

## VAGAGGINI AND CONGAR ON THE LITURGY AND THEOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Introduction

One striking feature of the documents of the Second Vatican Council is the extent to which liturgical texts and rites are quoted and alluded to in the body and footnotes of the promulgated constitutions, declarations, and decrees.<sup>2</sup> In addition to those found in the liturgical constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, extensive liturgical citations appear in *Lumen Gentium* and *Presbyterorum Ordinis* in addition to occasional citations in *Ad Gentes* and *Gaudium et Spes*.<sup>3</sup> For the Council Fathers, then, the liturgy appears to be

1. I am grateful to Christopher Ruddy, Andrew Cuff, and Gabriel Torretta, o.p., for their conversations which set the stage for the development of this essay, and to the anonymous reviewers who have enriched the redaction of this essay.

2. For a helpful guide to the complexities of the theological and historical interpretation of the Second Vatican Council, see Gavin D'Costa, "Interpreting the Interpreters," *Vatican II: Catholic Doctrines on Jews and Muslims* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 10-58. For a brief consideration of the footnote references of Vatican II, see Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2004) 12-14, 47-48; Ormond Rush, "Toward a Comprehensive Interpretation of the Council and Its Documents," *Theological Studies* 73 (2012) 547-569, at 560. For an example of a detailed study of the use of a particular source in the main text and footnotes of the preparatory documents and promulgated texts of Vatican II, see Anthony Dupont, "The Authority of Augustine of Hippo at the Second Vatican Council: A Comparative Analysis of the Use of Augustine in the Preparatory and the Promulgated Documents," *La théologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau: La réception des mouvements préconciliaires à Vatican II*, ed. Gilles Routhier – Philippe J. Roy – Karim Schelkens, Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 95 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Collège Érasme, 2011) 11-48.

3. See especially SC 2, 5, 10, 12, 47, 77; LG 6, 19, 21, 26, 28, 36, 39, 41, 50, 51, 52, 66; AG 8, 14; PO 2, 4, 7, 11, 13, 19, 22; GS 22, 39, 52. In preparing this list, I have made use of the "Index of Liturgical Books" provided on p. 1212 of Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed and Ward – Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990) 1213. It should be noted that the Tanner index does not take into account the alternative titles used in the conciliar texts for two of liturgical books, thus listing two liturgical books under four titles: the Leonine Sacramentary is the same as the *Sacramentarium Veronense* and the Gelasian Sacramentary is the same as the

relevant for a wide range of topics, ranging from ecclesiology and the priesthood to the missionary activity of the Church.<sup>4</sup> In this light, several questions present themselves: What are the sources of the liturgical sources of the Council, in terms of the individuals and groups who contributed to the redaction of the documents and the theological movements that gave rise to this liturgical emphasis? How did the Council Fathers determine which texts to feature, and how should a contemporary theologian interpret this aspect of the conciliar texts? More broadly speaking, what role should the liturgy play in the work of theologians today?

This essay will initiate a response to these questions by examining the life and thought of two Conciliar *periti* whose publications were widely influential before the Council and who made major contributions to the redaction of these documents during the Council itself: Cipriano Vagaggini (1909-1999) and Yves Congar (1904-1996). Although known today principally as a liturgist, Vagaggini made important contributions in the fields of patristic studies and theological criteriology. Likewise, Congar, although known today especially for his work on ecclesiology and ecumenism, was an influential figure in the French Liturgical Movement and was immersed in the life of the liturgy as well as in the research of his liturgist colleagues.

Although Congar and Vagaggini come from different theological and ecclesial backgrounds, it is fruitful to consider their work in tandem in order to come to a deeper understanding of the *status quaestionis* of the relationship between the liturgy and theology on the eve of the Council so as to identify both potential material sources for the conciliar teaching as well as to provide theological methodology for accurately assessing the significance of the liturgy in both the conciliar documents and in the wider theological enterprise. In this essay, I will provide a biographical overview for Vagaggini and Congar as well as an analysis of their understanding of the relationship between liturgy and theology as articulated in books published in the years immediately preceding the Second Vatican Council. I will conclude by analyzing the use of liturgical texts in the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium* in light of the theoretical expositions of the interaction between liturgy and theology found in Congar and Vagaggini.

*Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae.* Cf. Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, transl. William Storey – Niels Rasmussen (Portland, OR: Pastoral Press, 1986) 38-39, 65.

4. Important liturgical and sacramental themes are found throughout the documents of the council even when there are not quotations or citations of particular liturgical texts and rites. See, for instance, the important treatments of liturgy in DV 8 and DV 23. This paper does not intend to offer an exhaustive treatment of every instance of liturgical and sacramental themes found in the conciliar texts.

## 2. Cipriano Vagaggini on the Liturgy and Theology

### 2.1. *Life and Ministry*

Leonello Vagaggini was born on October 3, 1909 in Piancastagnaio in the province of Siena, Italy.<sup>5</sup> After an early education at the Benedictine Abbey of Saint-André in Bruges, Belgium, Leonello became a monk of Saint-André and made profession in 1928 with the religious name Cipriano. After a broad education including doctorates in philosophy and theology and studies in patristics, Vagaggini published widely and taught for many years in Rome, Bologna, and Milan, focusing on liturgical theology, monastic spirituality, and theological methodology.<sup>6</sup> Vagaggini served as a *peritus* for the liturgical commission in preparation for Vatican II from 1959-1962, as a conciliar *peritus* from 1962-1965, and as a member of the *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra liturgia* from 1964-1967.<sup>7</sup> After a further period teaching and serving as rector at Sant'Anselmo in Rome and as a member of the International Theological Commission and as a consultant to the Congregation for Education, Vagaggini transferred to the Camaldolese Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict in 1977, residing first at the Villa La Mausolea in the province of Arezzo and finally at the monastery of Camaldoli from 1991 until his death on January 18, 1999.<sup>8</sup>

First published in Italian in 1957, Cipriano Vagaggini's *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy* provides a vast overview of the field of liturgical theology that aims to "shed some light upon the nature of liturgy, the place which it occupies in the general plan of salvation in connection with the general laws which govern this plan, and its relationship to the Bible, to

5. For a brief biographical account of Vagaggini, which I have relied on here, see Giordano Remondi, "Dom Cipriano Vagaggini, osb.cam.," *Rivista liturgica* 96 (2009) 335-347; for further details on Vagaggini's education and teaching apostolates, see Elena Massimi, "Cipriano Vagaggini. Bio-bibliografia di un maestro del pensiero teologico," *Rivista liturgica* 96 (2009) 437-448. The Abbey of Saint-André played a prominent role in the liturgical movement of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; cf. N. N. Huyghebaert, "Saint-André-Lez-Bruges, Abbey of," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed., vol. 12 (Detroit, MI: Gale, 2003) 533.

6. Remondi, "Dom Cipriano Vagaggini, osb.cam.," 336-337. For a bibliography of Vagaggini's writings, see Camilo Profiro da Silva and Manlio Sodi, "Bibliografia di Cipriano Vagaggini," *Rivista liturgica* 96 (2009) 461-471.

7. For examinations of Vagaggini's contributions to Vatican II, see Angelo Lameri, "Un «perito» a servizio del concilio e della riforma liturgica promossa dal Vaticano II," *Rivista liturgica* 96 (2009) 348-361; Enrico Galavotti, "Verso una nuova era liturgica: Apunti sul contributo di Cipriano Vagaggini al concilio Vaticano II," *Teologia in un regime di simboli: Scritti in onore di Cipriano Vagaggini, 1909-1999*, ed. Matteo Ferrari – Giordano Remondi (Camaldoli, Arezzo: Edizioni Camaldoli, 2011) 56-93.

8. Massimi, "Cipriano Vagaggini. Bio-bibliografia," 448.

theology, and to the spiritual and pastoral life.”<sup>9</sup> In the preface of the Fourth Edition, published in 1965, Vagaggini suggests that the basic conceptions of his 1957 work have been confirmed by the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.<sup>10</sup> While not attempting to fully adjudicate this claim or synthesize the whole of Vagaggini’s liturgical theology, in this section I will examine Vagaggini’s articulation of the role of the liturgy as a source for theology.

## 2.2. *Liturgy as a Source for Theology in Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy*

In part four of *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy*, titled “Liturgy, Faith, and Theology,” Vagaggini gives an exposition of the relationship between liturgy and theology throughout the history of the Church and offers suggestions for the appropriate use of the liturgy in contemporary theology.<sup>11</sup> Throughout this part of the book, Vagaggini makes frequent recourse to major figures of the Catholic biblical, liturgical, and theological renewals of the mid-twentieth century, including Chenu, Congar, Daniélou, Schillebeeckx, and von Balthasar.<sup>12</sup> Although not commonly considered as a central figure of the theological *ressourcement* movement of the mid-twentieth century, Vagaggini appears to be closely aligned with and deeply influenced by the methods and insights of these figures.

After an introductory overview of the relationship between liturgy and faith,<sup>13</sup> Vagaggini describes the use of the liturgy by theologians of various eras, arranging his treatment in reverse chronological order. Vagaggini begins his historical overview by examining the use of liturgy as a source for

9. Cyprian Vagaggini, *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy*, transl. Leonard J. Doyle – W.A. Jurgens, From the Fourth Italian Edition Revised and Augmented by the Author (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1976) xxiv. Henceforth: TDL. Vagaggini’s *Il senso teologico della liturgia* was first published in 1957 and appeared in a revised fourth edition in 1965, from which the 1976 English edition was adapted. For an account of the development of the four editions and a critique of the 1976 English edition, see R. Gabriel Pivarnik, *Toward a Trinitarian Theology of Liturgical Participation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012) 55-56. In this essay, I will make use of the English adaptation of the fourth edition, although I have occasionally consulted the 1957 Italian edition.

10. Vagaggini, TDL, xxv: “The promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy by the Second Vatican Council proved to be a source of particular satisfaction to the author, inasmuch as in the conciliar document the basic positions which this book had adopted already in 1957, in its conception of the nature and function of the liturgy in the Church, have now been widely accepted and solemnly confirmed by the supreme authority.”

11. *Ibid.*, 509-643.

12. For a non-exhaustive set of references to these figures, see the “Index of Names” *ibid.*, 903-914. In other parts of the book, Vagaggini makes occasional references to de Lubac as well.

13. *Ibid.*, Chapter 16: “Liturgy and Faith,” 509-541.

“Positive-Scholastic theology,” describing the development of the concept of liturgy as a “locus theologicus” in the context of the “Positive theology” of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and examining the guidelines for the use of liturgy by eighteenth- through twentieth-century authors of theological manuals.<sup>14</sup> Next, Vagaggini considers the use of liturgy in medieval theology, focusing exclusively on its appearance in the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas.<sup>15</sup> Vagaggini then turns to a consideration of “Theology and Liturgy in the Fathers,” articulating a distinction between the Fathers’ polemical and irenic use of the liturgy, describing the centrality of the concept of *mystérion* or *sacramentum* in the liturgical theology of the Fathers, and alluding to the formative influence of the Fathers on the liturgies of East and West.<sup>16</sup> After completing his historical survey, Vagaggini concludes this part of the book by offering suggestions for incorporating liturgical sources into contemporary theological writing and instruction, including liturgical formation and catechesis.<sup>17</sup>

For Vagaggini, the fundamental relationship between faith and liturgy derives from the principle *lex orandi, lex credendi*: “the manner in which prayer is said in the liturgy indicates what must be believed; and that which must be believed influences the manner of praying.”<sup>18</sup> Despite its apparent simplicity, Vagaggini argues that this principle needs clarification because of the complexity and diversity of what is included under the general term liturgy: “if a closer look is taken at what is contained [in both the historical liturgies and those now in force], we find ourselves confronted with a whole, not only of great extension and variety, but also of notably different values as far as the faith itself is concerned.”<sup>19</sup> As an illustration of this point, Vagaggini gives a list of Marian feasts ranging from the Feast of the Assumption (particularly after the solemn definition of the dogma) to the

14. *Ibid.*, Chapter 17: “Positive-scholastic theology and liturgy,” 542-571.

15. *Ibid.*, Chapter 18: “Theology and liturgy in Saint Thomas,” 572-589. Despite his praise for Thomas’s use of the liturgy in contrast to his concerns about the use of the liturgy by later scholastics, Vagaggini’s failure to consider the wider medieval scholastic context of Aquinas leads him to make what I take to be unfounded judgments on the significance or lack of significance of the liturgy as a source for Thomas’s theology. For a fuller treatment of the use of liturgy in Aquinas and his contemporaries, see Innocent Smith, “In Collecta Dicitur: The Oration as a Theological Authority for Thomas Aquinas” (S.T.L. thesis, Pontifical Faculty of the Immaculate Conception [Washington, DC], 2015).

16. Vagaggini, TDL, Chapter 19: “Theology and liturgy in the Fathers,” 590-625.

17. *Ibid.*, Chapter 20: “Suggestions for the systematic inclusion of the liturgical-theological aspect in the individual questions of general synthetic theology,” 626-643.

18. *Ibid.*, 509. Relying on the work of Federer and Capelle, Vagaggini gives further attention to the historical context of the origins of this principle on 511, 529-531, 611-614.

19. *Ibid.*, 510.

Translation of the House of Loreto, observing that clearly “the magisterium of the Church and the adherence of the faithful are quite differently committed in each one of them.”<sup>20</sup>

In response to this phenomenon, Vagaggini argues that it is necessary to develop a sophisticated mode of interpreting liturgical texts and assessing their theological and dogmatic value. Vagaggini stresses the importance of Pope Pius XI’s observation that “The liturgy ... is the most important organ of the ordinary magisterium of the Church. ... The liturgy is not the *didascalía* of this or that individual, but the *didascalía* of the Church.”<sup>21</sup> For Vagaggini, the liturgy is not principally a didactic action, but nevertheless has a didactic effect in the midst of its immediate focus on the worship of God:

The liturgy is not so much concerned with simply communicating clear and distinct concepts or with teaching as with attuning the whole concrete man and immersing him in a general environment of prayer and of surrender to God, in that environment of *devotio* which is the soul of worship.<sup>22</sup>

The liturgy “is neither a catechism nor a sermon nor a manual of dogmatic theology nor an encyclical nor a pastoral letter,”<sup>23</sup> but rather “constitutes a literary genre of its own” in which didactic aspects are intermixed with chants and prayers, “as if to translate the teaching received into an act of worship at once.”<sup>24</sup> Despite having more of a doxological than a pedagogical aim, the liturgy is nevertheless an “incomparable means of teaching,” so long as the aspect of prayer at the first level is safeguarded; and it is “so much the more effective and universal inasmuch as it is indirect.”<sup>25</sup> Vagaggini describes the theological insight can come from liturgical experience in explicitly Thomistic terms as a “knowledge by connaturality” or knowledge by divine instinct:<sup>26</sup>

20. *Ibid.*, 510. In this context, Vagaggini also considers aspects of historical liturgies that seem problematic or erroneous to contemporary theological sensibilities and more recent dogmatic formulations.

21. *Ibid.*, 512.

22. *Ibid.*, 516.

23. *Ibid.*, 514.

24. *Ibid.*, 516.

25. *Ibid.*, 517.

26. *Ibid.*, 535-541. Vagaggini gives a helpful exposition of this principle *ibid.*, 536. For a broader treatment of Thomas’s notion of connaturality, cf. Taki Suto, “Virtue and Knowledge: Connatural Knowledge according to Thomas Aquinas,” *The Review of Metaphysics* 58 (2004) 61-79.

It is obvious that the liturgical life can be, and in fact very often is, the occasion of God's giving to individuals those superior knowledges by connaturality, not only about truths already proposed formally by the infallible teaching authority of the Church as dogmas of divine and Catholic faith, but also about other truths which the magisterium up to now has proposed only with a lesser degree of authority.<sup>27</sup>

Nevertheless, because the liturgy is directed to a penetration of divine things that goes beyond the conceptual, it is less conceptually precise than other organs of the magisterium.<sup>28</sup> Just as a careful application of hermeneutical tools is necessary to properly understand other aspects of Scripture, the magisterium, and the tradition of the Church, so too in the case of liturgy careful attention must be paid to the genres and proper modes of expression at play in various aspects of the liturgy.<sup>29</sup>

In light of this need, Vagaggini offers a series of rules for arriving at an accurate theological judgment of liturgical rites and texts that are closely related to broader theological methodology.<sup>30</sup> First, liturgical elements involve the doctrinal authority entrusted to the members of the hierarchy who have issued or approved them.<sup>31</sup> Second, just as the magisterium proposes teachings that demand various degrees of adherence by the faithful, so too liturgical texts are proposed with diverse degrees of dogmatic authority.<sup>32</sup>

27. Vagaggini, TDL, 539.

28. *Ibid.*, 518, 560-563. Cf. 562: "For example, even by the historical way alone the conviction held in the Roman Church of the fifth-sixth century concerning the primacy and infallibility of the Roman Church can be demonstrated from the liturgy alone of the Leonine Sacramentary; but the same can be demonstrated with just as much or with even more effectiveness from the very texts of St. Leo, from the Council of Chalcedon, from the statements of the legate Philip in the Council of Ephesus, from the texts of Boniface I, Zosimus, Innocent I, etc."

29. Cf. *ibid.*, 515-517. For Vagaggini, this form of connatural knowledge is especially important for an integrated understanding of the Bible and the liturgy: *ibid.*, 544: "It is in the liturgy and through the liturgy that the orthodox reading and the deep sense of the Bible is connaturally recovered... [T]he world of the liturgy remains impenetrable for anyone who is not reshaped by the world of the Bible."

30. *Ibid.*, 518-529. Here it is helpful to recall Vagaggini's broader focus on theological methodology; cf. Remondi, "Dom Cipriano Vagaggini, osb.cam.," 337.

31. Cf. Vagaggini, TDL, 521-522. According to Vagaggini, this principle both explains the possibility of problematic formulas or errors in particular historical liturgies, given that individual bishops are not infallible; it also suggests that "from the time of the explicit approbation given by the Roman Pontiff, even by exercise of the ordinary magisterium to the liturgies in use today in the Catholic Church, these liturgies can be considered in practice as immune from errors against faith and morals" (522).

32. Cf. *ibid.*, 522-524.

Third, the liturgy reflects the phenomenon and is an agent of the development of dogmas, doctrines, and opinions.<sup>33</sup> Fourth, and for Vagaggini most importantly, “only by means of exhaustive theological study of each individual problem can the degree of authority of any point of the liturgy, historical or present-day, be determined.”<sup>34</sup> For Vagaggini, this means both that liturgical texts and rites must be studied rigorously, but also that they must be studied within the wider context of Catholic theology, since it is difficult if not impossible “to determine with sufficient precision from the liturgy alone the degree of authority which the magisterium engages in proposing an element, even supposing – which is not always the case – that the very meaning of the element in question can be determined sufficiently from the liturgy alone.”<sup>35</sup>

Although liturgical texts must be studied within the context of broader theological sources and methods, they are able to play an important role in theology if properly understood and employed. Vagaggini’s conception of this proper integration is expressed throughout his chapters on the various eras of theology in the context of criticisms of what he perceives as weakness in various historical modes of treating of the liturgy and is summarized in a chapter titled “Suggestions for the systematic inclusion of the liturgical-theological aspect in the individual questions of general synthetic theology.”<sup>36</sup>

Throughout his treatment of the history of theological appeals to liturgical texts and rites, Vagaggini contrasts irenic and polemic appeals to the liturgy. He gives a particularly clear description of this distinction in the context of discussing the use of liturgy in the Fathers, although he suggests that the distinction may be observed more widely:

It is certain, in fact, that in the Fathers there is a liturgical theology considerably developed under the twofold aspect in which every theology is developed: the irenic aspect, simply expositive of the faith to believers; and the polemic aspect of the defense and proof of the same faith against the real or hypothetical unbelievers. In the first, the theological riches of the liturgy are simply set forth for the believer. In the second, recourse is had to the liturgy to prove the foundation and the obligation to believe a point of the faith against the denials or the objections, real or hypothetical, which are brought against it.<sup>37</sup>

33. Cf. *ibid.*, 524-526, 533-541. According to Vagaggini, an insufficient grasp of the principle of development has hampered earlier treatments of the theological value of the liturgy, such as that of Perrone; cf. *ibid.*, 553-555.

34. *Ibid.*, 526, cf. 526-529.

35. *Ibid.*, 526.

36. *Ibid.*, 626-643.

37. *Ibid.*, 591.



Vagaggini argues that in the patristic period, the liturgy is primarily treated in an irenic context, especially by means of reflection on “mystery,” although he acknowledges that it plays an important role in polemic patristic literature as well, especially in the context of debates on the Trinity and on grace.<sup>38</sup> Vagaggini highlights the importance of the liturgy as an authority, especially in the theology of St. Augustine.<sup>39</sup> Further, Vagaggini notes that a consideration of the place of the liturgy in the patristic period should attend to the foundational role of the Fathers in the early development of liturgical rites and texts.<sup>40</sup>

In the scholastic period, represented for Vagaggini by the theology of Thomas Aquinas, Vagaggini contrasts the place of liturgy in the theological synthesis of Aquinas with the use of liturgy as an “authority” in the context of scholastic argumentation. Although Vagaggini downplays the significance of Thomas’s use of the liturgy as an authority in dialectic,<sup>41</sup> he argues that considerable elements of a liturgical theology may be found in the synthesis of St. Thomas,<sup>42</sup> observing that Aquinas has a fine liturgical sense and sophisticated theoretical understanding of the nature of the liturgy and successfully avoids the danger of separating the sacraments from their liturgical context.<sup>43</sup>

In his treatment of what he describes as “positive-scholastic theology,” a term which for Vagaggini covers theology from the Tridentine era through the nineteenth- and twentieth-century manualists, Vagaggini relates the contrasting fortunes of the liturgy as a theological source in various writers. After noting the absence of the liturgy from the list of ten *loci theologici* articulated by Melchior Cano (1509-1560),<sup>44</sup> Vagaggini states that although later Catholic theologians developed an interest in liturgy as a *locus theologicus*, they did not enter into a serious encounter with the liturgy except for polemical purposes in the midst of controversies with Protestants.<sup>45</sup> Vagaggini suggests that Giovanni Perrone (1794-1876) displays a high theoretical exaltation of the liturgy but makes insufficient practical use of it in his theology and that Johann Baptist Franzelin (1816-

38. *Ibid.*, 596-608, 611-619. On 598, Vagaggini makes the tendentious but intriguing suggestion that with the exception of Daniélou, twentieth-century writers exploring the connection between liturgy and theology in the Fathers have unhelpfully pre-supposed what Vagaggini describes as the “positive-scholastic concept of theology,” leading them to an exaggerated focus on the appearance of the liturgy in polemical writings of the Fathers.

39. *Ibid.*, 611.

40. *Ibid.*, 606.

41. *Ibid.*, 582-585.

42. *Ibid.*, 572.

43. *Ibid.*, 572, 575, 578-580.

44. *Ibid.*, 548.

45. *Ibid.*, 550-555.

1886) includes the liturgy as a “monument of tradition” but hardly makes appeal to it in practice.<sup>46</sup>

Throughout this historical overview, Vagaggini militantly expresses his preference for an irenic inclusion of liturgy in theology while acknowledging to greater or lesser degrees the legitimate use of liturgy in the context of theological controversy. Although Vagaggini argues that liturgical texts are usually less conceptually precise than other organs of the magisterium, he nevertheless argues that there are “depths of revelation which the theologian cannot discover except in the liturgy.”<sup>47</sup> Vagaggini provides an extensive list of topics, ranging from the mystery of the Church and of the Trinity to the meaning of the sacramental priesthood and the universal priesthood of the faithful, which he believes demand a recourse to the liturgy in order to be fully understood and expressed by theologians.<sup>48</sup>

In the final chapter of part four of *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy*, Vagaggini synthesizes the observations he has made throughout his historical survey, describing his vision of a synthetic theology that integrates the scholastic concept of theology as science with a thorough consideration of historical and empirical study,<sup>49</sup> offering observations on the place of liturgy within this synthesis,<sup>50</sup> and making concrete suggestions for the integration of liturgical studies into seminaries and theological faculties.<sup>51</sup> In his description of the place of liturgy within theology, Vagaggini argues 1) that the liturgy should be investigated primarily for its theological value rather than its historical or rubrical interest; 2) that the liturgy should be “investigated primarily in its simply irenic, expositive theological value,” although “consideration of the liturgy as an authority to prove against real or hypothetical objections that a specific doctrine is contained in the sources of revelation ... is real but secondary”; 3) that liturgy should not only be investigated “by means of analyses of the philosophical type and by the deductive method,” but also by means of historical-critical investigation.<sup>52</sup> Vagaggini offers detailed suggestions for the integration of liturgical sources into general theological methodology as well as into the consideration of particular themes, highlighting his own contributions in other sections of the book to the establishment of these connections.<sup>53</sup>

46. *Ibid.*, 553-555.

47. *Ibid.*, 570.

48. *Ibid.*, 570-571; cf. 635-637.

49. *Ibid.*, 626-631.

50. *Ibid.*, 631-637.

51. *Ibid.*, 637-643.

52. *Ibid.*, 632-633.

53. *Ibid.*, 635-637.

Throughout this part of his book, Vagaggini gives a sweeping overview of the use of liturgy in theology throughout the centuries and offers concrete suggestions for its appropriate inclusion in contemporary theology. The liturgy provides a privileged encounter with the reality that the Church's teaching attempts to describe. Through the worship of God by means of external signs consisting of gestures and words, the liturgy provides an opportunity to understand more deeply the One whom we worship by giving us a connatural experience of supernatural reality. Although the liturgy does not always speak with the conceptual precision found in theological reflection and documents of the magisterium, it presents a doxological mode of teaching that to varying degrees is an authoritative expression of the Church's magisterium. Thus, theological reflection and instruction should make recourse to the liturgy in its attempt to articulate the mysteries of the faith. In the attempt to assimilate the liturgy into a theological synthesis, however, attention should be given to the literary genre, historical context, and authoritative character of a particular liturgical element.

### 3. Yves Congar on the Liturgy and Theology

#### 3.1. *Life and Ministry*

Yves Congar was born on April 13, 1904 in Sedan in the department of Ardennes in northern France.<sup>54</sup> After an upbringing marked by World War

54. For a brief but comprehensive overview of Congar's life, see Étienne Fouilloux, "Friar Yves, Cardinal Congar, Dominican: Itinerary of a Theologian," transl. Christian Yves Dupont, *U.S. Catholic Historian* 17, no. 2 (1999) 62-90. Congar provided several accounts of various aspects of his life, including a posthumously published memoir written between 1946 and 1949, a memoir focused on his ecumenical activities published first in 1964 and in a modified form in 1974, and a book-length interview in 1975. See Yves Congar, "Mon témoignage," *Journal d'un théologien (1946-1956)*, ed. Étienne Fouilloux (Paris: Cerf, 2001) 19-62; Yves Congar, "Appels et cheminements 1929-1963," *Chrétiens en dialogue: Contributions catholiques à l'Écumenisme*, Unam Sanctam, 50 (Paris: Cerf, 1964) ix-lxiv; Yves Congar, *Une passion: l'unité: Réflexions et souvenirs 1929-1973*, Foi Vivante, 156 (Paris: Cerf, 1974); Jean Puyo, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar: Une vie pour la vérité* (Paris: Le Centurion, 1975). The 1964 redaction of his memoirs has been translated into English as Yves Congar, "The Call and the Quest 1929-1963," *Dialogue between Christians: Catholic Contributions to Ecumenism*, transl. Philip Loretz (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1966) 1-51, although the translation is at times notably inaccurate. Although the 1974 text is largely the same as the 1964 text, the 1974 text omits the footnotes that appear in the earlier version; these footnotes offer significant details that are sometimes incorporated into the body of the 1974 text but sometimes omitted entirely. I am grateful to fr. Jean-Michel Potin, o.p. of the Bibliothèque du Saulchoir and Dr. Christopher Ruddy of the Catholic University of America for their generosity in facilitating my access to these sources.

I and the neo-Thomist revival in France, Congar joined the Order of Preachers in 1925, receiving the religious name Marie-Joseph, and was ordained a priest in 1930. After an early theological career interrupted by imprisonment during World War II and by various periods of withdrawal from teaching and publishing at the request of ecclesiastical authorities in the Order of Preachers and the Roman curia, Congar made a significant contribution to the development of the documents of the Second Vatican Council and continued to publish widely in the post-conciliar period.<sup>55</sup> Due to a neurological disease that had afflicted him throughout his life and to a growing paralysis stemming from sclerosis, Congar moved to the military hospital Les Invalides in 1984, where he lived until his death on June 22, 1995. Shortly before his death, Pope John Paul II created Congar cardinal on November 26, 1994.<sup>56</sup>

In composing this brief biography, I have benefited from some of the observations in the biographical and thematic overview provided in Elizabeth Teresa Groppe, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 15-49. However, it should be noted that Groppe makes several significant historical errors, misstating Congar's birthday (listed on p. 15 as May 13, 1904), confusing Marie-Joseph Lagrange and Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange (p. 18), stating on p. 18 that Congar "had been asked to perform the *Sermo Domini*" on the Holy Thursday preceding his ordination (in contrast to Congar's self-acknowledged personal initiative), misrepresenting on p. 22 the famous story of Angelo Roncalli's statement to a visiting missionary concerning the possibility of reform in the Church, and on p. 26 describing Dominique Congar as Yves' niece rather than nephew. The error regarding Congar's birthday may be derived from Aidan Nichols, *Yves Congar* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989) 1, who provides this date while citing *Le Père Congar: La théologie au service du peuple de Dieu*, Chrétiens de tous les temps, 21 (Paris: Cerf, 1967) which correctly lists Congar's birthdate as April 13. The error is also found in Susan Wood, "Congar, Yves Marie-Joseph," *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Theologians*, ed. Patrick W. Carey – Joseph T. Leinhard (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000) 131-135, at 131, but is already present in Elizabeth Teresa Groppe, "Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit" (Ph.D. Diss., University of Notre Dame, 1999) 12.

55. For a bibliography of Congar's works, see Pietro Quattrocchi, "Bibliographie générale du Père Yves Congar," *Le Père Congar: La théologie au service du peuple de Dieu*, by Jean-Pierre Jossua, Chrétiens de tous les temps, 21 (Paris: Cerf, 1967) 213-272; Aidan Nichols, "An Yves Congar Bibliography 1967-1987," *Angelicum* 66 (1989) 422-466; Gabriel Flynn, "An Yves Congar Bibliography 1987-1995, with Addenda: 1996-2002," *Yves Congar's Vision of the Church in a World of Unbelief* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004) 229-233. For a helpful introduction to Congar's experiences and contributions from the 1940s through the 1960s, see Jared Wicks, "Yves Congar's Doctrinal Service of the People of God," *Gregorianum* 84 (2003) 499-550.

56. Cf. David M. Cheney, "Consistory – 1994," <http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/event/cs1994.html>. In a discourse shortly after the consistory, John Paul II explained to the members of the International Theological Commission that his gesture of bestowing this honor on Congar was an expression of the confidence that he accorded to theologians; see John Paul II, "Discours du Saint-Père Jean-Paul II aux membres de la Commission théologique internationale à l'occasion du XXV<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de sa fondation" (2 December 1994), available at [Vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va).

In an interview published in 1975, Yves Congar testified to the importance of the liturgy in his theological work in the context of discussing the place of liturgy within the Dominican religious life: "I owe to the liturgy, to the celebration of the Christian mysteries, half of what I have perceived in theology."<sup>57</sup> In the *Theological Essay of Tradition and Traditions*, first published in 1963, Congar expresses a similar sentiment, while (like Vagaggini) acknowledging the potential ambiguity of the liturgy as a source for theological knowledge:

If we seek precision in the use of concepts, the liturgy can be relatively misleading. Such is my own oft repeated experience: having so many times been overwhelmed with an understanding of the mysteries, through an attentive celebration of the liturgy, to which I must admit that I owe at least half of what I have understood in theology, I have many times made (either directly, or by means of some publication) a study of the doctrine contained in the liturgical texts. I have noticed that their marvelously rich content, so continually and inexhaustibly nourishing, does not when studied yield up the expected precise data for theology.<sup>58</sup>

Given Congar's explicit acknowledgment of the impact of the liturgy, and in particular of his liturgical experience as a Dominican friar, on his theological work, it may be helpful before exploring Congar's understanding of the theological value of the liturgy to offer an account of several factors of Congar's upbringing and Dominican formation that influenced his religious life and theological apostolate.<sup>59</sup>

57. Puyo, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar*, 30. This comment is made in the context of discussing the importance of the balance in the Dominican life between the intellectual life and the religious/liturgical life, the renunciation of which would entail the loss of a Dominican identity that has been affirmed throughout the centuries of the Order's life.

58. Yves Congar, *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and a Theological Essay* (New York: Macmillan, 1967) 358. In footnote 2 on p. 358, Congar makes a helpful precision to this judgment: "On the other hand, the semantic investigation of the actual words themselves is extremely valuable here; there are numerous works on this subject."

59. Andrew Cameron-Mowat's account of Congar's liturgical experience helpfully highlights the influence of the Benedictine liturgist and ecumenist Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960) on Congar. Other aspects of Cameron-Mowat's biographical treatment are less helpful, failing to acknowledge Congar's specifically Dominican liturgical context while providing only tendentious descriptions of the "Tridentine liturgical tradition" in which Congar "grew up." See Andrew Cameron-Mowat, "Yves Congar as Liturgical Theologian: The Significance of His Writings for Christian Liturgy and Church Architecture" (Ph.D. Diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1998) 6-40.

### 3.2. Congar's Liturgical Formation

Several aspects of Congar's liturgical experience before entering the Dominican Order at the age of 21 are an important background for his Dominican experience. Congar was deeply influenced by the spirituality and piety of his mother, Lucie Desoye Congar, who would prepare her children for Sunday Mass by reading them the Gospel pericopes in French<sup>60</sup> and provided the opportunity for them to read books such as *Le mystère de l'Église* by the French Dominican Humbert Clerissac (1864-1914).<sup>61</sup> In the midst of the turmoil of World War I, the Catholic church of Sedan was burned by enemy soldiers in August 1914; in response, the local Calvinist pastor allowed the Catholics to celebrate the liturgy in a small chapel for the next several years, an act of generosity which Congar acknowledged as having had a profound influence on life and ecumenical vocation.<sup>62</sup> As a teenager, Congar became friends with the son of the Calvinist pastor and frequently engaged in "grandes discussions théologiques" with his friend concerning the sacrifice of the Mass; in a striking anticipation of his later Dominican vocation and theological work concerning the liturgy, the thirteen-year-old Congar memorized the Corpus Christi sequence *Lauda Sion* in order to have a set of responses at his fingertips in his arguments with his friend, little realizing at the time the authorship of the text!<sup>63</sup>

After discerning a vocation to the priesthood at the age of fourteen, the following year Congar had what he later described as a decisive visit to the Benedictine Abbey at Conques, where the monks of Saint-Wandrille (a

60. Congar, "Mon témoignage," 46; Congar describes his curiosity as a child concerning the phrase "en ce temps-là" (*in illo tempore*) which introduced each Gospel reading – a significant detail, given his later manifestations of a deep appreciation of history and liturgy.

61. Groppe, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 16; cf. Congar, *Une passion*, 13. For a brief discussion of the important influence of Clerissac on twentieth-century ecclesiology, see John Saward, "L'Église a Ravi Son Cœur: Charles Journet and the Theologians of Ressourcement on the Personality of the Church," *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn – Paul D. Murray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) 125-137, at 130. Cf. Yves Congar, "Le P. Cléris-sac 1864-1914 et le mystère de l'Église," *La Vie Spirituelle*, no. 111 (1964) 513-516. It is not clear when Congar became aware of the significance of the author's religious Order; as he acknowledges in "Mon témoignage," 30, in 1918 (at the age of 14) Congar was unaware of the Dominican Order, although in retrospect he felt that his Dominican vocation was already beginning to emerge at that time.

62. Congar, "Mon témoignage," 31; Congar, *Une passion*, 12-13; cf. Groppe, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 45. In "Mon témoignage," Congar states that the burning occurred on August 14, whereas in *Une passion* he gives the date as August 25, 1914.

63. Congar, "Mon témoignage," 30; Congar, *Une passion*, 12.

daughter house of Solesmes) were then in exile.<sup>64</sup> For Congar, this encounter with the splendid Benedictine liturgy was his “first revelation of the religious life,” giving him what he later described as a solid Benedictine foundation to his Dominican vocation.<sup>65</sup> Congar initially entered formation for the diocesan priesthood, but soon felt strongly drawn to religious life, although he had difficulty deciding between a Benedictine or a Dominican vocation.<sup>66</sup> In March 1922, Congar became a Third Order Dominican, after struggling to decide between becoming a Benedictine oblate or a Dominican tertiary.<sup>67</sup> After several years of seminary formation in philosophy,<sup>68</sup> Congar entered the novitiate for the Dominican Province of France on December 7, 1925, making profession on December 8, 1926 and subsequently studying theology at the Saulchoir in Belgium from 1926-1931.<sup>69</sup>

Congar’s liturgical formation as a Dominican friar took place in the context of the distinctive liturgical rite of the Order of Preachers, a medieval variant of the broader Roman rite that included variations in the rituals, texts, and melodies of the liturgy vis-à-vis the broader Roman rite with which Congar was already familiar.<sup>70</sup> In light of Congar’s later emphasis

64. Congar, “Mon témoignage,” 33; Congar, *Une passion*, 13. On Congar’s early encounters with the Benedictines and Dominicans, cf. Puyo, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar*, 21-23. Among the Benedictines whom Congar met at Conques, he specifies Dom Pothier, “un des restaurateurs du grégorien” (p. 22). In addition to playing a central role in the chant revival at Solesmes and in the Vatican Edition on the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, Pothier had a decisive influence on the Dominican liturgical revival in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries; see Innocent Smith, “Medieval and Modern Dominican Chant in the 19th Century,” *Chant: Old and New*, ed. William Renwick (Lions Bay: Institute of Mediaeval Music, 2012) 15-47.

65. Congar, “Mon témoignage,” 33: “Je n’oublierai jamais ces premières Vêpres de la Transfiguration. Ce fut une révélation. Chaque année, le 6 août est pour moi un anniversaire béni. Je dois à ce premier contact la première révélation de la vie religieuse. Je suis revenu bien des fois à Conques. Depuis, j’ai compris et je ressens très fortement que je n’ai pas la vocation de bénédictin, mais celle de frère prêcheur. Mais, dans les soubassements de ma vocation dominicaine, il y a la solide assise monastique et la paternité de saint Benoît.” In his interview with Puyo (p. 22) Congar emphasizes that the factor that most attracted him to the Benedictine life was “la liturgie comme vie de l’Église, comme respiration de l’Église.”

66. Congar, “Mon témoignage,” 37-38.

67. *Ibid.*, 36-37.

68. For an account of Congar’s philosophical formation, see Fouilloux, “Friar Yves, Cardinal Congar, Dominican,” 65-66, 86.

69. *Ibid.*, 67. For further details on Congar’s novitiate and initial formation, see Puyo, *Jean Puyo interroge le Père Congar*, 23-25, 28-47.

70. For a brief account of the history and unique characteristics of the Dominican rite, see Innocent Smith, “Dominican Chant and Dominican Identity,” *Religions* 5 (2014) 961-971. It is interesting to note that in “Mon témoignage,” 52, Congar lists the names of a number of friars with whom he was particularly close during his years of formation, including fr. Dominique Delalande, O.P., who became an expert in the Dominican chant tradition;

on the importance of legitimate diversity within the Church's liturgy, it is significant that his early religious formation took place in the context of a liturgical rite that presented significant differences from the more common Roman rite while still maintaining a profound unity with it.<sup>71</sup> Among his frequent liturgical quotations and references that are found throughout his published writings, some explicitly bear the mark of the Dominican liturgical texts in which Congar was daily immersed (until the adoption of the Roman rite by the Order of Preachers following the General Chapter of 1968).<sup>72</sup> In addition to his exposure to the Dominican rite during his initial

cf. Dominique Delalande, *Le Graduel des Prêcheurs: Recherches sur les sources et la valeur de son texte musicale*, Bibliothèque d'histoire dominicaine, 2 (Paris: Cerf, 1949).

71. See, e.g., Yves Congar, *Diversity and Communion*, transl. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1984).

72. For example, Congar's 1937 *Chrétiens désunis* closes with a scriptural quotation that Congar explicitly mentions is derived from the alleluia verse of the Dominican version of the Votive Mass for the Removal of Schism (later known as the Mass for the Unity of the Church or for the Unity of Christians); see Yves Congar, *Chrétiens désunis: Principes d'un "Œuménisme" Catholique*, Unam Sanctam, 1 (Paris: Cerf, 1937) 345. For a fuller treatment of the history of the votive Mass formularies for the unity of the Church, see my forthcoming article in *Studia Liturgica*: "The Formularies «Pro Unitate Christianorum» in the 2002 *Missale Romanum*." On the post-conciliar fate of the Dominican rite, see Augustine Thompson, "Postconciliar Reform of the Dominican Rite Liturgy: 1962-1969," *Antiphon* 15 (2011) 299-317.

For an interesting comment concerning the influence the post-conciliar liturgical reform on Congar's theology, see Groppe, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 49. For a nuanced assessment of revisions to the celebration of the liturgy undertaken in 1965, for instance, see Yves Congar, *My Journal of the Council* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012) 778, where Congar praises the broader selection of readings for the Epistle and the new ceremonial concerning the Gospel book, while suggesting that the replacement the Gregorian gradual chants with congregational antiphonal psalmody during the Liturgy of the Word presents a system "which is a bit overdone and of which one will soon grow tired. Each day, four times over, a sometimes humdrum antiphon is alternated with some rather long psalms..." For further reflections on Congar's reactions to the liturgical reforms undertaken in the course of the Council, see Peter De Mey, "The Daily Eucharist at the Council as Stimulus and Test Case for Liturgical Reform," *Questions Liturgiques* 95 (2014) 28-51. For another strand of Congar's complex reaction to post-Conciliar liturgical developments and attitudes, see Yves Congar, "Autorité, Initiative, Coresponsabilité," *La Maison-Dieu* 97 (1969) 34-57, at 55: "The conservative character of the liturgy makes it possible for it to preserve and transmit intact the values whose importance one epoch may have forgotten, but which the next epoch is happy to find intact and preserved, so that it can live from them again. Where would be if this liturgical conservatism had not resisted the late medieval taste for sensory devotions, the eighteenth century's individualistic, rational, and moralizing imperatives, the nineteenth century's critique, or the modern period's subjective philosophies? Thanks to the liturgy everything has been retained and transmitted. Ah! Let us not expose ourselves to the reproach sixty years hence that we squandered and lost the sacred heritage of the Catholic communion as it is deployed in the slow flow of time. Let us keep a healthy awareness that we carry in ourselves only a moment, the tip of the iceberg in relation to a reality which is beyond us in every way." This reference and translation are



Dominican formation, Congar also had exposure to the Eastern rites in the context of his encounters with the Russian seminary at Lille confided by Pope Pius XI to the French Dominicans.<sup>73</sup> In later years Congar maintained his contact with the Eastern liturgy in various ways, including through frequent visits to the Monastery of Amay/Chevetogne founded by Dom Beauduin as a bi-ritual monastery which employed both the Roman and Byzantine liturgies.<sup>74</sup>

Congar's discernment of a calling to devote his life to the unity of the Church took place in a deeply liturgical context. During the year leading up to his priestly ordination on July 25, 1930, which included his diaconate ordination on December 21, 1929,<sup>75</sup> Congar devoted himself to a study of the Eucharistic sacrifice (aided by the articles of Eugène Masure) and of the Gospel of St. John (aided by the commentaries of Marie-Joseph Lagrange and Aquinas).<sup>76</sup> As Congar later wrote, "It was while meditating upon the seventeenth chapter of St John's Gospel that I clearly recognized my vocation to work for the unity of all who believe in Jesus Christ."<sup>77</sup> In a footnote in the 1964 memoir (omitted in the 1974 version), Congar states that this discovery led him to request to sing this passage in the context of the Dominican Holy Thursday liturgy: "The Dominican liturgy for Maundy Thursday contains a solemn chant consisting of chapters 13-17 of St John's Gospel, the *Sermo Domini*. As I was then a deacon in the house of studies at Saulchoir, I had asked to be allowed to perform this function in Holy Week of 1930."<sup>78</sup> Congar's earlier memoirs from the 1940s further highlight the importance of this event for Congar by revealing that he

from Émile of Taizé, *Faithful to the Future: Listening to Yves Congar* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013) 175-176.

73. Congar, "Appels et cheminements," xi-xii.

74. *Ibid.*, xvii-xix.

75. Congar, "Mon témoignage," 20.

76. Congar, "Appels et cheminements," xi, and *Une passion*, 10. Congar specifies that his studies on the Eucharistic sacrifice focused on "*Le sacrifice du Chef*, paru d'abord en articles." The English translation of the 1964 account, "The Call and the Quest," 3, omits the qualifying statement about the status of Masure's book, misleadingly suggesting that Congar was reading the final version which was published for the first time two years after his ordination, in 1932. Groppe, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 18 is similarly misleading in stating that Congar "studied the theology of the eucharistic sacrifice, particularly Eugene Masure's *Le Sacrifice du chef*." For a brief account of Masure's life and writings, see Palémon Glorieux, "Masure (Eugène) prêtre, 1882-1958," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, vol. 10 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1980) 762-763.

77. Congar, "Appels et cheminements," xi; "The Call and the Quest," 3.

78. Congar, "Appels et cheminements," xi (note 2); "The Call and the Quest," 3 (note 4). For further details on the *Sermo domini* practice in use during Congar's diaconate, see *Ecclesiasticum officium juxta ritum sacri ordinis praedicatorum auctoritate apostolica approbatum Triduo ante pascha et Dominica resurrectionis agendum reverendissimi in Christo patris fratris Bonaventurae Garcia Paredes ejusdem ordinis magistri generalis jussu* (Rome: In Hospito Reverendissimi Magistri Ordinis, 1927) 121-130.

had requested to undertake this demanding liturgical task even though he was suffering from laryngitis and had otherwise temporarily ceased to sing.<sup>79</sup> Although Congar emphasizes that his devotion towards these chapters of John and his “spiritualité” oriented towards unity and reunion was already in place from at least as early as the winter of 1929-1930, his early memoirs suggest that the Holy Thursday liturgy played an important role in this area.<sup>80</sup>

After Congar’s ordination to the priesthood, the liturgy continued to play a formative role in his spiritual and intellectual development. Through his celebration of the votive Mass for the unity of the Church, which included a Gospel pericope from John 17, Congar maintained a frequent contact with this seminal text, keeping its ideal before his mind and helping him to deepen his understanding of the priest’s role as a representative of Christ in the Eucharist and in Christ’s prayer *ut unum sint*.<sup>81</sup> In particular, the liturgical proclamation of the Psalms appears to have been an important source of consolation for Congar, instilling him with what Jared Wicks has described as “a readiness to obey God with unshakeable hope, in spite of not knowing where he was being led.”<sup>82</sup>

### 3.3. *Liturgy as a Source for Theology in La foi et la théologie and La Tradition et les traditions*

In addition to frequently alluding to liturgical texts throughout his writings and acknowledging the importance of the liturgy in his life as a Dominican

79. Congar, “Mon témoignage,” 20.

80. See Congar, “Mon témoignage,” 20-21. It is interesting to note the subtle shift in terminology concerning the nature of Congar’s vocation; in his memoirs from the 1940s, “Mon témoignage,” 20, he uses the terms “vocation ecclésiologique et unionique” and “vocation à me consacrer à l’unité et à la réunion,” whereas in his memoirs from the 1960s he uses the terms “vocation à l’Écumenisme” as well as “vocation ecclésiologique.”

81. Congar, “Appels et cheminements,” xi: “J’ai souvent redit cette prière, en particulier en célébrant (dès les jours qui ont suivi mon ordination) la Messe votive *pro unitate*, en pensant alors que le prêtre a, dans sa personnalité de célébrant, un certain caractère sacramental, et qu’il re-présente le Christ, également dans sa prière.” (The translation of this passage in “The Call and the Quest,” 3, is notably imprecise.) Congar gives another testimony to the importance of the votive Mass for unity in his diary from his journey to Rome in 1946, where he describes celebrating an early morning votive Mass “pro unione” at the altar of the Chair of St. Peter at St. Peter’s Basilica on May 17, 1946; see Yves Congar, “Voyage à Rome avec le Père Féret Mai 1946,” *Journal d’un théologien (1946-1956)*, 63-132, at 88. (This incident is poignantly paired by Jared Wicks with a visit on the previous day to the tomb of St. Pius V at the Basilica of St. Mary Major; cf. Wicks, “Yves Congar’s Doctrinal Service of the People of God,” 499-500; Congar, “Voyage à Rome,” 86: “Nous prions au tombeau de Pie V, et je demande à Dieu, par son intercession, de se servir de moi pour ouvrir, s’il le veut, des portes que ce pape-inquisiteur a fermées.”)

82. Wicks, “Yves Congar’s Doctrinal Service of the People of God,” 513.

friar and in his theological endeavors, Congar offers more systematic treatments of the theological value of the liturgy in two of his books: *La foi et la théologie* (1962) and *La Tradition et les traditions: Essai théologique* (1963).<sup>83</sup> Although making frequent reference to contemporary scholarship on the topic of the relationship of liturgy and theology, including the works of Cipriano Vagaggini, I.H. Dalamis, Bernard Capelle, and Louis Bouyer, Congar offers a synthesis that explicitly incorporates his own liturgical experience and reflection into his presentation of this topic. I will first give an overview of these two volumes and specify the place of Congar's treatment of the liturgy within the wider context of each work, and then present a synthesis of Congar's understanding of the value of the liturgy as a source for theology as articulated in these two volumes.

First published in 1962 but written in 1958-1959, *La foi et la théologie* is a theological manual that consists of treatments of three parts: a treatment of the knowledge of faith, an introduction to theology, and a brief history of theology.<sup>84</sup> In the fourth chapter of the second part, Congar presents positive theology (*théologie positive*) as the search for a complete and even scientific knowledge of the sources (Latin: *fontium* / French: *sources*) of theology, namely Scripture and the Tradition of the Church.<sup>85</sup>

83. Focusing on these two volumes, Groppe, *Yves Congar's Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 28-31, provides a helpful summary of Congar's views of the broader questions concerning "loci theologici," including a brief account of Congar's understanding of the liturgy. In addition to these two volumes, it is helpful to consult Yves Congar, *La tradition et la vie de l'Église* (Paris: Arthème Fayard, 1963) available in English under the titles *Tradition and the Life of the Church* and *The Meaning of Tradition*. This book is written in a more popular literary style than Congar's more schematic *La foi et la théologie* and his more academic *La Tradition et les traditions*. For this reason, my treatment here will focus on the two earlier treatments, which offer a more precise account of the issues at hand.

84. Yves Congar, *La foi et la théologie*, *Le mystère chrétien*, 1 (Tournai: Desclée, 1962) [henceforth: FT]. An author's note on the copyright page describes the context and limitations of the volume, acknowledging that the book has an elementary, schematic and at times elliptical character. Throughout the volume, Congar offers twenty "thèses" which are articulated at greater length in the various chapters.

85. Congar, FT, 137-168. At the heading of this chapter, Congar offers the follow statement as "Thèse XVI": "*In quantum est positiva, theologia consequitur plenam, et etiam scientificam cognitionem suarum fontium, Scripturae scilicet necnon Traditionis Ecclesiae*. En tant que positive, la théologie poursuit une connaissance complète et même scientifique de ses sources: l'Écriture et la Tradition de l'Église" (Congar, FT, 137). It is interesting to note that Congar quotes this thesis in 1992 in the context of responding to a charge made by the author of a book he is reviewing that Congar has not truly placed scripture at the origin of all theological development; see Yves Congar, review of *Progrès de la théologie*, by Florent Gaboriau, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 76 (1992) 551. Although it is outside of the scope of this study, in this light it would be interesting to explore Congar's understanding of possibility of speaking of tradition and scripture as plural founts (*fontium*) of theology, given *Dei Verbum's* articulation of scripture and tradition as one sacred deposit (DV 10) that present in various ways the Gospel as the singular fount (*fontem*) of Christ's revelation (DV 7).

In this context, Congar offers a brief but dense account of the doctrinal value of the liturgy, providing criteria for theological appeals to the liturgy and describing the connection between liturgy and the related disciplines of epigraphy, archeology, and iconography.<sup>86</sup>

Published in May 1963 but substantially completed by the fall of 1962, *La Tradition et les traditions: Essai théologique* follows in the wake of Congar's 1960 *La Tradition et les traditions: Essai historique*, offering a theological synthesis of the idea of Tradition which he had approached from a more historical approach in the earlier volume.<sup>87</sup> Congar discusses the liturgy as a source for theology in two places within this volume: first, in chapter four, where he considers "Tradition and the Church's Life,"<sup>88</sup> and second, in chapter six, where he treats of "The Monuments of Tradition."<sup>89</sup> In chapter four, Congar reflects on the liturgy as a *locus theologicus*, the relationship between the altar and the pulpit as places in the communication of salvation, the liturgy's role as a repository and means of communication of Tradition, and the special characteristics of the liturgy which must be understood in order to make a fruitful appeal to the liturgy as a theological source.<sup>90</sup> In chapter six, Congar treats of the liturgy as one of the "principal monuments or witnesses" to tradition, highlighting the liturgy's character as a sacred action, its conservative power of preservation, its biblical roots, and its ability to communicate our relation to God in its fullness.<sup>91</sup> Throughout these two chapters, Congar incorporates many of the bibliographical references and ideas that were included earlier in *La foi et la théologie*, although they are now incorporated into a more expansive framework.<sup>92</sup>

86. Congar, FT, 145-148.

87. Yves Congar, *La Tradition et les traditions: Essai historique* (Paris: Arthème Fayard, 1960); Yves Congar, *La Tradition et les traditions: Essai théologique* (Paris: Arthème Fayard, 1963). Both volumes were published as a single English volume in Yves Congar, *Tradition and Traditions: An Historical and a Theological Essay*, transl. Michael Naseby – Thomas Rainborough (London: Burns and Oates, 1966 – New York: Macmillan, 1967). I will cite the English translation, making reference to it with the abbreviation TT. On the circumstances of the composition of the *Essai théologique*, see Congar, TT, 234, which specifies that this second volume, "having taken more than two years to write," was already complete by the time the question of Tradition came up during the first session of the Second Vatican Council in the fall of 1962. The final page of the 1963 *Essai théologique* specifies that it was printed on May 8, 1963.

88. Congar, TT, 349-375. Groppe's presentation of Congar's understanding of the liturgy as a *locus* for theology does not offer any references to chapter four of *Tradition and traditions*, focusing instead on the treatment offered in chapter six.

89. Congar, TT, 427-458.

90. *Ibid.*, 354-360.

91. *Ibid.*, 427-435.

92. For instance, Congar provides the same extensive list of references to treatments of the liturgy as a *locus theologicus* (including that of Vagaggini) in FT, 145n1 and TT 354n3,

In Congar's view, the precise theological value of the liturgy is best understood within a the wider framework of what Congar describes as "monuments of Tradition." Monuments of Tradition are "expressions in which Tradition is, at least partially, fixed and contained, and in which as a result it can be grasped and analysed."<sup>93</sup> For Congar, these monuments are of an uneven normative value, and must be understood within the broader relationship between Scripture and Tradition.<sup>94</sup> In order to explicate this relationship, Congar offers a schema that distinguishes between a) the "material content" of the faith of the Church and b) the Church as the subject of Tradition. The material content of the faith is manifested in two types of places (*loci*): first, constitutive *loci* (Scripture and non-written traditions) and second, declarative *loci* (Magisterium, Liturgy, Fathers, Canon law and custom, Theology). Congar identifies these declarative *loci* Congar as "monuments of Tradition" that aid our understanding of the content and sense of the constitutive *loci*.<sup>95</sup> Of these monuments, the liturgy holds pride of place (after the magisterium, which, in Congar's schema, is both a monument and an organ in which the content of Tradition is expressed as a formal rule of faith).<sup>96</sup>

For Congar, the liturgy is "a privileged custodian and dispenser of Tradition" that celebrates, contains and transmits the essential elements of the Christian mystery.<sup>97</sup> Liturgy is simultaneously an act of worship and a profession of faith, expressing in a synthetic way the mysteries of the faith, "only certain aspects of which have been formulated by our theological understanding and in dogmas."<sup>98</sup> In addition to presenting aspects of the

although in the later treatment he adds a 1960 text by J.A. Jungmann which was not included in the earlier list. In TT 427n1, Congar gives a further list of works which deal with the liturgy as a *locus theologicus*, repeating the references in 354n3 to two of Bernard Capelle's articles while adding references to works by Bouyer and others. (The English edition only provides references to the English translations of two Bouyer volumes, published in 1962 and 1963, whereas the French original [2:322n4] provides the original publication dates of 1956 and 1962, respectively.) The repetition and variation of references at different points in these volumes offers some helpful textual clues for the redaction process of Congar's treatments of this subject.

93. Congar, TT, 425. Congar acknowledges that the term "monuments of Tradition" is rooted in the nineteenth century theologians Perrone and Franzelin.

94. *Ibid.*, 425. Congar's discussion of the "monuments of Tradition" in TT follows upon chapter 5 of the theological essay (TT, 376-424) which treats of "Scripture and Tradition in relation to Revelation and to the Church."

95. Congar, FT, 144-145; TT, 425-427.

96. Congar, TT, 426-247; for a fuller discussion of Congar's understanding (in 1962) of the role of the magisterium, see FT, 157-168.

97. Congar, TT, 354.

98. *Ibid.*, 355; cf. TT 428-429, FT, 146. Congar's frequent insistence on the properly conservative character of the liturgy is directly related to his acknowledgment that the liturgy often conveys elements that we don't fully grasp in any particular moment: by passing down the rites which we have received, which are "a powerful means for communion in

faith that are not fully conceptually articulated, however, the liturgy also incorporates many texts that are “pregnant with doctrine,” at times the liturgy appears to have a precisely doctrinal intention.<sup>99</sup> Although doctrinal teachings that originally developed in the context of controversy are sometimes found in certain liturgical texts, on the whole the liturgy presents a serene and joyful character; as Congar observes, “while our dogmas were often formulated against heresies, the liturgy is directed against no one, even though there are a number of collects which have Pelagianism in view, and the *Gloria Patri* is anti-Arian in origin.”<sup>100</sup> Congar insists that we must avoid exploiting the liturgy for purely pedagogical (or polemical) purposes, but should rather respect its proper mode of doxological teaching.<sup>101</sup>

Although the liturgy is rich in doctrine, it does not always have the conceptual precision of theological language. This means that although the content of the liturgy is inexhaustibly nourishing for the theologian, it does not always yield “precise data for theology.”<sup>102</sup> Congar offers some guidelines for a responsible appeal to liturgical data: one should consider 1) the internal and necessary link between a liturgical fact and the dogma at hand, 2) the degree to which the liturgical fact has been received throughout the Church, and 3) whether the sense of the liturgical fact is in itself clear; if any of these elements are absent, the theological value of this particular liturgical fact is notably diminished.<sup>103</sup> In conjunction with these observations, however, Congar emphasizes that the highest value of the liturgy does not rest in the possibility of using it as an “arsenal of arguments,” but in understanding it (and being formed by it) as the “didascalía of the Church.”<sup>104</sup>

In Congar’s view, “the liturgy is not a manual, working with clear concepts and definitions: it procures entry into the Christian truths by way of prayer and actions... The entry into these truths is not by way of discussion

the same reality between men separated by centuries of change and affected by very different influences,” ritual is able to pass down in a fixed manner “elements which are much more numerous than were realized by those men who performed and preserved the rites, and actually handed them on to us: much more, even, than we ourselves can know” (TT, 429).

99. Congar, FT, 146; cf. TT, 358.

100. Congar, TT, 358. For further references to the anti-Arian and anti-Pelagian aspects of the liturgy, see FT, 146 notes 1 and 3.

101. Congar, TT, 356.

102. *Ibid.*, 358.

103. Congar, FT, 146. In TT, 427, by contrast, Congar explicitly avoids offering a treatment of “the conditions under which some particular text, or the existence of a feast, may or may not be cited as a proof for a theological assertion.”

104. Congar, FT 146; cf. TT, 427.

or argument, but through the intimacy of living experience.”<sup>105</sup> For instance, Congar suggests that “we come to understand many things through prayer and as a result of prayer: such is the case, for example, with God’s attributes, by which we invoke him and in doing so enter into a communion with him.”<sup>106</sup> In addition, the liturgy allows us to achieve a higher synthesis between elements that at first seem not only distinct but sometimes even opposed to one another, such as God’s initiative and man’s response, the ordained priesthood and the fully sacerdotal people of God, freedom in the spirit and fixed formulas, inspiration and discipline, or nature and culture.<sup>107</sup> For Congar, the liturgy provides an irenic and familial atmosphere in which difficult “questions are resolved in a sane, Christian manner sometimes before they are even put... for example, authority and freedom, person and community, continuity and innovation, tension and relaxation, etc.”<sup>108</sup>

Further, because the liturgy is “woven out of scriptural texts and allusions”<sup>109</sup> and presents “in another manner the same content as Scripture,”<sup>110</sup> through the liturgy we come to understand revelation more deeply because the “Bible finds in the liturgy a living commentary which gives it its fullest meaning.”<sup>111</sup> Through this living commentary, “Tradition extends Scripture while it uses it, reading it with eyes able to perceive a deeper reality than is attainable by purely philological or historical perceptions.”<sup>112</sup> In this way, the liturgy is a locus of Tradition “not only from the point of view of conservation and preservation, but also from that of progress and development.”<sup>113</sup>

For Congar, then, the liturgy is a monument of Tradition that puts us in living contact with the mysteries that have been revealed to us by God. The liturgy is a privileged locus for deepening our understanding of Biblical and non-Biblical revelation, passing down the practice of the Church from generation to generation in a manner that is both conserves and develops the mysteries that have been received. Throughout his life and ministry, Congar had a deep relationship with the Church’s liturgy, finding in it both

105. Congar, TT, 428.

106. *Ibid.*, 429. For a reflection on the divine attribute of mercy which incorporates liturgical texts on this theme, see Yves Congar, “La miséricorde, attribut souverain de Dieu,” *Les voies du Dieu vivant: Théologie et vie spirituelle* (Paris: Cerf, 1962) 61-74, at 70.

107. Congar, TT, 434. This list may be fruitfully compared with that given in Vagaggini, TDL 570-571; cf. Vagaggini, TDL, 635-637.

108. Congar, TT, 434.

109. *Ibid.*, 431.

110. *Ibid.*, 430.

111. *Ibid.*, 431, quoting a text by A. G. Martimort. Cf. Congar, FT, 147.

112. Congar, TT, 433.

113. *Ibid.*, 429.

consolation in the midst of trials and deep content for meditation. In his theological writing, Congar made frequent references to liturgical texts, although he acknowledged the limitations that attend a theological appeal to individual liturgical monuments or facts.

#### 4. Vagaggini, Congar, and the Liturgical Sources of *Lumen Gentium*

In examining the articulation of the relationship between liturgy and theology offered by Vagaggini and Congar, there are many points of confluence: each emphasizes the importance of understanding the broader formative value of the liturgy while also acknowledging the direct theological value of the liturgy in examining particular questions. Each acknowledges that the liturgy contains elements that have the potential to be used in a polemical manner, but propose that a more fruitful appeal is made to the liturgy in an irenic context. Further, both authors emphasize the need to recognize the literary genres of liturgical texts in order to accurately assess their theological content, acknowledging that the liturgy does not always possess the conceptual precision of other theological documents. Due perhaps both to the differing literary genres and aims of their respective publications and their individual theological emphases, Vagaggini offers more detailed suggestions on the criteriology for utilizing liturgical texts within theological argument, whereas Congar offers more limited directives in this regard while situating the appeal to the liturgy within a wider criteriology of the non-liturgical monuments of Tradition. Vagaggini's theological vocabulary is at times more explicitly Thomistic than Congar's (e.g. the emphasis on knowledge by connaturality), but the presentations of both are clearly marked by a combination of scholastic precision and an appreciation for the biblical, patristic, and liturgical sources that were receiving a renewed attention in the twentieth century.

Having considered the articulation of the relationship between liturgy and theology offered by Vagaggini and Congar, I will now analyze the appearance of liturgical sources in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium* of the Second Vatican Council in light of the liturgical-theological syntheses of Congar and Vagaggini. This document serves as a useful test-case for analyzing the practical application of the liturgical-theological principles of Congar and Vagaggini for two reasons. First, as a document that is principally focused on a subject other than the liturgy itself, *Lumen Gentium* offers an example of the use of liturgical texts to illuminate a broad range of theological themes. Throughout the constitution, liturgical texts and actions are frequently referred to in a variety of modes that illustrate the breadth of the possibilities for application



of the liturgy to theological questions articulated by Congar and Vagaggini. Second, the redaction process of the document has direct links with both Congar and Vagaggini. Congar's extensive contributions to *Lumen Gentium* are well known, although they are not usually considered in light of the liturgical elements of the dogmatic constitution.<sup>114</sup> While Vagaggini's contribution to the document is certainly less direct than Congar, the official *Relationes* which accompanied one of the drafts of *Lumen Gentium* presented during the Council point to Vagaggini's influence by referencing his *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy* twice in the context of providing bibliographical references for themes found in the draft text.<sup>115</sup> By analyzing the liturgical references in *Lumen Gentium* in light of the theoretical expositions of Vagaggini and Congar, we will be able to cast light on both their ideas in themselves and their direct or indirect influence on this pivotal text of the Second Vatican Council. In interest of space, this analysis will focus on the final text of *Lumen Gentium*, leaving a thorough study of the redaction process of the Dogmatic Constitution to a future study.

The liturgical references in *Lumen Gentium* may be divided into two types: references to particular liturgical texts of the Church, and references to practices of the Church.<sup>116</sup> In the following treatment, I will focus on references to liturgical texts. These references are usually made explicitly either in the body of the text or in the footnotes, although in at least one case there is an implicit reference to a liturgical text which incorporates

114. For a helpful presentation of Congar's contribution to *Lumen Gentium*, see William Henn, "Yves Congar and *Lumen Gentium*," *Gregorianum* 86 (2005) 563-592. Although Henn's article points to Congar's influence on the constitution's integration of patristic and scriptural sources, it does not consider the liturgical sources of *Lumen Gentium*.

115. These references are found in a written *Relatio* embedded in the draft of the *Schema constitutionis de Ecclesia* dated 3 July 1964, found in *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II* (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1973) 3/1:158-374; see "Relatio de n. 50, olim n. 56, §§1-2," *AS* 3/1:345-49:

"(A) Petikum fuit in doctrina de unione cum Sanctis in coelo etiam in connexione cum historia Ecclesiae, praesertim primitivae, exponeretur. Quod factum est in hac paragrapho. De oratione et sacrificiis pro defunctis et de oratione sanctorum pro vivis, cf.: [...] C. Vagaggini, O.S.B., *Il senso teologico della Liturgia. Saggio di Liturgia teologica generale*, ed. 2<sup>a</sup>, Roma 1958, pp. 257-260; [...].

"(K) *De Sanctis in liturgia Missae*: [...] De historia et significatione theologica harum commemorationum scite agit J.A. Jungmann, S.I., *Missarum Sollemnia* [...]; videatur etiam C. Vaggini [sic], O.S.B., *Il senso teologico della Liturgia. Saggio di Liturgia teologica generale*, ed. 2<sup>a</sup>, Roma 1958, pp. 261-262. [...]."

116. The references to practices of the Church range from broad statements regarding the sacramental life of the Church, found frequently throughout the document, to more specific examples such as LG 21's statement that the liturgical rites of the east and west witness to the range of effects of episcopal ordination, LG 45's reference to the liturgical rites of religious profession, or LG 50's references to the Church offering suffrages for the dead.

words that are recognizably derived from the liturgy without specifically avering to the fact.<sup>117</sup>

Although many of the references to liturgical texts focus on various forms of the Roman liturgy, several draw attention to other rites of the Catholic Church. In some cases, the references to the Roman liturgy come in the form of references to specific historical witnesses to the Roman liturgy, for instance the Gelasian sacramentary, whereas others come in the form of references to the contemporary forms of the Roman rite, as found for instance in the *Missale Romanum* or the *Pontificale Romanum*. In the final text of *Lumen Gentium*, there are 25 explicit references to liturgical texts. Thirteen are references to Roman liturgical texts (six to the *Missale Romanum*,<sup>118</sup> four to the *Pontificale Romanum*,<sup>119</sup> and three to the *Breviarium Romanum*<sup>120</sup>). Six are references to specific historical liturgical texts (three to the rite for the ordination of bishops in the *Apostolic Tradition* of

117. See LG 3 (*AAS* 57 [1965] 850): “Quoties sacrificium crucis, quo *Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus* (1 Cor. 5, 7), in altari celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur.” This statement implicitly references the *Secreta* prayer of the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost in the form of the *Missale Romanum* in use during the Council (“Concede nobis, quaesumus, Domine, haec digne frequentare mysteria: quia, *quoties* huius hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur”), which had already been explicitly quoted in second paragraph of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. For detailed examinations of the history of this prayer, including brief treatments of its appearance in 20<sup>th</sup> century magisterial and liturgical texts, see Anthony Ward, “Euchology for the Mass ‘In Cena Domini,’” *Notitiae* 44 (2008) 611-634, at 616-621; Anthony Ward, “Sources of the Orations for the Mass ‘In Cena Domini’ of the 2000 ‘Missale Romanum,’” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 123 (2009) 105-128, at 117-124; Anthony Ward, “The Mass Formularies ‘per Annum’ I-VIII in the 2000 Missale Romanum: Sources of the Super Oblata and Postcommunions,” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 128 (2014) 292-346, at 301-306. Ward’s treatments do not mention the implicit use of this prayer in LG 3.

118. LG 36, LG 39, LG 50, LG 51, LG 52 (two references). For a scholarly edition of the *Missale Romanum* in use during the Second Vatican Council, see Manlio Sodi and Alessandro Toniolo, eds., *Missale Romanum: ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini Restitutum Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum: Editio typica 1962*, Monumenta Liturgica Piana 1 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007).

119. LG 28 (two references), LG 41. See Manlio Sodi and Alessandro Toniolo, eds., *Pontificale Romanum: editio typica, 1961-1962*, Monumenta Liturgica Piana 3 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2008).

120. LG 6, LG 26, LG 50, LG 66. See Manlio Sodi – Alessandro Toniolo (eds.), *Breviarium Romanum: ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentinii restitutum summorum pontificum cura recognitum : cum textu psalmodum e versione Pii papae XII auctoritate edita : totum editio typica 1961*, Monumenta Liturgica Piana, 4 (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009).

Pseudo-Hippolytus,<sup>121</sup> three to the Gregorian sacramentary,<sup>122</sup> two to the Gelasian sacramentary,<sup>123</sup> and one to the so-called Leonine sacramentary<sup>124</sup>). Finally, there are individual examples of references to prayers from the *Euchologion* of the Byzantine rite,<sup>125</sup> the Mozarabic liturgy,<sup>126</sup> and the Monastic breviary.<sup>127</sup> While these references are heavily weighted towards the Roman liturgy, they reveal a modest interest in the relevance of non-Roman liturgical texts as well as in the relevance of early forms of the liturgy that are no longer part of the living liturgical tradition of the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.

Of these 25 references, four are found in the first chapter concerning the mystery of the Church;<sup>128</sup> twelve are found in the third chapter, concerning the hierarchical constitution of the Church;<sup>129</sup> one is found in the fourth chapter, concerning the laity;<sup>130</sup> two are found in the fifth chapter, concerning the universal call to holiness;<sup>131</sup> three are found in the seventh chapter, concerning the eschatological character of the Church; and three

121. LG 21 (two references), LG 26; on the Pseudonymous character of the *Apostolic Tradition*, see Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) 81-83. *Lumen Gentium* cites the *Apostolic Tradition* according to the first edition of the reconstruction by Bernard Botte: Hippolyte de Rome, *La Tradition Apostolique*, ed. Bernard Botte, 1st ed., Sources Chrétiennes, 11 (Paris: Cerf, 1946). For a recent English edition of the *Apostolic Tradition* which accounts for the breadth of early witnesses, see Paul F. Bradshaw – Maxwell E. Johnson – L. Edward Phillips, *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2002).

122. LG 6, LG 19, LG 21. *Lumen Gentium* references the Gregorian sacramentary according to the version found in volume 78 of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. In his fourth volume of the works of Gregory the Great, Migne reprinted a 17<sup>th</sup> century edition of what was purported to be an example of the Gregorian sacramentary, based on a manuscript now preserved as Paris BnF lat. 12051 (Sacramentary of St. Eligius). In fact, this manuscript represents a hybridization of the Gelasian and Gregorian sacramentary traditions, likely dating from the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Cf. Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, transl. William Storey – Niels Rasmussen (Portland, OR: Pastoral Press, 1986), 104, 133n281. For the authentic Gregorian sacramentary, see Jean Deshusses (ed.), *Le sacramentaire grégorien: ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits: Le sacramentaire, le supplément d'Aniane*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, Spicilegium Friburgense, 16 (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1992).

123. LG 6, LG 21.

124. LG 21.

125. LG 26.

126. LG 26.

127. LG 6.

128. LG 6 (four references).

129. LG 19, LG 21 (five references), LG 26 (four references), LG 28 (two references).

130. LG 36.

131. LG 39, LG 41.

are found in the eight chapter, concerning the Mother of God in the mystery of Christ and the Church.<sup>132</sup> No liturgical references are found in the second chapter, concerning the people of God, nor in the sixth chapter, concerning religious.

The third chapter of *Lumen Gentium* provides the largest number of liturgical references within the document. As the references in this chapter are representative of the breadth of references throughout the document, I will now focus on the references made in this chapter. In paragraph 19, the Constitution references two liturgical texts from the Gregorian sacramentary, the prefaces for the feasts of St. Matthias and St. Thomas, in the context of stating that the Church is founded on the apostles, on their leader Peter, and on the corner-stone of Christ himself.<sup>133</sup> The first references the apostles as “fundamenta” or foundations, or the Church, whereas the second refers to the apostles as both being “fundamentis” and being members of a “collegio” or college. The liturgical references are put alongside references to several Church Fathers and medieval writers, namely Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, Primasius, and Paschasius Radbertus; in addition, a reference is made to a letter of Pope Leo XIII. The liturgical references in paragraph 19 are placed first in order, serving to provide a wider context for the scriptural references which they immediately follow in the main text (“cf. Ap 21,14; Mt 16,18; Eph 2,20”). In this case, then, texts from the liturgy are used to provide historical witnesses to a tradition of referring to the college of apostles as being part of the foundation of the Church, while at the same time balancing this formation with a focus on the special role of Peter and most of all of Christ as the foundation of the Church. *Lumen Gentium* thus appeals to the witness of the liturgy in the context of discussing one of its most important themes, the collegial relationship between the bishops and the Pope as successors of the college of apostles and St. Peter.

In paragraph 21, five liturgical references appear in the course of two footnotes. The first four appear in a footnote that accompanies the Constitution’s solemn declaration concerning the episcopate as the fullness of the sacrament of order, another of the important themes of *Lumen Gentium*. In footnote 19, four liturgical sources are referenced, together with specific phrases that support the proposition that the episcopate is the fullness of order: the *Apostolic Tradition* (referenced here and in the following footnote without association with “Hippolytus”), the Leonine sacramentary, the Gelasian sacramentary, and the Gregorian sacramentary (the last of

132. LG 52 (two references), LG 66.

133. In fact, versions of the Gregorian sacramentary from before the 9<sup>th</sup> century do not include the preface for the feast of St. Matthias; cf. Edmond Eugène Moeller (ed.), *Corpus Praefationum*, 5 vols., Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 161-161D (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980) 161B:170, at §370.

which is referred to elliptically with “Cf. PL 78, 224”). In footnote 30, the *Apostolic Tradition* is again referred to in connection with the liturgical testimony that the grace of the holy Spirit is conferred through episcopal ordination. In this paragraph, then, liturgical texts ranging from the relatively early witness of the *Apostolic Tradition* through the early medieval witness of the Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian sacramentaries are used to support one of the central solemn teachings of the Council regarding the sacramentality of the episcopate.

In paragraph 26, four liturgical references are found in the course of four footnotes. In footnote 48, a prayer of episcopal consecration in the Byzantine rite is cited in connection with a recapitulation of the teaching from paragraph 21 that the bishop is marked with the fullness of the sacrament of order. In footnote 51, a prayer from the Mozarabic liturgy is quoted that offers a beautiful articulation of the fellowship between the faithful and the bishop gathered together at the Eucharist. In footnote 56, the prayer of episcopal ordination from the *Apostolic Tradition* is cited (here uniquely associated with “Hippolytus”) to support a statement concerning the bishop’s authority to direct the distribution of the sacraments. Finally, as a support to the concluding statement of the paragraph concerning the bishop’s duty to watch over the flock, footnote 57 refers somewhat elliptically to two aspects of the episcopal consecration rite from the *Pontificale Romanum*, the Examination at the beginning of the ceremony and the Prayer after the *Te Deum* at the end of the liturgy. This paragraph includes the widest range of liturgical references found in *Lumen Gentium*, ranging from texts from the Roman, Byzantine and Mozarabic rites to the witness of the *Apostolic Tradition*. The texts here are used in a wide variety of ways, serving as recapitulations of earlier statements from the Constitution and as succinct articulations of the rights and duties of bishops.

In paragraph 28, which focuses on the role of priests in the hierarchy of the Church, the Constitution cites one liturgical source, the *Pontificale Romanum*, in two succeeding footnotes. In footnote 71, the Constitution offers a reference to a statement made by the bishop during the clothing with vestments of the ordination of priests to support the statement that priests are to teach what they have believed and put into practice what they have taught. In footnote 72, the Constitution refers to the preface of the ordination rite to support the description of priests as “prudent cooperators of the episcopal order.” In this case, then, *Lumen Gentium* incorporates specific phrases from the Roman liturgy of priestly ordination in order to articulate the roles of priests.

When we consider this range of liturgical references in chapter three of *Lumen Gentium* in light of the theoretical principles of Vagaggini and Congar, several features come into focus. First, it should be emphasized that

liturgical texts are not being put forward in isolation from the broader context of Scripture and the Church Fathers, in line with the emphasis of Congar that an appeal to the liturgy as a monument of Tradition serves to help explicate the constitutive *locus* of Scripture. Further, in line with Vagaggini and Congar's emphasis on the primacy of irenic appeal to the liturgy, the liturgical texts appealed to here are not being used in the context of polemical arguments concerning controversial themes, but rather to support an irenic exposition of the scriptural tradition of referring to the Church in a variety of modes, with the possible exception of the texts related to the collegiality of the apostles. In light of Vagaggini's insistence on giving careful consideration to the varying dogmatic authority of historical forms of the liturgy and forms of the liturgy in force in the contemporary Church, it is interesting to note that the Constitution appeals both to historical liturgical texts that are no longer in common usage as well as to liturgical texts used widely in the contemporary Church, showing the longstanding applicability of the liturgy to deepening an exposition of scriptural imagery of the Church. Finally, throughout the chapter we see a careful attention to specifying the liturgical genres of the texts which are quoted. In short, the liturgical references provided in this chapter provide an excellent example of the appeal to the liturgy as a monument of Tradition in line with the principles articulated by Congar and Vagaggini.

## 5. Conclusion

The extensive liturgical documentation of the Second Vatican Council did not arise in a vacuum, but was indebted to the renewed theological interest in liturgical sources that is represented by scholars such as Congar and Vagaggini. The findings of this paper may be helpful as a background for future research concerning the liturgical citations which are found throughout the documents of Vatican II. Further consideration should be given to the theological significance of the liturgical sources of the Council, the contributions made to the redaction of the texts by individuals such as Congar and Vagaggini, and to the relationship of the liturgical theology of these authors to that of other important writers of the period such as A.G. Martimort, I.H. Dalmais, Louis Bouyer, and Antoine Chavasse.

In addition to the usefulness of these findings for understanding the context and documents of the Second Vatican Council, the consideration of the relationship between liturgy and theology offered here can be of assistance for contemporary theologians attempting to draw on the liturgies of their respective traditions and those of the wider Christian community in their theological endeavors. Appeals to the liturgy in theology may be of great assistance in incorporating the richness of Christian prayer into

theological reflection, but careful consideration must be given to the methodologies employed in this endeavor. By incorporating the testimony of liturgical prayer into theology, one is able to do theology not only “on one’s knees,” but also in the nave, in the sanctuary, in the choir stall, in the baptistry and at the altar – that is, in the church which represents the Church of God.

Priory of St. Vincent Ferrer  
869 Lexington Ave  
New York, NY, 10065  
USA  
[innocent.smith@opeast.org](mailto:innocent.smith@opeast.org)

Innocent SMITH, op