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Abstract

Benedict XVI’s views on the liturgy have become controversial in many circles both in and beyond the Catholic Church. They are often regarded as counter to the Spirit of Vatican II. In this article an attempt is made to understand Benedict’s liturgical views within their wider theological context. He regards the direction taken by contemporary secular society as fundamentally flawed and unsustainable. The Christian vision, on the other hand, can offer a real alternative. However, in the half century since Vatican II the liturgy in many places has sought to reflect the concerns of contemporary society rather than provide the impetus for a renewed Christian society.

However, in order to fulfil this commission of renewal the Church needs to return to her authentic roots in the past so as to have the spiritual, moral and intellectual resources to effectively tackle the future. So as the liturgy is central to her life and mission, the liturgy, too, must return to her living past in order to serve the future of the Church community.

Introduction

A fundamental question facing both liturgists and historians is whether the post-conciliar liturgical reforms truly reflect Sacrosanctum Concilium, the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

The mood of the years immediately following the Council was turbulent. Society displayed fascination with a perhaps exaggerated sense of individual freedom and a consequent rejection of anything permanent, absolute or otherworldly. This approach contained within itself strong tendencies favourable to relativism and all that was conceived to be new: the Council itself was seen to be a new beginning of the Church. In regard to liturgy some were influenced by an overwhelming desire for change and openness and
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consequently may have undermined its centrality, sacredness, its mystery and the theologically important, the continuous action of the Holy Spirit within the two-thousand-year history of the church in guiding the development of her liturgical life. Increasingly, in some places the liturgy became horizontal obscuring salvation history and the mystery of the living Christ.

What was the intention of John XXIII in convoking the Council? His call for aggiornamento sought to respond to modern challenges such as the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution and certain philosophical trends resulting from the influence of Kant, Hume and Hegel which led to the emergence of Marxism and Positivism. Parallel to these challenges was the rise of biblical criticism which generated a questioning attitude about the objectivity of established truth and its necessary link to ecclesial traditions and institutions.

Pope John explained his decision to call the council in these words:

Today the Church is witnessing a crisis underway within society. While humanity is on the edge of a new era, tasks of immense gravity and amplitude await the Church, as in the most tragic periods of its history. It is a question of bringing the modern world into contact with the vivifying and perennial energies of the Gospel ... we ... have felt immediately the urgency of the duty to call her sons together to give the Church the possibility to contribute more efficaciously to the solutions of the problems of the modern age.²

The Council was to strengthen the members of the Church in their faith in order to prepare them to face new challenges. The faith was not to be changed, but presented more effectively in response to complex societal needs.

In turning our attention now to Pope Benedict’s concerns in regard to liturgy we note that they cannot be divorced from his overall theological vision which accords with the sentiments expressed above by Pope John. Ratzinger wishes the Church to be very much in the world, but not of the world. He believes that Christianity, and Catholicism in particular, can pose a real alternative; a set of meanings and values that can stand a critical and redemptive distance from contemporary culture. Only in this way can the Church be both prophetic while discerning on the other hand the signs of the times, an essential dimension of the proclamation of the Word. For Benedict, the life of the Church is reflected and actualised above all in the riches of her theological tradition and her tradition of worship.

In this article I will first give a brief outline of Ratzinger’s theological approach and vision, particularly as these have an impact on liturgy. Augustinian personalism is dominant and one of the most powerful influences on his thought. The next section will attempt to link these central theological concerns to liturgy. It is in the liturgy where we make our own the prayer of Christ, that we find our true identity in Christ. Ratzinger’s liturgical approach is totally Trinitarian and Christocentric. Since there is a relationship within God himself and since the Word has become incarnate, such participation is offered to us. “Man is able to participate in the dialogue within God himself, because God has first shared human speech and has thus brought the two into communication with one another.”

Next I will turn to Ratzinger’s specific theological concerns such as active participation in the liturgy, posture during Mass, the eastward celebration of the Eucharist, liturgical music and the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. Finally, Benedict’s more positive contribution to the debate on contemporary liturgy will be assessed.

Outline of Ratzinger’s theology

To seek to give a brief overview of the theology of Joseph Ratzinger, one of the most prolific theologians of our time, is indeed a daunting task. Most of his writings deal with particular foundational questions such as faith and reason, theological method, ecumenical theology, ecclesial praxis, spirituality, liturgy and ethics and particularly political ethics.

Joseph Ratzinger’s theology is moreover marked, like that of any great theologian, by an inner unity and consistency. His liturgical vision and concerns can be understood only within the unity of his fundamental theological vision, hence the structure of this article. Moreover, his theology is above all written for a period of crisis – a time of crisis for faith and belief. Such theology must concentrate then on what is essential in the Christian faith, that is, on its identity and specificity as these are recognised in the basic structure and constitution of the faith. In what way is the Christian message distinctive and what can it give to humanity that differs from mere worldly wisdom?

According to Siegfried Wiedenhofer, one of Ratzinger’s former assistants:

This essence of the faith can be summarised in three decisive aspects of Ratzinger’s understanding of Christian faith: the rationality of faith, faith’s historicity as centered in the revela-
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In Ratzinger’s writings there are few positive references to intellectual developments outside the church. These references almost all appear as a contrast or as antithetical to the specific Christian vision. There are contrasts between, for example, the Christian notions of truth, freedom and nature, and those that are current in western culture. As Komanchak notes:

The faith must be presented as counter-cultural, as an appeal to nonconformity … It will make its appeal by presenting the Christian vision in its synthetic totality as a comprehensive structure of meaning that at nearly every point breaks with the taken-for-granted attitudes, strategies, and habits of contemporary culture.

It is clear that Ratzinger wants Christianity and the Church to present a real alternative to contemporary culture in order to provide a truly liberating force that can stand at a critical distance from present culture. He would oppose a church that has become indistinct from its surroundings and lost its sense of identity and mission.

We turn now to the rationality of faith, the first of Ratzinger’s central theological themes. Historically Ratzinger opposed the sharp distinction between faith and reason made in neo-scholasticism for he believed that this distinction prepared the groundwork for the Enlightenment and nineteenth century rationalism. However, he believes that in the search for truth, philosophy is indispensable. Philosophy can be a friend as well as an enemy in the search for truth. However, when he turns his attention to relativism, Ratzinger is critical of the dominant modern notion of reason. Relativism supposedly supports freedom and tolerance; however, according to Ratzinger it actually enslaves, for it bars one from the truth that liberates and enlightens. Consequently, faith and reason must complement each other.

Secondly, it would seem that the core doctrinal concern of Ratzinger is Christology. Christianity is not about morality or doctrine, but about a person: Jesus Christ. The relationship within God himself means that through the incarnation of the Logos humanity is offered a participation in that relationship. “Man is able to participate in the dialogue within God himself, because God has first shared in human speech and has brought the two into communication with one another.”
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Benedict’s thesis in *Jesus of Nazareth* is that there is no humane social order or true moral progress apart from a right relationship with God; try as it might, a world organised as if God does not exist will be dysfunctional and ultimately inhumane. Jesus Christ, Benedict, insists, is the sign of God for human beings. Presenting humanity with the proper teaching about Jesus is, therefore, according to Benedict, the highest form of public service the church has to offer.8

Thirdly, the truth that is Jesus Christ, the truth of love, a truth that is really humane, is realised in a *person*. This means that the truth of God does not reach humanity from the outside, as it were, but rather, *in* humanity as a message of life and love that consequently permits the human person to live in a full and proper sense, in love. Here we can see how Ratzinger has been deeply influenced by the personalist thinking of theologians such as Scheler and Guardini. Wiedenhofer expresses Ratzinger’s personalist thought in these words:

> For man lives, finally from the love that he receives and passes on, first and finally from that love that God is and that has become visible in the history of Jesus Christ. No one can live if he is not able to accept himself. But no one is able to accept himself if he has not already been accepted and loved by another. Truly being human is dependent upon love … thus it is only where love is identical with truth that love is able to offer salvation of man.9

Love, personal love, identical with truth, is the true centre of Christianity.

**Ratzinger’s theological approach to liturgy**

Ratzinger’s approach to liturgy, as noted earlier, is thoroughly theologically based. Sound liturgical practice can only be done on the basis of a sound liturgical theology. Aidan Nichols, in his highly acclaimed *The thought of Pope Benedict XVI*, states that “Ratzinger’s starting point is that liturgy is an instance of praying, itself the most transparent moment in the dialogue between God and man which gives the Christian gospel its entire pattern.”10 Consequently, authentic worship must not neglect the “vertical” relationship to God. While the desire to foster the “horizontal” relationships between
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belongers is a legitimate concern, the primary call is to divine adoration. Ratzinger believes that “Man is able to participate in the dialogue within God himself, because God has first shared in human speech and has brought the two into communication with one another.” Likewise, liturgy, according to Ratzinger, is given before it is constructed — it comes to us as a divine gift and a human heritage. The “givenness” of the liturgy means that it is always something received and it is not to be arbitrarily or “creatively” changed. Liturgical texts are mysterious having developed over many centuries and reflecting the ancient orthodox faith of the Church.

Another concern for Ratzinger arises from his ideas of theological and liturgical renewal. His identification with a return to the historical sources (resourcement) — biblical and patristic — associated with De Lubac and Danielou set him in opposition to those like Chenu, Lonergan, Rahner and Schillebeeckx who advocated a positive engagement with modern philosophical, intellectual and cultural movements. Thus as Komanchak notes, Ratzinger would have preferred that the text of Gaudium et Spes begin from the actual Christian Creed rather than from the contemporary situation. In his estimation, then, dialogue was substituting for the proclamation of the faith. Ratzinger’s approach is “from above”, from revelation, from the ancient wisdom displayed in the Church Fathers and the medieval masters rather than from various forms of modern philosophy.

Within the context of the above concerns we turn next to sacrifice versus meal. Ratzinger shows that the basic structure of the Eucharist was not a meal but rather a memorial, an anamnesis, in the shape of a thanksgiving for Jesus’ self-offering to the Father into which we enter by a spiritual sacrifice through the Eucharistic Prayer. In fact, he rejects the view that the Last Supper should be seen as the basis of the Mass. Rather, “The Last Supper is the foundation of the dogmatic content of the Christian Eucharist, not of its liturgical form. The latter does not yet exist.” The Eucharist only becomes the Passover of Jesus when the promises of the Last Supper are fulfilled and made real by Jesus’ suffering, death and rising to new life. The form and meaning of the Last Supper is not complete in itself. So Ratzinger insists that the origins of the Eucharist are not identified with the Passover, but are rather placed within the new context of Lord’s day which marks both the first day of creation and the new creation inaugurated by Christ’s resurrection. There is a radical newness contained and effected in the Eucharist — the renewal of...
history and of the whole of the cosmos. Thus he specifically rejects the idea that the Eucharist was originally a simple fellowship-meal with the disciples or even that it was a continuation of the meal that Jesus shared with sinners. The “Eucharist is not itself the sacrament of reconciliation, but in fact it presupposes that sacrament. It is the sacrament of the reconciled, to which the Lord invites all those who have become one with him.”

For Ratzinger, then, the Church’s worship is far more than a congregational gathering. It has a strong cosmic dimension for it is an exercise of the priesthood of the whole People of God gathered across time into eternity. The essence of this priesthood of the Church is the adoration and glorification of God and the Eucharistic liturgy through which this worship establishes the identity of the new People of God. Every celebration of the Eucharist on earth becomes an entry into the heavenly liturgy of eternity. “Earthly liturgy is liturgy because, and only because, it joins what is already in progress, the greater reality.” Hahn expresses Ratzinger’s thought so well. “The Eucharist on earth is the liturgy, the song of the royal and priestly people on their pilgrimage. In the Eucharist the kingdom here on earth is in some measure realised and the final descent of the kingdom of heaven is anticipated.”

This means that the Christian Eucharistic sacrifice is more than appropriation of Jewish traditions or a simple re-presentation of Jesus’ last supper. The last supper is incomplete in itself without Jesus’ suffering, death and resurrection. It is something radically new for it is the renewal of history and the whole of creation. Consequently, then, Ratzinger’s “cosmic liturgy” realises to some extent then the kingdom here on earth and at the same time anticipates the final consummation of the eschaton.

In conclusion, then, Ratzinger takes exception to the contemporary concern with fostering community at the expense of the spiritual and theological meaning of the Eucharistic sacrifice. His emphasis would be on the “objectivity” of the Eucharist rather than on the “subjectivity” of experience. The liturgy is God’s work, the opus Dei.

Ratzinger’s liturgical concerns

Attention will now turn to some of Benedict’s main liturgical concerns which arise from the theological considerations outlined above.
First, he rejects that “active participation” means that as many persons as possible should be involved in liturgical action. For him the essential action is the Eucharistic prayer, the “solemn public speech”, spoken by the priest in the person of Christ. This is the essential, the real action in which both priest and people participate and the people of God are drawn into the action of Christ.26 The active participation, then, is primarily an inner process for a contemplative dimension and is another of Ratzinger’s concerns. Indeed, if there is to be true active participation then, paradoxically, there must also be silence. “In this silence, together, we journey inward, becoming aware of word and sign, leaving behind the roles which conceal our true selves. In silence man ‘bides’ and ‘abides’; he becomes aware of ‘abiding reality’”.27 Ratzinger also recommends a partial return to a silent recitation of the Eucharistic Prayer to counter the excessive wordiness of much contemporary celebration. “That is why, here especially, we are in such urgent need of an education toward inwardness. We need to be taught to enter into the heart of things ... The only way we can be saved from succumbing to the inflation of words is if we have the courage to face silence and in it to learn to listen afresh to the Word.”28 Allied to a more contemplative focus during the Eucharistic celebration is Benedict’s concern with the “disruption” of the solemnity of the Mass by the exchanging of the sign of peace before communion. Benedict has suggested that the sign of peace could be better placed before the presentation of the gifts in order not to disrupt the contemplative preparation for the reception of Communion.29

Secondly, Benedict expresses concern about the virtual falling away of the practice of kneeling. In his theological justification for the custom of kneeling he finds support in the letter to the Philippians.

In bending the knee at the name of Jesus, the Church is acting in all truth; she is entering into the cosmic gesture, paying homage to the Victor and therefore going over to the Victor’s side. For in bending the knee we signify that we are imitating or adopting the attitude of him who, though he was in “the form of God”, yet “humbled himself unto death”. 30

Thirdly, Benedict advocates an eventual return to the practice of the eastward celebration of the Eucharist. The priest facing the people at Mass is misconceived and “has turned the community into a self-enclosed circle. In its outward form, it no longer opens out on what lies ahead and above, but is
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closed in on itself”.

He fears that the priest now becomes the focus and the community risks celebrating itself. Benedict wishes, therefore, to emphasise that essentially it is God who acts in the liturgy and that the community is therefore not the primary focus. In order to symbolically display this reality he states that “[w]here a direct common turning towards the east is not possible, the cross can serve as the interior ‘east’ of faith. It should stand in the middle of the altar and be the common point of focus for both priest and praying community”.

Fourthly, Benedict gives much attention to the place of liturgical music. The Word cannot be restricted to mere speech. Sacramental signs are more than language. Music expresses the pre-rational and super-rational powers of humanity so uncovering for us the “song which lies at the foundation of all things”. Consequently, Ratzinger is particularly opposed to various contemporary forms of rock and pop music and to musical expression derived from political or erotic arousal or from a desire to entertain. Aidan Nichols expresses Ratzinger’s concerns in these words:

With regard to the frequently banal and unworthy music which has too frequently, since the Council, perpetuated the worst of the pre-conciliar practice at the expense of the plainsong and polyphony which was its best, Ratzinger is putting questions of importance. Has the Church the right to renounce her mission to baptise culture, especially that “high” culture which is the bearer of human insights and values attained at most cost? Has she ceased to seek the cultural expression of that glorious transfiguration of the human which is la vita nuova, the new life in Christ? In other words: has not the triumph of liturgical populism been achieved at too high a price?

In essence Ratzinger is opposed to what may be termed “utility music” which is promoted not for any aesthetic quality, but rather for its popularity and perhaps its educational purpose. He expresses his view in these words:

... the taking up of music into the liturgy must be its taking up into the Spirit, a transformation which implies both death and resurrection ... The cultic music of pagan religions has a different status in human existence from the music that glorifies God in creation. Through rhythm and melody themselves, pagan music often endeavours to elicit an ecstasy
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of the senses, but without elevating the sense into the spirit. ... this imbalance towards the senses recurs in popular music: the "god" found here ... is quite different from the God of the Christian faith.  

Benedict is quite clear that utility music has no place in the liturgy as it generates emotions that have no place in the Church’s worship.

For Benedict too, beauty is intrinsic to the liturgy. Tracy Rowland in Ratzinger’s faith contends that, unlike Paul VI who imbibed a Kantian attitude that aesthetics is a mere matter of taste, Ratzinger in his first Apostolic Exhortation, Sacramentum Caritas states that “everything related to the Eucharist should be marked by beauty.” He continues that “like the rest of Christian Revelation, the liturgy is inherently linked to beauty: it is veritatis spendour (the splendour of truth).” For all these reasons then he concludes that “The Church is to transform, improve, ‘humanise’ the world — but how can she do that if at the same she turns her back on beauty, which is so clearly allied to love.” Expressions of beauty in liturgy may never be regarded as superfluous or incidental, but are integral to divine worship. Too sharp a distinction between outward appearance and inner reality has resulted in a reductionist approach to liturgy inimical to Catholic theological and liturgical integration. All too often some contemporary “sacro-pop” liturgies have degenerated into celebrations of human community rather than the gathering of a community to worship the triune God.

Fifthly, then, and closely related to the theological considerations outlined in the previous section, the deepest meaning of the Mass lies in its being a Holy Sacrifice offered ritually as worship and not as a fellowship meal. Although originating within the framework of the Passover meal, the Eucharist “refers back to the Cross and then to the transformation of the Temple sacrifice into the worship of God that is in harmony with logos?” Accordingly, Jesus in the Eucharist does not give us not a “thing” but himself in order to make us sharers in God’s own life. Although instituted in the context of a Jewish ritual meal, it is truly something new. The former ancient rite has been surpassed and we are drawn into Christ’s own sacrificial act and indeed into himself. It is worthy to note that in the document,
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Sacramentum Caritatis, the word ‘sacrifice’ is mentioned more than forty times.

Conclusion

Benedict believes firmly that the community gathered in worship must in their priestly action reflect and manifest the faith that they profess. Liturgy that does not manifest and accord with the life of faith must ultimately undermine that faith. He is convinced that many of the Church’s contemporary difficulties are to a large extent due to the disintegration of the liturgy. As we have already noted liturgy is given before it is constructed. There is a “givenness” to the liturgy: it has developed over many centuries and is a tangible manifestation of the fixed and yet mobile developing tradition of the church which, together with scripture, is one of the sources of revelation in Catholic theology.

Ratzinger is convinced that the liturgical experiments of the post-Vatican II era are based on an overemphasis on Baroque sacramental theology, eighteenth century philosophy and an obsession with pedagogy. Rowland further notes that these aberrations have historical origins that can be further reduced to a

... cocktail of scholasticism (the reduction of sacramental theology to considerations of matter and form), the Kantian obsession with pedagogical rationalism (the predominance of ethical values over strictly religious ones), moralism (the notion of Mass attendance as a duty parade), and a Jansenist attitude to beauty (it is irrelevant: the only thing that matters is that the words are doctrinally sound and in the vernacular) ...  

Benedict’s theology and by extension liturgical concerns are, as has been noted earlier, extremely Christocentric. Thus Christianity is not primarily about morality or even doctrine, but about a person: Jesus Christ. Worship is the Church’s central activity in which Christ gives himself fully in the Eucharist and believers give themselves fully in thanksgiving.

Perhaps positively Benedict’s liturgical initiatives may help the Church to recover a sense of the presence of the Holy which has so often been lost in many contemporary liturgies. His concern for more reverence and silence may deepen spiritual awareness. As Thomas Rauch notes, “Celebration has too often focused on celebration, community, ministry and hospitality, with far less attention to worship, entering into the holy or
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approaching the altar of God. Too often liturgies have become overly wordy, didactic and banal.\textsuperscript{46}

Pope Benedict cannot simply be written off as a reactionary or restorationist. He is far more complex and theologically profound. He is too rooted in the Fathers, and Augustine in particular, to wish to return the church to pre-conciliar and neo-scholastic days. He favours a return to the sources of the Church’s traditions and at the same time to update the Church in response to the times, but in conformity with the distinctiveness of Christian revelation. His liturgical concerns accord with this basic theological vision.

Why have I termed Benedict’s liturgical concerns as “back to the future”? He does not wish merely to correct what he may regard as past mistakes. He sees a need to appreciate the liturgical traditions of the past in order that the Church may discover her true liturgical and theological roots. Armed thus the church may confidently face the future for as Ratzinger states, “The true time of Vatican 11 has not yet come, and its authentic reception has not yet begun”.\textsuperscript{47}
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