereal quality of the music. We do not need simplification as much as amplification; we do not need minimalism as much as maximalism, an experience of *pleroma*, the fullness of the One who fills all in all.

The liturgy should convey nothing less than a world view, a view of what life is like under the reign of Christ, in the presence of God, in the communion of the Holy Spirit, a world view that competes with the world views worshipers bring with them to the assembly. In its expressions of praise and prayer and its work of catechesis and formation, the liturgy as “the public work of the people” should generate what every social group produces: a culture by which its beliefs, values, and institutions are transmitted from one generation to another.²⁶ We need to take this into account as we consider what needs must be met and what needs renewal.

²⁵Jean Corbon, *The Wellspring of Worship*, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1988), 42.

²⁶See Frank C. Senn, *New Creation: A Liturgical Worldview* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).