

A TRIPTYCH COMPARATIVE STUDY

Two Missals, One Sacrifice

Reading the 1962 and Postconciliar Roman Missals at Their Own Loci

Contents

1	Two Books on One Desk	1
2	What the Governing Acts Actually Legislate	2
3	The Order of Mass: Structure, Retention, Loss, Composition	4
4	The Offertory and Its Replacement	8
5	The Roman Canon in Each Book, and the Three Added Prayers	10
6	The Word: Two Lectionary Provisions	14
7	The Calendar and the Rank Systems	16
8	The Rubrics' Theology of the Priest	18
9	The Language Question as the Books Legislate It	21
10	What the Comparison Yields	23
	Notes	26
	A Scope, Method, and Qualifications	31
	B References	33

1 Two Books on One Desk

Put the two books side by side and the first surprise is how much of the argument about them cannot be conducted from them. The 1962 *Missale Romanum* is a single volume of about eleven hundred pages containing everything a priest needs at the altar: the general rubrics, the ceremonial directory, the calendar, the Order of Mass, the Canon, and every Mass formulary with its readings printed in place. The postconciliar *Missale Romanum* in its third typical edition is a volume of comparable bulk containing almost the same things minus the readings, which now live in a separate book with its own introduction and its own three-year architecture. Neither book contains a word about which of them a given priest may lawfully use today; that is settled elsewhere, by acts that are not liturgical books at all. Neither contains an argument for itself. What each contains is a rite, printed with its rubrics, and the rubrics are extraordinarily specific about things the polemics rarely mention and silent about things the polemics treat as central.

This study reads the two books at their own loci. The method is pedestrian and the discipline is severe: for each point of comparison, find the place in each book where the matter is actually settled, quote or describe what stands there, and refuse to characterise either book from anything except its printed text and its own promulgating and governing acts. Where a claim commonly made about the two Missals does not survive that treatment, the claim is named and the text is shown. Where the claim survives, it is credited, including when it is uncomfortable.

Two consequences of the method should be stated at once, because they will disappoint different readers in different sections. The first is that this study cannot tell you which Missal is better. A book does not contain the measure of its own fruitfulness, and the question of what four decades of celebration have done to Catholic belief and practice is an empirical and historical question that no amount of textual collation can answer.¹ The second is that this study will not soften a difference to keep the peace. Several of the differences between the two books are large, and at least two of them are large in ways that the standard defence of the reform tends to pass over quickly. Saying so is not a verdict; it is the precondition of one.

1.1 What the two objects are

Precision about the objects is not pedantry here; almost every confused argument about “the old Mass” and “the new Mass” can be traced to an imprecision in naming one of them.

The older witness is the *Missale Romanum, editio typica*, published at the Vatican Press in 1962. Its own opening decree, dated 23 June 1962 and signed by Cardinal Larraona as Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, explains why it exists: a new corpus of rubrics had been approved by John XXIII in the motu proprio *Rubricarum instructum* and promulgated by the Congregation the following day, and so “it could scarcely fail to happen” that the same Congregation should prepare a new edition of the Roman Missal “fully accommodated to the said code of rubrics.”² That sentence is worth holding on to. The 1962 book is not a survival that escaped reform; it is the product of a reform completed two years earlier, and it says so on its second leaf.

The newer witness is the *Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia*, approved in 2000 and published in 2002, together with its 2008 emended reprint. It stands in a line whose earlier members—the 1969 *Ordo Missae*, the 1970 first typical edition, the 1975 second—are distinct historical objects and are treated as such where they matter. The third edition is used here because it is the current normative Latin text, because it prints the 1969 apostolic constitution and the three promulgating decrees in its own front matter, and because comparing a current book with a current book removes one whole class of evasion from the argument.

Both books are Latin. Where this study quotes them, it quotes the Latin, because the Latin is the text that was promulgated and the only text in which the comparison can be made without importing a translator’s decisions. The approved English of the postconciliar Missal and the text of the Lectionary are under copyright and are nowhere reproduced; they are cited by locus and described.³

1.2 The rule of the study

Three working rules govern everything that follows, and they are stated here so that a reader can hold the study to them.

First: a locus, or nothing. Every substantive comparative claim is anchored to a place in a book—an article of the *Institutio generalis*, a number in the *Rubricae generales*, a rubric in the Order of Mass, an article of a *motu proprio*. A claim about “the spirit” of either book, or about what its compilers intended, or about what its use has produced, is either supported from a printed text or is not made.

Second: keep the demonstrable and the contested apart. A great deal about the two books is simply demonstrable: whether a prayer is present, what words it has, how many signs of the cross a rubric prescribes, which day outranks which. A great deal else is contested judgement: whether a shorter form says the same thing, whether repetition is redundancy or formation, whether a permission is a danger. This study separates them typographically and grammatically. Demonstrable matter is stated flatly. Contested judgement is marked as judgement, attributed where it belongs, and—in the one place where the study advances a judgement of its own—labelled as such and equipped with the finding that would overturn it.

Third: take each side at its strongest. The critical case against the postconciliar Missal is not the internet’s version of it; it is the case made by a pope who legislated in its favour and by a constitution that the reform itself invokes. The case for the reform is not a shrug about pastoral necessity; it is an argument from the same phrase—*ad pristinam sanctorum Patrum normam*—that Pius V used in 1570, deployed by the new Missal’s own *Institutio* with full awareness of what it was doing.⁴ A comparison that meets only the weaker version of either case has proved nothing about the stronger.

2 What the Governing Acts Actually Legislate

Liturgical books do not authorise themselves. Both Missals were promulgated by acts, and the use of each is presently governed by further acts. Those acts are short, they are public, and they say markedly less—and occasionally markedly more—than the arguments built on them.

2.1 *Quo primum* (14 July 1570)

The bull of Pius V is printed in the front matter of the 1962 Missal itself, three leaves after the title page, and can therefore be read in the very book whose defenders most often invoke it.⁵ It does four things.

It **narrates a commission**: learned men were charged to restore the Missal “ad pristinam sanctorum Patrum normam ac ritum,” after collating the oldest manuscripts of the Vatican Library with others sought out from everywhere. It **imposes the new book**, ordering that in every patriarchal, cathedral, collegiate and parochial church, secular and regular, Mass be sung or read according to no formula but that of the Missal published by Pius V, and forbidding priests to add to or recite in the celebration of Mass any ceremonies or prayers other than those the Missal contains. It **grants a perpetual faculty**: priests may use this Missal freely and lawfully, “absque ullo conscientiae scrupulo, aut aliquarum poenarum, sententiarum et censurarum incurso”—without any scruple of conscience or incurring any penalty, sentence or censure. And it **shields the book from tampering**, decreeing that nothing is ever to be added to, taken from, or changed in it, under pain of the pope’s indignation, and that priests may not be compelled by anyone to alter this Missal, nor may these letters at any time be revoked or modified.

Two features of that text are routinely lost. The first is the exception. The suppression of other Missals is expressly qualified: it does not touch churches whose own rite was approved from its first institution by the Apostolic See, or whose custom of celebrating Mass in that manner had been continuously observed for more than two hundred years. Of those, Pius V says plainly, “a quibus . . . nequaquam auferimus”—from them we by no means take it away—and he adds a permission, not a command, that such churches may adopt his Missal if it pleases them better, with the consent of the bishop or prelate and the whole chapter. *Quo primum* therefore did not abolish the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, Lyonese, Dominican, Carthusian or Carmelite uses; it left them standing by name of principle, and their later disappearance, where it occurred, has other causes.

The second is the addressee of the shielding clause. The persons the bull binds under pain of indignation are named in the sentence itself: patriarchs, administrators, and “all and singular persons adorned with any ecclesiastical dignity, even Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church,” who are commanded in virtue of holy obedience to sing and read Mass according to this Missal and to presume to add nothing; and, in the following clause, the printers, who are threatened with loss of their books, fines, and excommunication if they print an uncollated copy. The clause about the letters

never being revoked is a standard perpetuity formula of the chancery, and the claim built upon it—that a pope of 1570 disabled his successors—has never been the Church’s reading of it.

That reading has an unusually clean internal refutation, because the 1962 Missal prints the counter-evidence on the facing leaves. Immediately after *Quo primum* comes the brief of Clement VIII, *Cum sanctissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum* (7 July 1604), whose own narrative runs: Pius V had the Roman Missal restored and printed, “and although he most severely provided, under many penalties, that nothing should be added to it or in any way taken away, nevertheless, with the passage of time,” printers’ and others’ errors had crept in—whereupon Clement VIII appointed cardinals to restore the Missal, had the emended book printed at the Vatican Press, and revoked the printing privileges his predecessors had granted.⁶ Thirty years later Urban VIII, in *Si quid est in rebus humanis* (2 September 1634), ordered the Missal examined again and corrected, restoring rubrics that “had gradually degenerated from ancient use and rite” and clarifying others.⁷ A reader who holds that *Quo primum* made the Missal of 1570 unalterable is holding a position that the book he is holding refutes on its own front pages, twice, in the acts of the two popes who altered it first. The same sequence of popes—Clement VIII, Urban VIII, Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XII, John XXIII—is rehearsed for exactly this purpose in the preamble to *Summorum Pontificum*.⁸

2.2 *Missale Romanum* (3 April 1969)

Paul VI’s apostolic constitution is the promulgating act of the newer book, and it is printed in the third typical edition’s own front matter. It is unusually concrete about what it is doing. It records that the Order of Mass has been revised so that the parts proper to each minister and to the people are more clearly distinguished; that three new Eucharistic Prayers have been added to the Roman Canon; that the words of consecration have been made the same in all four; that the lectionary has been greatly enlarged; and it fixes the effective date of the whole at the First Sunday of Advent, 30 November 1969.⁹ It does not abrogate the 1962 Missal in terms; whether it did so implicitly became a disputed question of law, and it is a question the 2007 *motu proprio* answered in the negative.

Three further acts complete the newer book’s edition history, and all three are printed in the 2002 volume: the decree of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship of 26 March 1970 declaring the first typical edition; the act of 27 March 1975 for the second; and the decree of 20 April 2000 declaring the third, approved by John Paul II on 10 April 2000.¹⁰ A 2008 *reimpressio emendata* of the third edition followed, published with a schedule of variations rather than as a new typical edition.

2.3 *Summorum Pontificum* (7 July 2007) and after

The 2007 *motu proprio* made three moves that must be kept distinct. Article 1 states that the Missal of Paul VI is the ordinary expression of the *lex orandi* of the Latin Church and that the Missal of Pius V as revised by John XXIII is “nonetheless to be considered an extraordinary expression of the same *lex orandi*”: two usages of the one Roman Rite. The same article states that the 1962 typical edition was “never abrogated.” Articles 2 through 5 then deregulate its use: any priest of the Latin rite may use either Missal in a Mass without a congregation on any day except the Easter Triduum, needing no permission from the Apostolic See or his own Ordinary; and where a stable group of the faithful exists in a parish, the parish priest should willingly accede to its requests. Article 6, which is almost never quoted in the language debate, permits the readings in such Masses to be proclaimed *also in the vernacular*, using editions approved by the Apostolic See.

The 2011 instruction *Universae Ecclesiae* implemented that framework, and two of its provisions are worth recording because they cut against the picture of the older Missal as a sealed object. Number 24 requires that the liturgical books of the extraordinary form “are to be used as they are,” and that those who celebrate must know and correctly follow their rubrics. But number 25 states that “new saints and certain of the new prefaces can and ought to be inserted into the 1962 Missal,” according to provisions to be indicated later; and number 26 sets out the three permitted arrangements for the readings—Latin alone, Latin followed by the vernacular, or, in low Masses, the vernacular alone.¹¹ The framework most favourable to the older Missal in living memory therefore both required exact fidelity to its rubrics and directed that it be augmented from the newer books. *Universae Ecclesiae* was superseded in its operative parts by what followed.

2.4 *Traditionis custodes* (16 July 2021), the *Responsa*, and the 2023 rescript

The 2021 motu proprio reverses the direction of the 2007 framework and does so by a small number of very exactly worded provisions. Article 1: “The liturgical books promulgated by Saint Paul VI and Saint John Paul II, in conformity with the decrees of Vatican Council II, are the *unique* expression of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite.” Article 2 reserves to the diocesan bishop the exclusive competence to authorise the use of the 1962 Missal in his diocese. Article 3 governs existing groups: the bishop is to determine that they do not deny the validity and legitimacy of the liturgical reform; to designate locations for their celebrations, not in parochial churches and without erecting new personal parishes; to fix the days; to appoint a delegate priest; to review existing personal parishes; and “to take care not to authorize the establishment of new groups.” Article 4 subjects priests ordained after the motu proprio to a formal request to the bishop, who is to consult the Apostolic See. Article 8 abrogates “previous norms, instructions, permissions, and customs” that do not conform.¹²

Two precisions belong here, and both cut across the usual reporting.

First, article 1 does not say that the 1962 Missal is abrogated. It says that the postconciliar books are the unique expression of the Roman Rite’s *lex orandi*, and article 8 abrogates *norms, instructions, permissions and customs* inconsistent with the new regime—which is a statement about the legal apparatus of permission, not about the existence of a book. The 1962 Missal continues to be used, under authorisation, by the express provision of articles 2 to 5 of the same act; a rite that the same document regulates in five articles has not been abolished by its first. Whether the shift from “extraordinary expression” to “unique expression” amounts in substance to a reversal of the 2007 judgement is a real question; but it is a question about the two acts’ juridical import, not a question that can be settled by asserting an abrogation the text does not contain.

Second, article 3 §3 requires that in these celebrations “the readings are proclaimed in the vernacular language, using translations of the Sacred Scripture approved for liturgical use by the respective Episcopal Conferences.” Where *Summorum Pontificum* art. 6 *permitted* vernacular readings, *Traditionis custodes* *requires* them. The *Responsa ad dubia* of 4 December 2021 drew the consequence with unusual clarity: because the 1962 Missal is a plenary book containing its own readings and there is no separate lectionary for it, one must “necessarily resort to the translation of the Bible approved by the individual Bishops’ Conferences for liturgical use, choosing the pericopes indicated in the *Missale Romanum* of 1962,” and no vernacular lectionaries reproducing the older cycle may be published.¹³ The *Responsa* further denied recourse to the pre-conciliar *Pontificale Romanum*, permitted the 1952 *Rituale Romanum* only to canonically erected personal parishes celebrating with the 1962 Missal, and denied bination with the 1962 Missal to a priest who has already celebrated that day with the current one.

The rescript of 20 February 2023 reserved to the Apostolic See two dispensations previously exercised by bishops—the use of a parish church or the erection of a personal parish, and permission for priests ordained after 16 July 2021—and confirmed the *Responsa* with their explanatory notes, the Pope’s assent to which had been given in the audience of 18 November 2021.¹⁴ As of the stated date of this study, that is where the universal discipline stands.

What the acts do and do not settle

The acts settle who may use which book, on what conditions, and by whose authorisation. They settle that both books are of the Roman Rite: *Summorum Pontificum* art. 1 calls them two usages of one rite, and *Traditionis custodes*, which withdraws that framework’s permissions, nowhere denies that the older book is Roman. They do not settle any question of textual comparison. Nothing in *Quo primum* describes the contents of the Missal it promulgates; nothing in *Missale Romanum* (1969) or in *Traditionis custodes* adjudicates whether a particular prayer was rightly dropped. For that, one has to open the books.

3 The Order of Mass: Structure, Retention, Loss, Composition

The Order of Mass is where the comparison either becomes exact or becomes rhetoric. Both books print it as a continuous rubricated sequence; both can therefore be inventoried unit by unit, and the units can be sorted into four classes—retained with the same words, retained with altered words, dropped, and newly composed—without any interpretive step at all. The sorting is done here first, and interpreted afterwards.

One preliminary matters. The 1962 Order of Mass is printed as a single ceremonial script for a priest at the altar, with variations for solemn Mass supplied in rubrics and in the separate *Ritus servandus*. The postconciliar Order of Mass

is printed as one script for Mass with a congregation, followed by a distinct *Ordo Missæ cuius unus tantum minister participat* for Mass with a single server.¹⁵ The default case has been inverted: what the older book treats as the norm from which solemnity is built up, the newer book treats as the reduction from which the norm is abbreviated. This is a structural fact about the two books, visible from their tables of contents, and it precedes every particular difference.

3.1 The inventory

1962 Order of Mass	Postconciliar Order of Mass	Relation
<i>In nomine Patris</i> ; antiphon <i>Introibo ad altare Dei</i> with Ps 42, said alternately with the ministers, then repeated; <i>Adiutorium nostrum</i>	<i>In nomine Patris</i> , sung or said with the people, then a greeting (three forms; <i>Pax vobis</i> for a bishop)	Psalm and antiphon dropped; the sign of the cross retained and made a common act; a scriptural greeting newly composed from 2 Cor 13:13 and Rom 1:7 alongside <i>Dominus vobiscum</i>
Priest's <i>Confiteor</i> , ministers' <i>Misereatur</i> ; ministers' <i>Confiteor</i> , priest's <i>Misereatur</i> ; <i>Indulgentiam</i> ; <i>Deus tu conversus</i> , <i>Ostende nobis</i> , <i>Domine exaudi</i> , <i>Dominus vobiscum</i>	Penitential act in one of three forms: <i>Confiteor</i> said by all together with <i>Misereatur nostri</i> ; or the <i>Miserere nostri</i> versicles; or the <i>Qui missus es</i> invocations with <i>Kyrie</i> ; sprinkling rite permitted in its place on Sundays	Doubled <i>Confiteor</i> collapsed into one said by all; text altered (see below); <i>Indulgentiam</i> and the four versicles dropped; two alternative forms and a Sunday substitution newly composed
<i>Aufer a nobis</i> on ascending; <i>Oramus te</i> , <i>Domine</i> at the kiss of the altar	No formula; the rubric prescribes the veneration of the altar by kiss and, as opportune, incensation	Dropped as texts; the gestures retained as rubric
Introit antiphon; <i>Kyrie</i> ; <i>Gloria</i>	Entrance chant during the procession; <i>Kyrie</i> (unless already used); <i>Gloria</i>	Retained; <i>Gloria</i> identical in wording; entrance chant relocated to the procession rather than read at the book
<i>Dominus vobiscum</i> ; Collect, one or more as the Office requires	<i>Oremus</i> , silence, then one Collect	Retained; the multiplication of collects removed
Epistle; Gradual; Alleluia or Tract; Sequence when appointed	First reading; responsorial psalm; second reading on Sundays and solemnities; Alleluia or other chant; Sequence when appointed	Restructured: see section 6
<i>Munda cor meum</i> ; <i>Iube</i> , <i>Domine</i> , <i>benedicere</i> (or the deacon's <i>Iube</i> , <i>domne</i> with <i>Dominus sit in corde tuo</i>)	<i>Iube</i> , <i>domne</i> , <i>benedicere</i> and <i>Dominus sit in corde tuo</i> when a deacon reads; <i>Munda cor meum</i> only when the priest reads without a deacon	Both retained, with the alternatives now assigned by whether a deacon is present rather than by degree of solemnity
Gospel; <i>Per evangelica dicta</i> said at the kissing of the book	Gospel; <i>Per evangelica dicta</i> said quietly at the kissing of the book	Retained verbatim
—	Homily, obligatory on Sundays and holy days of obligation, commended on other days	Newly prescribed within the Order of Mass
<i>Credo</i> when appointed	<i>Credo</i> when appointed; the Apostles' Creed permitted in its place, especially in Lent and Eastertide	Nicene text retained verbatim; a second creed added as an option
—	Universal prayer (prayer of the faithful)	Newly prescribed
Offertory antiphon and the offertory prayers	Preparation of the gifts	Treated in section 4
Preface; <i>Sanctus</i>	Preface; <i>Sanctus</i>	Retained; <i>Sanctus</i> identical in wording; the repertory of prefaces greatly enlarged
Canon Missæ	Prex eucharistica I (Canon romanus) or II, III, IV	Treated in section 5
<i>Pater noster</i> sung or said by the priest alone, the ministers answering <i>Sed libera nos a malo</i>	<i>Pater noster</i> said by the priest with the people	Retained; the speaker changed

1962 Order of Mass	Postconciliar Order of Mass	Relation
<i>Libera nos</i> said silently, with the intercession of Our Lady, Peter, Paul and Andrew; fraction; <i>Pax Domini</i> ; <i>Hæc commixtio et consecratio</i>	<i>Libera nos</i> said aloud, without the saints, with <i>exspectantes beatam spem</i> added and the people's doxology; <i>Domine Iesu Christe, qui dixisti</i> said aloud; <i>Pax Domini</i> ; optional exchange of peace; fraction; <i>Hæc commixtio</i>	Retained with substantial alteration; one of the priest's three private prayers before Communion promoted to an audible prayer for peace; an exchange of peace made an option
<i>Agnus Dei</i>	<i>Agnus Dei</i> , repeatable if the fraction is prolonged	Retained verbatim
<i>Domine Iesu Christe, qui dixisti</i> ; <i>Domine Iesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi</i> ; <i>Perceptio Corporis tui</i>	<i>Domine Iesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi</i> or <i>Perceptio Corporis et Sanguinis tui</i>	All three retained in the book; the first relocated and made audible, the other two reduced to a choice of one
<i>Panem cælestem accipiam</i> ; <i>Domine, non sum dignus</i> said three times; <i>Corpus Domini nostri</i>	<i>Ecce Agnus Dei . . . Beati qui ad cenam Agni vocati sunt</i> ; <i>Domine, non sum dignus</i> said once by priest and people together; <i>Corpus Christi custodiat me</i>	<i>Panem cælestem</i> dropped; <i>Ecce Agnus Dei</i> moved from the Communion of the faithful to this point and expanded with Apoc 19:9; the threefold <i>Domine, non sum dignus</i> reduced to one and made common
<i>Quid retribuam</i> ; <i>Sanguis Domini nostri</i>	<i>Sanguis Christi custodiat me</i>	<i>Quid retribuam</i> dropped; the formula shortened
Communion of the faithful: <i>Ecce Agnus Dei</i> , <i>Domine non sum dignus</i> three times, <i>Corpus Domini nostri Iesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam æternam. Amen</i>	<i>Corpus Christi — Amen</i>	Formula abbreviated and the response transferred to the communicant
<i>Quod ore sumpsimus</i> ; <i>Corpus tuum</i> , <i>Domine</i> , <i>quod sumpsi</i>	<i>Quod ore sumpsimus</i>	First retained verbatim; second dropped
Communion antiphon; Postcommunion(s); <i>Oratio super populum</i> on Lenten ferias	Communion chant; silence or a psalm; Prayer after Communion; <i>Oratio super populum</i> on Lenten ferias and, as an option, elsewhere	Retained; a period of silence newly prescribed as an option
<i>Ite, missa est</i> / <i>Benedicamus Domino</i> / <i>Requiescant in pace</i>	Announcements if needed; greeting; blessing; dismissal	Retained, reordered: in 1962 the dismissal precedes the blessing; in the newer book the blessing precedes the dismissal
<i>Placeat tibi, sancta Trinitas</i> ; blessing; Last Gospel (Jn 1:1–14)	—	<i>Placeat</i> and the Last Gospel dropped

3.2 What the inventory shows

Four observations follow directly, and none of them requires a judgement.

The great fixed texts are untouched. *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, *Pater noster* and *Agnus Dei* stand in the newer book with the same Latin words they have in the older one. So do *Per evangelica dicta*, *Quod ore sumpsimus*, and—as section 4 will show—*In spiritu humilitatis* and the *Orate, fratres* with its response. Anyone who has been told that the reform rewrote the Ordinary of the Mass is holding a claim that five minutes with the two books disproves.

The losses are concentrated at the two ends and in the priest's private apparatus. What is gone is the psalm and doubled confession at the foot of the altar, the two prayers of the ascent, *Panem cælestem*, *Quid retribuam*, *Corpus tuum Domine*, *Placeat tibi*, and the Last Gospel; together with the offertory prayers treated separately below. Every one of these except the Last Gospel is a text the older book directs the priest to say *secreto* or in a low voice, and most are in the first person singular. The reform did not remove the congregation's texts; it removed a large part of the celebrant's private ones.

Where a text was retained but altered, the alteration is usually an addition or a reassignment, not a subtraction. The *Confiteor* gains *et omissione* to the list of ways one has sinned—in thought, word, deed *and omission*—and loses the enumeration of Michael, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul in favour of “all the Angels and Saints”; it is said once, by everyone, rather than twice, by two parties in turn.¹⁶ The *Libera nos* loses “past, present

and to come” and the four named intercessors and gains *expectantes beatam spem et adventum Salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi* from Titus 2:13; it also moves from silence to audible prayer and acquires a people’s doxology.¹⁷ A reader who wants to argue that these changes impoverish the rite has a real argument available; a reader who wants to argue that they suppress something is misdescribing the text.

The newly composed material is small in bulk and large in position. What is genuinely new in the Order of Mass—as distinct from relocated or shortened—amounts to the alternative greetings, two of the three penitential forms, the sprinkling option, the memorial acclamation, the people’s doxology after *Libera nos*, the *Beati qui ad cenam Agni vocati sunt*, and the two *Benedictus es* prayers at the preparation of the gifts. That is a short list. But almost every item on it is placed at a seam where the people speak, and their cumulative effect is to convert a rite in which the congregation had four or five spoken moments into one in which it has a dozen. Whether that is the recovery of something ancient or the addition of something modern is precisely the argument; that it is the reform’s structural centre of gravity is not in dispute, and the 1969 constitution says as much when it explains that the Order was revised so that “the parts proper to each, whether minister or people, might be more clearly distinguished.”

3.3 Options: the difference the inventory cannot show

An inventory of units understates the structural difference between the two books, because it counts what is printed and not how many of the printed things are alternatives.

The 1962 Order of Mass is, with a few defined exceptions, an invariable script. The exceptions are real but narrow: the psalm *Iudica me* and the *Gloria Patri* are omitted in Masses for the dead and from Passion Sunday to Maundy Thursday; the Gloria and Creed are said when the Office requires; the number of collects and postcommunions follows the calendar; the incensations belong to solemn Mass; the dismissal takes one of three forms; the Last Gospel is proper on Palm Sunday and omitted in defined cases. Beyond these, the celebrant chooses nothing. He does not choose a greeting, a penitential formula, a creed, a Eucharistic Prayer, a preface where one is appointed, an acclamation, or a Communion prayer. The book tells him what to say.

The postconciliar Order of Mass is built on choice. At the opening there are three greetings. At the penitential act there are three forms and, on Sundays, a fourth possibility in the sprinkling rite. There are two creeds. There are four Eucharistic Prayers in the Order itself, and further ones in an appendix—the third typical edition’s promulgating decree names “the Eucharistic Prayer for Reconciliation” and “a particular Eucharistic Prayer which may be used for various needs”—and, for most days, a repertory of prefaces from which the priest selects.¹⁸ After the consecration there are three memorial acclamations. Before Communion there are two prayers of which the priest says one. The sign of peace is offered “pro opportunitate.” A period of silence after Communion is one of three permitted uses of that moment. And article 31 of the *Institutio generalis* allows the priest, where the rubrics provide for it, to adapt the prescribed introductions “somewhat, so that they respond to the understanding of those participating”—while charging him to keep the sense of what the Missal proposes and to express it in few words.¹⁹

This is the difference that no side-by-side table registers, and it is arguably the most consequential of all. A book of alternatives produces variation between celebrations of the same rite on the same day. That variation may be experienced as pastoral responsiveness or as instability, and the reform’s defenders and critics have both understood its significance: *Institutio generalis* n. 31 hedges the adaptation it permits with a threefold restraint, and the concern the hedges answer is precisely the concern the critics raise. What can be said flatly is that the older book locates the rite’s fixity in its text, and the newer book locates it in a framework within which texts are selected. That is a change of kind, not of degree, and it happened at the level of structure rather than of wording.

3.4 The claim that does not survive: “the 1962 book is the unreformed rite”

The comparison above is conventionally staged as “the traditional Mass” against “the reformed Mass.” The 1962 book will not support the first half of that description, and it says so itself in several places.

Its own opening decree, quoted in section 1, presents it as an edition prepared to conform to a code of rubrics approved in July 1960. That code, printed in the same volume as the *Rubricæ generales Missalis romani*, had already done substantial work. It reduced the octaves of the entire Roman calendar to three—“celebrantur tantum octavæ Nativitatis Domini, Paschatis et Pentecostes, exclusis omnibus aliis”—suppressing every other octave in the universal and every particular calendar.²⁰ It replaced the old ranks of doubles and semidoubles with four classes of liturgical

day. It ruled that in solemn Mass the celebrant “omits those things which are proclaimed by the sacred ministers or by a lector”—abolishing the duplication by which the priest had read privately what the subdeacon and deacon were singing.²¹ It permitted the celebrant at solemn and sung Mass to sit during *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, sequence and *Credo*.²² And it suppressed the *Confiteor* and absolution before the Communion of the faithful within Mass, retaining only *Ecce Agnus Dei* and the threefold *Domine, non sum dignus*.²³

These are not marginal adjustments. Three of them—the end of celebrant duplication, the celebrant’s seat, the suppressed second *Confiteor*—are moves in exactly the direction the postconciliar reform would continue, made by the very book that is now offered as the alternative to it. The honest description of the comparison is therefore not “unreformed against reformed” but “the reform of 1960 against the reform of 1969.” That description costs the critical case nothing that matters; it only removes an argument the critical case does not need and cannot sustain.

4 The Offertory and Its Replacement

If there is one locus on which the whole argument about the two Missals is habitually staked, it is this one. The 1962 book prints, between the Creed and the Secret, a sequence of seven prayers and a psalm; the postconciliar book prints, at the same point, three prayers and a verse. The claim built on that difference—that the reform removed the offertory, and with it the language of sacrifice, from the Mass—is the single most consequential textual claim in the dispute. It is also the claim most easily tested, because both sequences are short enough to set out entire.

4.1 The two sequences

1962: from the Offertory antiphon to the Secret	Postconciliar: preparation of the gifts	Disposition
Offertory antiphon, read at the middle of the altar	Offertory chant, sung while the ministers prepare the altar and the gifts are brought	Retained; reassigned from reading to singing, and given a procession of gifts
<i>Suscipe, sancte Pater, omnipotens æterne Deus, hanc immaculatam hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deo meo vivo et vero, pro innumerabilibus peccatis, et offensionibus, et neglegentiis meis, et pro omnibus circumstantibus, sed et pro omnibus fidelibus christianis vivis atque defunctis . . .</i>	<i>Benedictus es, Domine, Deus universi, quia de tua largitate accepimus panem, quem tibi offerimus, fructum terræ et operis manuum hominum: ex quo nobis fiet panis vitæ.</i> People may answer <i>Benedictus Deus in sæcula</i>	Dropped; replaced by a newly composed berakah-form blessing
<i>Deus, qui humanæ substantiæ dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilis reformasti: da nobis, per huius aquæ et vini mysterium, eius divinitatis esse consortes, qui humanitatis nostræ fieri dignatus est particeps . . .</i>	<i>Per huius aquæ et vini mysterium eius efficiamur divinitatis consortes, qui humanitatis nostræ fieri dignatus est particeps</i>	Retained in its second half; the Leonine opening dropped
<i>Offerimus tibi, Domine, calicem salutaris, tuam deprecantes clementiam: ut in conspectu divinæ maiestatis tuæ, pro nostra et totius mundi salute, cum odore suavitatis ascendat</i>	<i>Benedictus es, Domine, Deus universi, quia de tua largitate accepimus vinum, quod tibi offerimus, fructum vitis et operis manuum hominum, ex quo nobis fiet potus spiritualis</i>	Dropped; replaced by the parallel blessing over the chalice

1962: from the Offertory antiphon to the Secret	Postconciliar: preparation of the gifts	Disposition
<i>In spiritu humilitatis et in animo contrito suscipiamur a te, Domine: et sic fiat sacrificium nostrum in conspectu tuo hodie, ut placeat tibi, Domine Deus</i>	<i>In spiritu humilitatis et in animo contrito suscipiamur a te, Domine; et sic fiat sacrificium nostrum in conspectu tuo hodie, ut placeat tibi, Domine Deus</i>	Retained verbatim
<i>Veni, sanctificator omnipotens æterne Deus: et benedic hoc sacrificium, tuo sancto nomini præparatum</i>	—	Dropped
At solemn Mass: <i>Per intercessionem beati Michaelis Archangeli . . .</i> at the blessing of incense; <i>Incensum istud a te benedictum ascendat ad te, Domine; Ps 140, 2–4 Dirigatur, Domine, oratio mea; Accendat in nobis Dominus ignem sui amoris</i>	Incensation of the gifts, cross and altar as opportune, and of priest and people; no formula	Ceremony retained, formulas dropped
Ps 25, 6–12 <i>Lavabo inter innocentes manus meas</i> with <i>Gloria Patri</i>	<i>Lava me, Domine, ab iniquitate mea, et a peccato meo munda me</i> (Ps 50, 4)	Washing retained; psalm text replaced
<i>Suscipe, sancta Trinitas, hanc oblationem, quam tibi offerimus ob memoriam passionis, resurrectionis, et ascensionis Iesu Christi Domini nostri . . .</i>	—	Dropped
<i>Orate, fratres: ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum Patrem omnipotentem. R. Suscipiat Dominus sacrificium de manibus tuis ad laudem et gloriam nominis sui, ad utilitatem quoque nostram, totiusque Ecclesiæ suæ sanctæ</i>	<i>Orate, fratres: ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum Patrem omnipotentem. R. Suscipiat Dominus sacrificium de manibus tuis ad laudem et gloriam nominis sui, ad utilitatem quoque nostram, totiusque Ecclesiæ suæ sanctæ</i>	Retained verbatim , invitation and response
Secret, said silently, concluding aloud	Prayer over the offerings, said aloud, with the people's <i>Amen</i>	Retained in position and function; audibility changed and the name changed to match

4.2 What the comparison establishes

Set out entire, the sequences yield four findings, and they do not all point the same way.

The strong form of the accusation fails. The postconciliar rite does not lack the word *sacrificium* at the preparation of the gifts. It occurs three times in the retained material: twice in the *Orate, fratres* and its response, which stand in the newer book with the older book's words unaltered, and once in *In spiritu humilitatis*, likewise unaltered—"and so let our sacrifice be made in thy sight this day, that it may please thee, O Lord God."²⁴ A rite in which the priest turns to the people, immediately before the Eucharistic Prayer, and asks them to pray that "my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father almighty," and in which they answer that the Lord may receive "the sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of his name, for our good and the good of all his holy Church," has not removed sacrificial language from the offertory. That is a matter of what is printed on the page.

The weak form of the accusation succeeds, and it is the form that matters. Four prayers are gone—*Suscipe, sancte Pater, Offerimus tibi, Veni, sanctificator, Suscipe, sancta Trinitas*—and with them a particular set of things the older rite said at that moment: that the host now on the corporal is an *immaculata hostia*; that the priest, "thy unworthy servant," offers it for his own countless sins, offences and negligences and for all present and for all the

faithful living and dead; that the chalice offered is the *calix salutaris* ascending in the sight of the divine majesty for our salvation and that of the whole world; that God is asked to *bless* this sacrifice prepared for his holy name; and that the whole is offered in memory of the passion, resurrection and ascension. The two new blessings do not say any of that. They say that the bread and wine come from God's bounty, are the fruit of the earth or the vine and of human labour, are being offered to him, and will become for us the bread of life and spiritual drink. That is a different register: eucharistic in the plain sense of thanksgiving, anticipatory of the consecration, and without the anticipatory naming of the victim and the propitiatory intention that the older prayers supply.

The point can be put precisely. The older offertory anticipates the Canon; the newer preparation defers to it. Both are defensible arrangements, and the second has a strong argument in its favour—that to call the unconsecrated host an immaculate victim offered for sins is to say at the offertory what the rite only makes true at the consecration. But the argument that nothing was lost is not available. Something specific was lost, and it can be named.

The commonest textual mistake in the debate is on this locus. It is often said that the water-and-wine prayer was abolished. It was not. The 1962 text runs: “Deus, qui humanæ substantiæ dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilis reformasti: *da nobis, per huius aquæ et vini mysterium, eius divinitatis esse consortes, qui humanitatis nostræ fieri dignatus est particeps.*” The postconciliar text runs: “*Per huius aquæ et vini mysterium eius efficiamur divinitatis consortes, qui humanitatis nostræ fieri dignatus est particeps.*” The theological heart of the prayer—the exchange by which we come to share his divinity because he deigned to share our humanity—survives word for word, in the same ceremonial position, spoken over the same commixture. What was dropped is the Leonine invocation that framed it. That is a real reduction, and it deserves to be argued about as what it is: the loss of a clause, not of a prayer.

The *Lavabo* change is not a shortening but a substitution. The older rite has the priest wash his hands while reciting Ps 25, 6–12, the psalm of the innocent man who circles the altar; the newer rite substitutes a single verse of the *Miserere*, Ps 50, 4, “Wash me, O Lord, from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.” The gesture is unchanged and the penitential sense is arguably sharpened; the psalm's altar-imagery and its plea *ne perdas cum impiis* are gone. Nothing about this change follows from any principle of abbreviation; it is a deliberate exchange of one scriptural text for another, and it should be evaluated as such.

4.3 A note on what the rubric says about audibility

One further difference is easy to miss and materially affects how the two sequences are experienced. In the 1962 book every offertory prayer is said *secreto* except the *Orate, fratres*, whose first two words alone are said aloud, the rest secretly.²⁵ In the postconciliar book the two *Benedictus es* prayers are said in a low voice *if* the offertory chant is being sung, but if it is not, “the priest is permitted to speak these words aloud,” and the people may then acclaim *Benedictus Deus in sæcula*.²⁶ The reform did not simply exchange one set of quiet prayers for another; at this point it built a hinge on which the priest's action at the altar can become audible speech shared with the congregation. Whether that gain is worth the loss catalogued above is a judgement, and it is reserved for section 10.

5 The Roman Canon in Each Book, and the Three Added Prayers

The Roman Canon is the oldest continuously used Eucharistic Prayer in the Latin Church and the one text about which Trent legislated directly: “If anyone shall say that the canon of the Mass contains errors and is therefore to be abrogated: let him be anathema.”²⁷ It is therefore the locus at which a claim of rupture would be most damaging if true, and the locus at which a claim of continuity would be most valuable if demonstrable. Both books print it. The comparison can be made line by line.

5.1 What is the same

From *Te igitur* to *Per ipsum*, the Roman Canon stands in the third typical edition with the same prayers in the same order as in the 1962 book, and in almost every clause with the same words. *Te igitur* is identical, including *una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N. et Antistite nostro N.* So is the *Memento, Domine. Communicantes* is identical apart from the parenthesising discussed below, and its five proper forms for Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension and

Pentecost are all retained. *Hanc igitur* is identical, with its paschal variant retained. *Quam oblationem*, *Unde et memores*, *Supra quæ*, *Supplices te rogamus*, *Memento etiam*, *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, *Per quem hæc omnia* and the doxology *Per ipsum* stand with their words unchanged.²⁸

That is a considerable finding, and it should be stated before the differences, because it is the larger fact. The claim that the reform abolished the Roman Canon is false in the plainest sense: the Canon is printed first among the Eucharistic Prayers in the current Missal, and the rubric governing the choice among them says of it that it “may always be used.”²⁹

5.2 What is different

The differences are of three kinds, and it is worth keeping them apart because they have very different weights.

The institution narrative. Here the words themselves change.

Locus	Change
Words over the bread	1962: <i>Hoc est enim Corpus meum</i> . 2002: <i>Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: hoc est enim Corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur</i> . The Pauline clause from 1 Cor 11:24 is added, and the invitation <i>Accipite et manducate</i> , which in the 1962 book stands in the narrative introduction, is now printed as part of the formula the rubric marks off
Words over the chalice	1962: <i>Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et æterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum</i> . 2002: <i>hic est enim calix Sanguinis mei novi et æterni testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum</i> . <i>Mysterium fidei</i> is removed from the formula
After the consecration of the chalice	1962: <i>Hæc quotiescumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis</i> , said after the chalice is set down. 2002: <i>Hoc facite in meam commemorationem</i> , printed inside the narrative, immediately after the chalice formula
Acclamation	1962: none. 2002: the priest says <i>Mysterium fidei</i> and the people answer with one of three acclamations, the first of which is drawn from 1 Cor 11:26
Gestures within the narrative	1962: the priest signs the host and the chalice with the cross at <i>benedixit</i> ; after each consecration he genuflects, rises, shows the species to the people, replaces it, and genuflects again; from the consecration until the ablutions he keeps thumb and forefinger joined. 2002: the crosses at <i>benedixit</i> are gone; the priest bows slightly at the words, shows the species, replaces it, and genuflects once

Two of these deserve comment, and the first requires a correction that cuts against the reform’s defenders.

The removal of *mysterium fidei* from the chalice formula is the single most-discussed textual change in the whole reform, and it is regularly minimised on the ground that the phrase was never part of the sacramental form. The 1962 Missal contradicts that defence in its own front matter. Its treatise *De defectibus in celebratione Missæ occurrentibus*, printed among the preliminary matter of every altar edition, states the form of the sacrament in terms: “The words of consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: *Hoc est enim Corpus meum*. And: *Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et æterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*.”³⁰ On the older book’s own account, therefore, *mysterium fidei* belonged to the form, and a priest who omitted it would be subtracting from what that book calls the form of the sacrament.

Two things follow, and they must be kept apart. The first is that the defence just described fails on the older book’s own terms, and should be abandoned. The second is that nothing about the validity of the newer rite follows from that, because the case in view is not a priest’s private subtraction but a determination of the form by the authority that determines it—and the 1962 book’s own paragraph anticipates the distinction it turns on, holding that a subtraction which does not change the signification leaves the sacrament confected, though gravely sinfully if done by private authority. Trent itself declares that “this power has always been in the Church, that in the dispensation of the sacraments, their substance being preserved, she might determine or change whatever she judged more expedient for the benefit of those receiving them”—which is precisely the power at issue.³¹ Whether *mysterium fidei* belongs to

the substance is exactly the question the 1962 paragraph does not answer and the 1969 promulgation answers in the negative by legislating.

Beyond that, the phrase is not deleted from the rite: it is promoted to the position of a versicle inviting the people's acclamation, and the acclamations themselves are scriptural. Whether that is a recovery of the phrase's original function—it is not a scriptural phrase, and its origin within the formula is genuinely obscure—or the loss of a confession embedded in the consecratory words is a serious question with real scholarship on both sides, and this study does not pretend to settle it. What it can say is that the phrase's disappearance from the formula and its reappearance eight lines later are one operation, not two, and that any account which mentions the first without the second is not describing the book.

The addition of *quod pro vobis tradetur* runs in the opposite direction from what the popular account of the reform predicts: the reformed formula over the bread is *more* explicit about the offering of the body “for you” than the older one. And on the phrase around which most heat has gathered—*pro multis*—the two Latin books read identically. The vernacular rendering “for all,” which occupied four decades of controversy in English-speaking countries, was a translation, never a variant of the typical edition; it was corrected in the English Missal of 2011. A comparison of the two Missals as Latin books finds no difference here at all.³²

The ritual gestures. This is the largest non-textual change in the Canon, and the least often quantified; the deepest change in the words themselves is the one just described. The 1962 Canon prescribes twenty-five signs of the cross made by the priest over the offerings, at eight places: three at *hæc dona, hæc munera, hæc sancta sacrificia illibata*; five within *Quam oblationem* (three over both species at *benedictam, adscriptam, ratam*, one over the host at *Corpus*, one over the chalice at *Sanguis*); one over the host and one over the chalice at *benedixit* in the two institution narratives; five within *Unde et memores* on the same pattern as *Quam oblationem*; two in *Supplices*, at *Corpus* and *Sanguinem*, with a further sign the priest makes upon himself; three at *sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis* in *Per quem hæc omnia*; and five at the doxology, three made with the host across the chalice and two between the host and the chalice. In the postconciliar Canon exactly one remains, at *benedicas* in *Te igitur*. The kiss of the altar within *Supplices* is gone; the double genuflection at each elevation is reduced to one; the joining of thumb and forefinger is not prescribed.³³

No word of the Canon changed here. What changed is the ceremonial grammar in which the words are set: a rite that punctuated almost every naming of the offering with a blessing gesture became a rite that names the offering and does not gesture. It is possible to argue that the gestures were a medieval accretion whose removal restores the prayer's shape; it is possible to argue that they were the rite's way of saying with the body what the words say, and that their removal is a loss no textual identity compensates. What is not possible is to describe the postconciliar Canon as “the same prayer” without noticing that its performance was substantially rewritten.

The brackets. The current edition places in parentheses the second and third groups of saints in *Communicantes* (from *Iacobi, Ioannis* through *Cosmæ et Damiani*), the corresponding group in *Nobis quoque* (from *Ignatio, Alexandro* through *Anastasia*), and the concluding *Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen* of *Communicantes, Hanc igitur, Supplices* and *Memento etiam*. A rubric before the Canon states that what is enclosed in parentheses may be omitted.³⁴ This is a genuine and permanent alteration of the Canon's shape, since a prayer that may be shortened is a different object from a prayer that may not; and it is the change that most directly touches Trent's canon VI, which is about the Canon's integrity rather than its words. It is also, in the reform's own logic, minor: the abbreviation is optional, the saints remain printed in the book, and nothing doctrinal turns on the list.

5.3 The three added Prayers

Paul VI's constitution names the addition of three Eucharistic Prayers as one of the reform's principal acts and states that the words of consecration are the same in all of them. Both statements are verifiable in the book: Prayers II, III and IV each carry the institution narrative in the same words as the Roman Canon, differing only in the narrative frame that introduces it.³⁵

The four prayers are not four versions of one thing. They are of different literary types, and the differences are structural.

Prayer	Shape and character
I (Roman Canon)	Intercession before and after the consecration; no distinct invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts; the consecratory petition is <i>Quam oblationem</i> , which asks God to make the offering <i>benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque</i> ; <i>Supplices</i> asks that the offering be borne to the heavenly altar by the hand of an angel. Proper <i>Communicantes</i> and <i>Hanc igitur</i> for the great seasons
II	The shortest; carries its own preface but may be used with others; a distinct epiclesis over the gifts (<i>Hæc ergo dona, quæsumus, Spiritus tui rore sanctifica</i>) and a second invocation after the anamnesis asking that communicants be gathered into one by the Holy Spirit
III	Newly composed; usable with any preface; opens from Mal 1:11 (<i>ut a solis ortu usque ad occasum oblatio munda offeratur nomini tuo</i>); a consecratory epiclesis and a communion epiclesis; the anamnesis explicitly offers <i>hoc sacrificium vivum et sanctum</i> and asks the Father, “recognising the Victim by whose immolation you willed to be reconciled,” to grant that the communicants become one body and one spirit in Christ
IV	A fixed and unchangeable preface, because the prayer’s structure is a summary of salvation history; may be used when the Mass has no proper preface and on Sundays in Ordinary Time; the anamnesis offers “his Body and Blood, the sacrifice acceptable to you and bringing salvation to the whole world”

The most consequential structural difference is the epiclesis. The Roman Canon has no explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts; the three added prayers have one, and each has a second invocation after the anamnesis directed to the unity of the communicants. That is a real change in the Latin rite’s euchological repertoire, and it is a deliberate importation of a shape more familiar from Eastern anaphoras. It can be defended as a recovery of the Church’s wider tradition; it can be criticised as importing into the Roman Rite a theological structure the Roman Rite had never had. Both are arguments about the books, and both are available from the books.

5.4 The prefaces

One further difference belongs here because the preface is part of the Eucharistic Prayer and because it is measurable.

The 1962 Missal prints fifteen prefaces in its Order of Mass, each set out in a solemn and—except for the Chrism Mass—a ferial tone, together with a preface for the dead: Nativity, Epiphany, Lent, the Holy Cross, the Chrism Mass, Easter, the Ascension, the Sacred Heart, Christ the King, the Holy Spirit, the Most Holy Trinity, the Blessed Virgin Mary, Saint Joseph, the Apostles, and the Common.³⁶ The third typical edition prints fifty in the corresponding section of its Order of Mass, before the Eucharistic Prayers, and prints further proper prefaces within particular formularies.³⁷

The change is therefore large in one direction and worth being precise about. The older book handles the year with a small, memorable and heavily reused repertoire: the Common preface serves the great majority of days, and any congregation attending Sunday Mass hears the same handful of texts through the year. The newer book handles it with a wide repertoire in which nearly every season and category of saint has its own, and the eight prefaces for Sundays in Ordinary Time replace the older book’s single Common on those days. Whichever way one values it, this is one of the reform’s clearest reversals of direction: at the offertory and in the Canon’s gestures it subtracted, and here it multiplied.

5.5 The claim that does not survive: “the new Prayers removed propitiation”

It is frequently said that the three added prayers replaced the Roman Canon’s sacrificial and propitiatory register with a register of thanksgiving and communion. The texts do not bear this. Prayer III asks the Father to “look upon the oblation of your Church” and, “recognising the Victim by whose immolation you willed to be reconciled,” to grant the fruits of communion, and it goes on to ask that “this Sacrifice of our reconciliation advance the peace and salvation of all the world”—language whose propitiatory content is explicit and whose vocabulary (*Hostia, immolatio*,

placari, reconciliatio) is precisely the vocabulary of Trent’s session XXII.³⁸ Prayer IV offers the Body and Blood as “a sacrifice acceptable to you and bringing salvation to the whole world.” Prayer II, the shortest, offers “the bread of life and the chalice of salvation.”

The point is not merely that the words are there. The current *Institutio generalis* cites Prayers III and IV by number, in its opening articles, precisely as the places where the Missal’s own *lex orandi* expresses the doctrine Trent defined: the priest, it says, “offers a living and holy sacrifice, namely the Church’s offering and the victim by whose immolation God willed to be appeased”—with a footnote to Prayer III—“and prays that the Body and Blood of Christ may be a sacrifice acceptable to the Father and salutary for the whole world”—with a footnote to Prayer IV.³⁹ The new prayers are not an evasion of Trent; the reform’s own instruction offers them as its proof text.

6 The Word: Two Lectionary Provisions

The most consequential structural difference between the two books is not a prayer at all. It is that one of them contains the readings and the other does not.

6.1 A plenary Missal and a Missal with a Lectionary

The 1962 *Missale Romanum* is a plenary book. Every Mass formulary prints its Epistle and its Gospel in place, between the Collect and the Secret, so that the priest at the altar reads the whole Mass from one volume. The postconciliar Missal prints the prayers and the antiphons and refers the readings to a separate *Ordo lectionum Missæ*, first published in 1969 and issued in a second typical edition in 1981, which the current *Institutio generalis* cites by name.

This is not a matter of binding convenience. The 2021 *Responsa ad dubia* treats it explicitly as one of the reform’s substantive achievements: the publication of the Lectionary, it says, “in addition to overcoming the ‘plenary’ form of the *Missale Romanum* of 1962,” returns “to the ancient tradition of individual books corresponding to individual ministries.”⁴⁰ A plenary Missal presupposes that one man says everything; a book set presupposes that a lector, a psalmist, a deacon and a priest each hold their own book. The lectionary question and the ministries question are the same question seen from two sides, and section 8 returns to it.

6.2 The two provisions, side by side

The newer provision’s architecture is stated in its own *Prænotanda*: the Sunday and festal order runs over three years and the weekday order over two, each proceeding independently of the other; every Sunday and festal Mass has three readings, from the Old Testament, from an apostle, and from a Gospel; the same texts return only every fourth year; and the governing principles are named as “harmonious composition” and “semicontinuous reading,” applied differently according to the season.⁴¹

1962 Missal	<i>Ordo lectionum Missæ</i>	
Two readings at Mass: Epistle (or a lesson from the Old Testament, Acts, or the Apocalypse) and Gospel	Three readings on Sundays and solemnities of the Lord: Old Testament, apostle, Gospel; two on weekdays	The Old Testament reading is made a normal Sunday element rather than an occasional one
One annual cycle: the same Epistle and Gospel return on the same Sunday each year	Three-year Sunday cycle (A, B, C), so that the same texts return every fourth year; weekday Gospels annual, weekday first readings in a two-year cycle (I in odd years, II in even)	Sunday repetition interval extended from one year to three
Gradual, Alleluia with verse, or Tract; Sequence on five days	Responsorial psalm; Alleluia or, in Lent, another acclamation; Sequence, obligatory on Easter and Pentecost	The interlectionary chant is retained and redesigned around congregational response

1962 Missal	<i>Ordo lectionum Missæ</i>	
Selection principle not stated in the book	Selection principles stated at length in the Lectionary's own <i>Prænotanda</i> nn. 64–77: harmony and semicontinuous reading, the reservation of certain books to certain seasons, criteria of length, difficulty, and omission	The newer provision publishes its own rationale and thereby exposes it to criticism

6.3 Two claims that do not survive

“The old Mass had no Old Testament.” This is false, and demonstrably so from the 1962 book. Old Testament lessons stand in it throughout: the Lenten and Ember ferias draw on Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, the books of Kings, Esther, Daniel, Jeremias, Ezechiel and the Machabees; Isaias supplies a substantial series; the sapiential books supply the standing lessons of many sanctoral Masses and Commons; the Easter Vigil prophecies are a continuous course of Old Testament reading. A survey of the printed incipit formulas in the artifact's text layer counts on the order of one hundred and eighty *Lectio* headings drawn from Old Testament books, against roughly two hundred from the Pauline corpus.⁴²

What is true, and worth stating exactly, is where those lessons fall. On the Sundays after Pentecost—the long green season in which most Catholics heard most of their Mass readings—the pre-Gospel reading in the 1962 book is drawn from an apostle without exception. The Old Testament in the older Missal is a matter of Lent, the Ember Days, the Vigil, and the sanctoral; it is not a Sunday element. The reform's change was therefore not from absence to presence but from occasional and seasonal to weekly and structural, and that is a large change stated accurately.

“Omitting verses is a postconciliar invention.” The Lectionary's own *Prænotanda* state the practice and deny the novelty in the same paragraph: “The tradition of many liturgies, the Roman liturgy by no means excluded, has sometimes been accustomed to omit certain verses in the readings from Scripture. It must further be admitted that such omissions cannot be made lightly, lest the sense of the text or the mind and, as it were, the style of Scripture be mutilated. Nevertheless, with care taken that the sense truly remain whole in its essence, it seemed right, on pastoral grounds, to preserve that tradition in the present Order too.”⁴³ The 1962 book bears this out on its own pages: its pericopes are editorially bounded, its Epistles are furnished with liturgical incipits (*Fratres*, *Carissimi*) that replace the original openings, and its selections stop and start where the formulary requires rather than where the biblical author does.

6.4 The criticism that does survive, in the reform's own words

Against those two corrections stands a criticism that the Lectionary's *Prænotanda* concede in terms. Immediately before the paragraph on omitted verses, under the heading *De textibus difficilioribus*, stands this: “For pastoral reasons, in the readings on Sundays and solemnities, biblical texts which are genuinely more difficult are avoided.”⁴⁴ The sentence is not a polemicist's summary; it is the reform's own statement of a selection criterion, printed in the typical edition's own introduction. Anyone who has been told that the charge of pastorally motivated omission is an invention of the reform's critics is holding a claim that the reform's own introduction refutes.

Two qualifications belong immediately beside that concession, and they belong there because they are also in the text. The first is the paragraph's own limiting clause, quoted in the note: difficulty arising from inadequate catechesis or inadequate clerical formation is expressly disallowed as a reason for omission. The second is the *Institutio generalis*, which, in governing the choice among optional texts, warns that “care must be taken lest, in the selection of texts of Sacred Scripture, parts of it be permanently excluded.”⁴⁵ The reform legislated both a policy of omission and a norm against its abuse. A fair account of the lectionary question quotes both.

6.5 What the comparison cannot settle

Two questions arise here that the books cannot answer and this study will not pretend to.

The first is whether more Scripture, heard once every three years, forms a congregation better than less Scripture heard every year. That is not a textual question. It is a question about memory, repetition, and catechesis, and the honest answer is that nobody has measured it. The 1962 provision is short and cyclical: a Catholic who attended Sunday Mass for a decade heard one small set of Epistles and Gospels ten times over, in the same order, on the same days. The postconciliar provision is long and progressive: the same Catholic hears a substantially larger body of Scripture, and hears any given passage about three times. These are different pedagogies with different characteristic virtues, and the choice between them is a prudential judgement that the Church made and may revisit.

The second is what *Traditionis custodes* art. 3 §3 does to the older provision in practice. Since the readings must now be proclaimed in the vernacular from a conference-approved translation, and since no vernacular lectionary reproducing the older cycle may be published, the 1962 book's pericope list has been detached from the 1962 book's text: the cycle survives as a schedule of references, read from a modern Bible.⁴⁶ That is a real and recent change in what "celebrating with the 1962 Missal" means, and it is one that neither party in the older argument anticipated.

7 The Calendar and the Rank Systems

Both Missals carry their own calendar and their own system of ranking days, and the two systems are incommensurable: there is no dictionary that translates "feast of the second class" into a postconciliar grade, because the two schemes cut the year at different joints. Setting them out side by side is therefore the only way to compare them without smuggling in a false equivalence.

7.1 The two schemes

1962: <i>Rubricæ generales Missalis romani</i>	Postconciliar: <i>Normæ universales de anno liturgico et de calendario</i>	
Every liturgical day is of the first, second, third or fourth class; precedence among them is fixed by a single table	Celebrations are ranked as solemnity, feast, or memorial (obligatory or optional); ferias have their own place in the table of liturgical days	The older scheme ranks days; the newer ranks celebrations and then situates ferias among them
Sundays are of the first or second class; first-class Sundays are the four of Advent, the four of Lent, the two of Passiontide, Easter, Low Sunday and Pentecost	Sunday yields only to solemnities and feasts of the Lord; the Sundays of Advent, Lent and Easter take precedence over all feasts of the Lord and all solemnities, and a solemnity falling on them is transferred	The newer scheme gives Sunday a broader and more uniform protection
Octaves: only Christmas, Easter and Pentecost, all others suppressed by the 1960 code	Octaves: only Easter and Christmas, each ordered by its own laws	The Pentecost octave, retained in 1962, is not retained
Seasons: Advent, Christmastide, Septuagesima, Lent (with Passiontide), Eastertide, and <i>tempus per annum</i> running from 14 January to Septuagesima and from Trinity Sunday to Advent	Seasons: Advent, Christmas, Lent, the Paschal Triduum, Easter, and <i>Tempus per annum</i> in thirty-four weeks	Septuagesima and Passiontide as distinct seasons are not retained; Ordinary Time becomes a single numbered series
Sundays counted after Epiphany and after Pentecost, with the resumed-Sunday mechanism when Septuagesima cuts the Epiphany series short	Sundays numbered continuously through Ordinary Time	The older scheme's arithmetic of resumption disappears

1962: <i>Rubricæ generales Missalis romani</i>	Postconciliar: <i>Normæ universales de anno liturgico et de calendario</i>
The paschal Triduum is not a distinct liturgical unit in the general rubrics; Holy Week is named, and its last three days are the <i>Triduum sacrum</i>	The paschal Triduum begins with the evening Mass of the Lord's Supper, has its centre in the Easter Vigil, and closes with Vespers of Easter Sunday; it is called the culmen of the whole year
	The Triduum is constituted as the year's structural summit and its boundaries are legislated

7.2 What the schemes say about themselves

Neither scheme is silent about its own purpose, and both statements are worth having.

The 1960 code, printed in the 1962 Missal, states its reductions flatly and without argument: octaves “are celebrated only for Christmas, Easter and Pentecost, all others being excluded, whether in the universal calendar or in particular calendars.”⁴⁷ A book that suppresses every octave of the Roman calendar except three, in one clause, without explanation, is not a book that regards the received calendar as untouchable.

Paul VI's *motu proprio Mysteriorum paschalis*, printed in the current Missal ahead of the universal norms, does argue. It cites the Council's direction that the feasts of the saints should not prevail over the feasts recalling the mysteries of salvation, and that many of them should be left to particular churches, nations and religious families, with only those of universal significance extended to the whole Church; and it explains the consequence—names removed from the general calendar, others left to local restoration, and martyrs added from regions to which the Gospel came later, “so that in the same list certain representatives of all peoples may be seen with equal dignity.”⁴⁸

The contrast between the two is instructive in a way that cuts against both parties' habits. The book usually praised for reverence toward the received calendar suppressed a large part of it by fiat; the book usually accused of demolishing it published its reasons and grounded them in a conciliar text.

7.3 Where the newer calendar is genuinely more conservative

Two provisions deserve notice because they run against the expected direction.

The first is Sunday. In the 1962 scheme a second-class Sunday—which is to say every Sunday outside Advent, Lent, Passiontide and the paschal days—yields to a first- or second-class feast of the Lord, and the older *Rubricæ generales* list the fixed feasts perpetually assigned to Sundays.⁴⁹ In the postconciliar scheme Sunday yields only to solemnities and feasts of the Lord, the Sundays of Advent, Lent and Easter yield to nothing at all, and a solemnity occurring on them is transferred to the following Monday; the *Institutio generalis* further instructs conferences constructing national calendars that Sunday “must be preserved and protected as the primordial feast day,” so that other celebrations are not set above it unless they are truly of the greatest moment.⁵⁰

The second is the third typical edition's own footnotes. Where the universal norms give a collect drawn from an earlier book, they cite it: “Cf. *Missale Romanum* [ed. typ. 1962], Oratio de Epiphania”; “Cf. *Missale Romanum* [ed. typ. 1962], Oratio feriæ III infra octavam Paschæ.”⁵¹ The current Missal's own critical apparatus names the 1962 typical edition as a source. That is a small thing, and it is the kind of small thing that settles an argument: a book that cites its predecessor by edition is not a book that regards its predecessor as an alien object.

7.4 What was genuinely lost

Against that, three losses are real and are not softened here.

Septuagesima and *Passiontide* are gone as seasons. The pre-Lenten weeks that eased a congregation into the fast, with their violet vestments, their suppressed *Alleluia* and their tracts, have no counterpart; the fortnight in which the crosses were veiled and the Passion drew near was folded into the fifth week of Lent. Whatever else may be said,

these were formative structures of the Western year for well over a millennium, and their removal was a decision about the shape of Christian time.

The *octave of Pentecost* is gone, and this one has a peculiar sting: it was retained in 1962, which had abolished nearly every other octave, precisely because Pentecost ranks with Christmas and Easter. Its suppression is therefore the one place where the postconciliar calendar cut into what the 1960 reform had deliberately preserved.

The *Ember Days and Rogations* pass from universal law to national determination: the *Institutio generalis* directs conferences to indicate, in their national calendars, the days of Rogations and of the Four Seasons and the forms and texts for celebrating them.⁵² What was a fixed quarterly rhythm of fasting and ordination in the universal calendar became a matter each conference must positively provide for—and in many territories has not.

Project note on the calendar comparison

A calendar is not a doctrine, and no proposition of faith is at stake in whether Septuagesima exists. But a calendar is the shape in which a congregation receives the mysteries over time, and the two books shape that time differently: the older by a dense web of octaves, vigils, seasons of anticipation and commemorations that the 1960 code had already thinned; the newer by a smaller number of stronger structures—Sunday, the Triduum, the fifty days—with the sanctoral pruned and largely optional. The choice between density and clarity is genuinely a choice, and this study does not think either book's answer is obviously right. What can be said is that both books made the choice consciously, and that the 1962 book made it first.

8 The Rubrics' Theology of the Priest

Rubrics are not treatises, but they are not neutral either. A book that tells a man to say a prayer in the first person singular, silently, while others sing something else, is saying something about what he is doing; and so is a book that tells him to say a prayer aloud, in the name of the whole people, while everyone listens. The question of this section is what each Missal's directives, taken as they stand, imply about the priest—and, equally, what neither of them says.

8.1 What the postconciliar books say in terms

The *Institutio generalis* does not leave the matter to inference. Four of its articles state the priest's role directly, and all four use the vocabulary of offering and of *persona Christi*.

The *Prooemium* article on the ministerial priesthood, placed among the articles establishing the Missal's continuity with Trent, describes "the nature of the ministerial priesthood, proper to bishops and presbyters, who offer the sacrifice in the person of Christ and preside over the assembly of the holy people"—the two functions named in one clause, in that order.⁵³ Article 27, which opens the treatment of the Mass's structure, defines the Mass itself in terms that carry the same freight: "In the Mass, or Lord's Supper, the people of God are called together, with a priest presiding and acting in the person of Christ, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord, that is, the Eucharistic sacrifice"—and the next sentence says that in the celebration of Mass "the sacrifice of the cross is perpetuated," with a footnote to Trent's session XXII.⁵⁴ Article 93, in the chapter on offices and ministries, is the fullest: the presbyter, "who in the Church possesses by the sacred power of Order the power of offering sacrifice in the person of Christ, thereby presides over the faithful people here and now gathered, presides over their prayer, proclaims to them the message of salvation, joins the people to himself in offering sacrifice through Christ in the Holy Spirit to God the Father, gives to his brethren the bread of eternal life, and partakes of it with them."⁵⁵ Article 30 names the Eucharistic Prayer as first among the things assigned to the priest and calls the collect, prayer over the offerings and prayer after Communion "presidential prayers," addressed to God "in the name of the entire holy people and of all present."

Three observations follow. First, the claim that the reformed books reduce the priest to a president or master of ceremonies cannot be sustained from the books: the word *præses* and its cognates appear there, but always in the same sentence as *sacrificium offerre* and *in persona Christi*. Second, the ordering is consistent and deliberate: he presides *because* he can offer—"exinde populo fidei . . . præest"—not the reverse. Third, the vocabulary of presiding is not a postconciliar invention in the offensive sense; what is new is that a book of rubrics states the theology it presupposes, which the older book, being a book of rubrics, does not.

8.2 What the 1962 rubrics imply

The older Missal makes no such statements, and it would be an anachronism to expect them. It gives directions, and the directions imply an ordering of their own.

They begin before the Mass, in the *Ritus servandus*: the priest who is to celebrate should first spend some time in prayer, then vest, saying the appointed prayer at each garment.⁵⁶ They contemplate a man whose attention is not to be divided: having said *In nomine Patris*, “he ought not to notice anyone celebrating at another altar, even if the latter should elevate the Sacrament, but is to continue his own Mass through to the end.”⁵⁷ They assign him, in the low Mass, a long apparatus of prayers said *secreto*—the general rubric enumerates what is said aloud, and concludes “*Cetera dicuntur secreto*”—which includes the whole Canon.⁵⁸ And they distinguish sharply between what he does and what others do: at solemn Mass the subdeacon sings the Epistle, “which the celebrant listens to, seated”; the deacon sings the Gospel while the celebrant stands at the Epistle side, hands joined.⁵⁹

That last provision is the one that most changes the received picture, and it belongs to the 1960 reform: as section 3 recorded, the general rubrics direct that in solemn Mass the celebrant “omits those things which are proclaimed by the sacred ministers or by a lector,” and in sung Mass without sacred ministers he is bound to sing the parts proper to them—with the Epistle able to be sung by a lector, and the rubric preferring, if it is not sung by a lector, that the celebrant simply read it.⁶⁰ The 1962 book therefore already contains, in its own idiom, the principle that the postconciliar *Institutio* would state as a norm: that each person does all of, and only, what belongs to him.

8.3 The genuine differences

Three differences remain after the caricatures are cleared away, and each is real.

The Canon’s audibility. In the 1962 books the Canon is said silently. In the postconciliar books the Eucharistic Prayer is a presidential part, and the *Institutio* requires that presidential parts “be pronounced in a loud and clear voice and listened to attentively by all,” with no other prayer or song and with the organ and other instruments silent while the priest speaks them.⁶¹ This is not a change of words; it is a change in the mode of the rite’s central act, and no comparison of texts registers it. It is also the change most directly traceable to the Council’s own norms rather than to any later decision.

The priest’s own prayers. The postconciliar book has not abolished the category. Article 33 states that the priest “sometimes prays in his own name alone, that he may fulfil his ministry with greater attention and devotion,” and names the surviving instances: the prayers before the Gospel, at the preparation of the gifts, and before and after his own Communion. These, it says, are said quietly.⁶² What changed is the volume of that category, not its existence: the older rite’s private prayers run from the foot of the altar to the last gospel and occupy a large fraction of the celebrant’s speech; the newer rite keeps four moments of them. A critic who says the priest’s interior apparatus was thinned is describing the book correctly. A critic who says it was abolished is not.

The rite without a congregation. The 1962 book’s ceremonial presumes a server; the *Rubricæ generales* and the *Ritus servandus* are written for a priest and at least one minister. The postconciliar book prints a whole Order of Mass for the case of a single minister and legislates the limiting case: “a celebration without a minister or at least one of the faithful is not to take place except for a just and reasonable cause.”⁶³ The formulation concedes what the older discipline assumed—that Mass is not a private act—while making express provision for the exception. Whether this counts as a change of doctrine or of emphasis is arguable; that it is a change in what the book says out loud is not.

8.4 The distribution of ministries

The priest’s role cannot be compared in isolation, because in both books it is defined partly by what is not his. Here the two books are asymmetrical in a way that is easy to state.

The 1962 Missal names sacred ministers—deacon, subdeacon, acolytes, thurifer—and a *lector* who may sing the Epistle at a sung Mass without sacred ministers. It has no general treatment of ministries; the *Ritus servandus* tells the celebrant what to do and, incidentally, what others are doing while he does it.

The postconciliar *Institutio generalis* devotes a whole chapter to offices and ministries. Article 91 states the governing principle—that the Eucharistic celebration is the action of Christ and of the Church, that it belongs to the whole

Body, and that “all, whether ordained ministers or lay faithful, in fulfilling their office or their function, should do all and only those parts which pertain to them”—and quotes *Sacrosanctum Concilium* on the point.⁶⁴ Articles 95 to 107 then enumerate the parts: the faithful as a holy people; the instituted acolyte and lector and the lay persons deputed in their absence; the psalmist; the schola or choir; the cantor or choir director; the sacristan, the commentator, those who take up the collection, and those who receive the faithful at the doors; and, in cathedrals and larger churches, a master of ceremonies. Article 107 provides that the liturgical functions which are not proper to the priest or deacon may be entrusted to suitable lay persons chosen by the parish priest or rector, “by liturgical blessing or by temporary deputation.”⁶⁵

Two things follow that are worth separating. The first is that the enumerated principle is not new: the 1960 code applied it, in its own idiom, when it directed that the celebrant omit what the sacred ministers or a lector proclaim. The second is that the scale of application is new: the older book applies the principle among clerics and instituted ministers, and the newer book extends it, by an express faculty, to lay persons deputed for the purpose. That extension is what changes the appearance of a celebration more than any textual difference in this study, and its warrant is stated in the book that makes it.

8.5 Concelebration

One institution present in the newer books is simply absent from the older. Concelebration by presbyters appears in the 1962 Missal only as a word in the Common Preface, describing the angels; as a rite it belongs, in the older books, to the Pontifical and to ordinations. The postconciliar *Institutio generalis* devotes fifty-three articles to it and legislates its use: it is prescribed by the rite itself at the ordination of a bishop and of presbyters, at the blessing of an abbot, and at the Chrism Mass; it is commended at the evening Mass of the Lord’s Supper, at Masses during councils, meetings of bishops and synods, at conventual and principal Masses, and at gatherings of priests. The same article preserves the individual priest’s liberty: “it is nevertheless lawful for each priest to celebrate the Eucharist individually”—though not at the same time as a concelebration in the same church or oratory, and not at all on Holy Thursday evening or at the Easter Vigil.⁶⁶

This is one of the clearest cases in the whole comparison of an addition rather than a substitution, and it deserves to be recognised as such by both parties. It also bears directly on the theology of the priest, since concelebration expresses the unity of the priesthood in a way the older books’ presumption of individual celebration did not; and it raises a question the books do not answer—whether a priest who concelebrates offers as fully as one who celebrates alone—which is a theological question the rubrics do not reach.

8.6 The claim that does not survive: “the reform inverted the priest’s relation to the people”

The strongest form of this claim is not about words but about orientation: that the priest who faced east now faces the congregation, and that everything else follows. It is worth being exact about what the two books legislate here, because the answer surprises readers on both sides.

Neither Missal prescribes the direction of celebration as a general rule, and neither forbids the other direction. The 1962 *Ritus servandus* explicitly contemplates an altar “ad orientem, versus populum”—facing east, toward the people—and gives the celebrant a rubric for that case: he does not turn his shoulders to the altar when he is to say *Dominus vobiscum*, *Orate, fratres*, *Ite, missa est*, or give the blessing, but having kissed the altar in the middle, greets the people from there.⁶⁷ The postconciliar *Institutio generalis* treats the matter as a norm of church building rather than of celebration, saying that the altar should be built separate from the wall “so that it can be easily walked around and Mass celebrated at it facing the people, which is desirable wherever possible.”⁶⁸

So the older book anticipates a priest facing the people and tells him how to behave; the newer book expresses a preference about architecture. Neither legislates what the argument assumes each of them legislates. That does not make the question unimportant—orientation shapes a congregation’s perception of what is happening more than most texts do—but it does mean that the question cannot be settled by appealing to either Missal, and that a comparison of the two books is not where the orientation argument can be won.

9 The Language Question as the Books Legislate It

No part of this comparison is argued more often on less text. It is worth setting out, in order, every governing provision on the language of the Roman Mass from Trent to the present rescript, because the sequence is short, it is public, and almost every step of it is misdescribed in ordinary argument.

9.1 Trent (1562)

The Council of Trent addressed the vernacular twice in session XXII, once in the doctrinal chapters and once in the canons, and the two texts do different work.

Chapter VIII carries the heading *Missa vulgari lingua non celebretur. Eius mysteria populo explicentur*, and its body reads: “Although the Mass contains great instruction for the faithful people, it did not nevertheless seem expedient to the Fathers that it should be celebrated everywhere in the vernacular tongue.” It goes on to command that pastors and all having the care of souls should frequently, during the celebration of Masses, expound something of what is read in the Mass, and among other things declare some mystery of this most holy sacrifice, especially on Sundays and feasts.⁶⁹

Canon IX then anathematises three propositions in one sentence: that the Roman Church’s rite of pronouncing part of the canon and the words of consecration in a low voice is to be condemned; *or* that Mass ought to be celebrated in the vernacular tongue only; *or* that water is not to be mixed with the wine in the chalice to be offered, on the ground that it is against Christ’s institution.⁷⁰

Two things are therefore established, and both bear on the modern argument. Trent’s own judgement against vernacular celebration is expressed as an inexpediency—*non expedire visum est*—and not as a definition; and the anathema is directed at the proposition that Mass *ought to be celebrated in the vernacular only* (*lingua tantum vulgari*), which is a different proposition from the proposition that it may be celebrated in the vernacular at all. A canon that condemns an exclusive claim does not thereby define its contrary.

That reading is not a modern gloss. It is exactly the reading given by the postconciliar Missal’s own *Institutio generalis*, which quotes both passages verbatim in its *Prooemium*, notes that Trent was “taking account of the circumstances of that age,” and observes that since “no Catholic denied that a sacred rite performed in the Latin language was legitimate and efficacious,” the Council of Vatican II was able to grant that vernacular use “may very often be of great advantage to the people” and to give the faculty of employing it.⁷¹ The reform’s own instruction, in other words, argues its case on the language question by quoting Trent at length and reading it as a prudential judgement—and it does so in the same articles in which it says that Trent forbade the vernacular in the Mass and that Vatican II conceded it. The account is neither triumphalist nor evasive; whatever else is said about it, it is not a suppression of the older text.

9.2 *Quo primum* (1570) and the 1962 Missal

Quo primum legislates nothing about language. The bull imposes a book, protects it, and grants a faculty for its use; the word *lingua* does not occur in it in any relevant sense. Anyone who cites *Quo primum* as the charter of Latin in the Roman Mass is citing a document that does not mention the subject.

The 1962 Missal itself is more interesting than the argument allows. It is of course a Latin book. But its own general rubrics contain a vernacular provision, in the norms for the Rogation litanies: those bound to the divine office who do not take part in the procession must say the Litany of the Saints with its prayers “lingua latina”; but if the litanies with their prayers are said in the vernacular, together with the faithful, according to local custom, in the procession or in the other special supplications, those bound to the office who duly take part are “not bound to repeat these prayers in Latin.”⁷² That is a small provision, and it is not about the Mass. It is worth having because it shows that the Latin of the older books was a discipline with recognised exceptions rather than an absolute, and because it stands in the very code of rubrics that governs the book usually held up as the guarantor of an unqualified Latin.

9.3 *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 36 (1963)

The conciliar article that governs everything after it says two things in successive paragraphs. Paragraph 1: “Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.” Paragraph 2: since the use of the mother tongue, “whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended”—in the first place to the readings and directives and to some of the prayers and chants, according to regulations to be laid down separately in the subsequent chapters. Paragraphs 3 and 4 assign the decision to the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority, with acts to be approved or confirmed by the Apostolic See, and require that translations be approved by the same territorial authority.⁷³

The article is therefore neither what its critics nor what its enthusiasts usually make of it. It preserves Latin as the rule and admits the vernacular as a permitted extension whose scope is to be determined case by case. What it does not contain is a mandate for wholesale vernacular celebration; that came from the exercise of the faculty it created, by episcopal conferences and the Apostolic See, over the following decade. This distinction between a conciliar norm and its subsequent application is the single most load-bearing distinction in the whole reform, and it recurs on every question in this study.

9.4 The postconciliar books

The current Missal legislates about language in three places, and the three do not point in one direction.

The typical edition is Latin. The book from which every vernacular Missal is made is the Latin *editio typica tertia*. The *Institutio generalis* charges conferences with preparing and approving the vernacular edition, “the acts having been recognised by the Apostolic See,” and adds that “the Roman Missal, whether in the Latin text or in legitimately approved vernacular versions, is to be published in its entirety.”⁷⁴ A vernacular Missal is a translation of a Latin book, not a substitute for it.

Latin is legislated for the congregation, not only for the celebrant. Article 41, on sacred music, gives Gregorian chant pride of place “as proper to the Roman liturgy,” admits other kinds of sacred music and especially polyphony, and then adds a directive that is easily overlooked: since the faithful of different nations increasingly come together, “it is fitting that they should know how to sing together at least some parts of the Ordinary of the Mass in Latin, especially the profession of faith and the Lord’s Prayer, set to simple melodies.”⁷⁵ The current Missal, that is, prescribes that congregations be able to sing the Creed and the Our Father in Latin. Whether that prescription has been carried out anywhere is a different question; that the book contains it is not.

Translation is governed by a stated standard. Article 392 requires that translations render the sense of the original Latin text “fully and faithfully” while observing the character of each language, attending to the literary genres in use in the Mass, and remembering that a liturgical text is made for proclamation or singing rather than for meditation; the language is to be suited to the faithful of the region and yet “noble and marked by literary quality.”⁷⁶ The standard is exacting, and the history of its observance is the history of a great deal of the controversy about the reform in English—but the controversy is then about translations, not about the Missal.

9.5 Where the current discipline has ended up

The most striking fact about the language question as it now stands is that the direction of legislation has reversed on the older Missal and not on the newer one.

Summorum Pontificum art. 6 permitted the readings in the older form to be proclaimed also in the vernacular, using editions approved by the Apostolic See; *Universae Ecclesiae* n. 26 spelled out the three arrangements that permission allowed—Latin alone, Latin followed by the vernacular, or, in low Masses, the vernacular alone. *Traditionis custodes* art. 3 §3 requires that in the celebrations it governs “the readings are proclaimed in the vernacular language, using translations of the Sacred Scripture approved for liturgical use by the respective Episcopal Conferences.” The 2021 *Responsa* confirmed that this means the pericopes of the 1962 Missal read from a conference-approved Bible, and forbade the publication of vernacular lectionaries reproducing the older cycle.

The result is a legal position that neither side of the twentieth-century argument would have predicted: the Missal whose partisans defend Latin most vigorously is the one whose readings the universal law now requires to be in the

vernacular, while the Missal usually identified with the vernacular is the one whose typical edition is Latin and whose *Institutio* directs that congregations learn to sing the Creed in it. Whatever one concludes about the merits, an argument that treats “the old Mass” as the Latin option and “the new Mass” as the vernacular one has stopped describing the law.

The claim that does not survive

Two claims fail here, one on each side.

“*The Church has always required Latin, and Trent defined it.*” Trent expressly declined to define it. Its chapter says the Fathers judged vernacular celebration inexpedient; its canon anathematizes the claim that Mass must be said in the vernacular *only*. *Quo primum* does not legislate about language at all.

“*Vatican II replaced Latin with the vernacular.*” *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 36 §1 says the use of Latin is to be preserved in the Latin rites; §2 permits a wider use of the vernacular within limits to be set case by case. The general vernacularisation of the Roman Rite was an exercise of the faculty the Council created, by conferences and the Apostolic See over the following decade, and it must be defended or criticised as such rather than attributed to the conciliar text.

10 What the Comparison Yields

The preceding sections were deliberately undramatic. This one states a judgement, gives the strongest case against it, and says what would overturn it. It is marked off from everything before it because the reader is entitled to know exactly where description stops.

10.1 The two cases at full strength

Before the judgement, both cases deserve their best form. Neither is given here in a polemicist’s version; both are given in the words of authorities who legislated. That choice has a cost, stated here and not in the appendix alone: this study examined no work of the reform’s non-official critical literature in an identified edition, so the case against appears below in official and papal formulations rather than in the words of the scholars who have pressed it at greatest length; a reader who thinks those scholars put it more strongly should treat what follows as a floor, not a ceiling.

The case for the reform, at its strongest. The reform’s own argument is not that the older book was defective. It is that the norm invoked to justify the older book—restoration *ad pristinam sanctorum Patrum normam*—is a norm the reform is entitled to invoke against it. The *Institutio generalis* makes this argument in four articles and makes it carefully. Pius V’s revisers, working in an age when the sacrificial character of the Mass, the ministerial priesthood and the real presence were under attack, rightly aimed to preserve “the more recent tradition, unjustly assailed,” introducing “only the smallest changes” to the sacred rite; and the 1570 Missal “differs very little from the first printed edition of 1474, which in turn faithfully reproduces the Missal of the time of Innocent III.” The manuscripts available to them did not permit an inquiry into “the ancient and approved authors” beyond the liturgical commentaries of the Middle Ages. Today that norm “is enriched by innumerable writings of scholars”—the Gregorian Sacramentary printed in 1571, the old Roman and Ambrosian sacramentaries, the Spanish and Gallican books, the traditions of the centuries before East and West divided—and so “the norm of the holy Fathers” requires not only that what our nearer forebears handed down be kept, but that all past ages of the Church be comprehended and more deeply weighed.⁷⁷ That is a serious historical argument, made from the sources, and it deserves to be met rather than dismissed: the older book is itself a moment in a tradition, shaped by a sixteenth-century emergency and by the limits of sixteenth-century scholarship, and fidelity to the Fathers may require going behind it.

The case against the reform, at its strongest. Its best form is not a claim of heresy; it is a claim about how a rite forms belief, and its most authoritative statement comes from a pope who legislated in the older book’s favour. Benedict XVI, writing to the bishops of the world in 2007, granted that “in many places celebrations were not faithful to the prescriptions of the new Missal,” that “the freedom to ‘creativity’ . . . was often taken to extremes,” and that this “led to deformations of the liturgy which were hard to bear”; and he stated the principle plainly: “What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful.”⁷⁸ Behind that stands the Council’s own limiting norm, which the current *Institutio generalis* itself restates as binding law: “that innovations not be made in liturgical restoration unless a true and

certain benefit of the Church requires it, and with the caution that new forms should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.”⁷⁹ The critical case, at its best, is that this norm is a legal standard with content; that a reform which replaced the offertory prayers wholesale, removed some twenty-four of the twenty-five signs of the cross in the Canon, suppressed Septuagesima, Passiontide and the Pentecost octave, and reduced by an order of magnitude the priest’s own prayers cannot easily be described as growth from existing forms; and that the burden of showing “true and certain benefit” fell on those who made it and has not obviously been discharged.

The two cases are not symmetrical. The first is an argument about sources, answerable by scholarship; the second is an argument about a standard of prudence, answerable only by judgement—which is why the Church has governed the disagreement rather than adjudicating it.

10.2 Project synthesis

Project synthesis: a judgement, its counterargument, and its falsifier

The judgement. At the loci where the Roman Rite’s confession of the Eucharistic sacrifice is legally located—the Canon, the added Eucharistic Prayers, the *Orate, fratres*, the prayer over the offerings, and the instruction that governs them—the postconciliar Missal says what the 1962 Missal says, and in the Roman Canon says it, from *Te igitur* to *Per ipsum*, in the same words. One substantial exception stands inside that sentence and is not softened here: the institution narrative, where three alterations were made—*mysterium fidei* removed from the chalice formula, *Hæc quotiescumque feceritis* replaced by *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* and moved inside the narrative, *quod pro vobis tradetur* added over the bread—to a form that had stood substantially unchanged in the Latin West for more than a millennium. That is the deepest change in the words of the Roman Canon, and it was made by the promulgating authority, not by drift. It is also a change of a different kind from the rest: what else the reform reduced was not the rite’s doctrine but its *redundancy*: the property by which the older book said the same thing many times over, in many registers—repeated prayers, repeated gestures, repeated seasons of anticipation, and a large apparatus of the priest’s own speech. The 1962 book named the offering as an immaculate victim at the offertory, again in *Quam oblationem*, again in *Unde et memores*, again in *Supra quæ*, again in *Supplices*, again in *Placeat*; and blessed it with the sign of the cross at each naming. The postconciliar book names it fewer times and blesses it once. On the demonstrable evidence assembled here, the reform’s losses are concentrated in that redundancy—in the offertory prayers, the gestural language of the Canon, the priest’s private apparatus, the pre-Lenten and Passiontide seasons, and the Pentecost octave—and its gains are concentrated in the word: three readings on Sundays, a three-year cycle, an Old Testament pericope as a normal element, an audible Canon, an obligatory homily, and a set of ministries distributed among distinct books. Both the losses and the gains are real, both were chosen deliberately, and neither is what the standard account of either party says it is.

The reasons.

- *The doctrinal loci were read, not assumed.* *Orate, fratres* with its response and *In spiritu humilitatis* stand unaltered in the newer book (section 4); the Roman Canon stands prayer for prayer from *Te igitur* to *Per ipsum* (section 5); Prayers III and IV carry *Hostia, immolatio, placari* and *reconciliatio*, which the *Institutio generalis* cites by number as the Missal’s own witness to Trent (section 5).
- *The reductions are countable and are concentrated where redundancy was.* Four offertory prayers dropped against three retained (section 4); twenty-five signs of the cross over the offerings reduced to one (section 5); the celebrant’s private prayers reduced to four named moments (*Institutio generalis* n. 33, section 8); Septuagesima, Passiontide and the Pentecost octave suppressed (section 7).
- *The gains are equally on the page.* Three readings on Sundays and a three-year cycle in place of one, with the Old Testament a normal Sunday element rather than a seasonal one (section 6); an audible Eucharistic Prayer (*Institutio generalis* n. 32, section 8); an obligatory Sunday homily and a universal prayer in the Order itself (section 3); a preface repertory of fifty against fifteen (section 5).
- *The one substantial textual alteration is named, not absorbed.* The change to the dominical words is stated above and treated at length in section 5, where the 1962 book’s own *De defectibus* V contradicts the defence usually offered for it.
- *Neither book is what its partisans need it to be.* The 1962 volume is itself the product of the 1960 reform and says so on its second leaf (section 3); the current Missal’s apparatus cites the 1962 typical edition by name

(section 7); and the current law requires vernacular readings in the older rite while directing Latin singing of the Creed in the newer (section 9).

The strongest counterargument, at full strength. Redundancy is not decoration; it is how a rite forms the people who use it. A liturgy does not teach by stating a proposition once at the point where a canonist would look for it; it teaches by saturation—by the same truth said in prayer, gesture, silence, posture, season and repetition until it is no longer a proposition but a habit of soul. On that account, a book that says the Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice once in the Canon, once in the *Orate, fratres*, and once in an instruction most laymen will never read has not preserved the doctrine in the sense that matters; it has preserved the doctrine’s minimum sufficient statement while dismantling the machinery that transmitted it. It then adds an empirical prediction which is not obviously false: that a generation formed by the reduced book would believe less about the sacrifice than one formed by the fuller book. This study cannot refute that. It can only observe that the argument is about formation rather than text, and that its own judgement is confined to the text.

What would overturn the judgement. Here is the test. Name a proposition of the Council of Trent’s session XXII doctrine on the sacrifice of the Mass—that the Mass is a true and proper sacrifice; that it is propitiatory and not merely a sacrifice of praise; that it is offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments and satisfactions; that Christ instituted the Apostles priests by the words *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*; that Masses in honour of the saints are not an imposture—and show that the postconciliar Missal, taken as a whole (the four Eucharistic Prayers, the prayers over the offerings, the prefaces, the Masses for the dead, and the *Institutio generalis*), nowhere expresses it. Any such proposition shown to have no locus in the newer book brings the judgement down, and on the ground that matters most.

The searches this study ran were bounded and returned negative: the propitiatory offering is expressed at Prayer III (*agnoscens Hostiam, cuius voluisti immolatione placari*) and Prayer IV (*sacrificium tibi acceptabile et toti mundo salutare*); the offering for the dead at the Canon’s *Memento etiam* and the commemorations in Prayers II–IV; the priesthood conferred at the Supper at *Institutio generalis* nn. 2 and 4, which cite Trent session XXII directly; and the whole is summarised at n. 2, which states that in the new Missal “the Church’s rule of prayer corresponds to her perennial rule of belief,” that the sacrifice of the cross and its sacramental renewal in the Mass are “one and the same, save for the manner of offering,” and that the Mass is therefore “at once a sacrifice of praise, of thanksgiving, propitiatory and satisfactory.”⁸⁰ That search is bounded by the loci examined and correctable; it is a falsifiable claim, not a proof of universal negation.

Status. A source-grounded project judgement by an AI contributor, made from the loci cited and nothing else. It is not magisterial teaching, a canonical opinion or a specialist consensus, and it has had no independent review.

10.3 Three things this study will not say

It will not say that the two books are the same. A rite whose offertory is four prayers shorter, whose Canon is twenty-four crosses lighter, whose year has three fewer seasonal structures, whose readings triple in volume and whose central prayer is spoken aloud is a different book, and a reader who wants to be told that nothing changed should be told the opposite.

It will not say that the differences are indifferent. Section 4 named a specific and irrecoverable loss at the offertory; section 5 the reduction of a gestural language to a single sign; section 6 the reform’s own admission that difficult texts are avoided on Sundays; section 7 three losses in the calendar. Those findings stand whatever anyone concludes from them.

And it will not say which book a reader should prefer, or which a bishop should permit. A comparison of texts cannot reach that question, and the present law reserves the answer to the diocesan bishop and, in the cases the 2023 rescript specifies, to the Apostolic See.

10.4 A closing observation

The most durable thing the two books have in common is not a prayer but a phrase. *Ad pristinam sanctorum Patrum normam*: Pius V’s revisers claimed it in 1570; the Second Vatican Council used it in 1963; the *Institutio generalis* notes the coincidence and concludes that “both Roman Missals, although four centuries have intervened, embrace one and the same tradition.” Whether the second book made good on the claim is what four decades of argument have been about. That both books make it, in the same words, is where any honest comparison has to start.

Notes

¹The wider question—what the Council mandated, how the reform was executed, and what the postconciliar statistical record will and will not support—is treated in a separate Triptych study, *Council, Missal, and Crisis*, and is deliberately not reopened here. The present study is confined to the two books and the acts that govern them.

²*Missale Romanum*, editio typica (Vatican City, 1962), *Decretum* of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 23 June 1962, unnumbered front-matter leaf (artifact p. 2 of the registered facsimile): “Novo rubricarum corpore, a Summo Pontifice Ioanne XXIII, Motu proprio *Rubricarum instructum* diei 23 iulii anno 1960 approbato posteroque die a Sacra Rituum Congregatione promulgato, vix fieri non potuit quin eadem Sacra Rituum Congregatio novam Missalis romani editionem, ad dictum rubricarum codicem plane accommodatam, pararet.” Collated visually at the page image, 25 July 2026. The Missal prints a discrepancy about the motu proprio’s date: this decree gives 23 July 1960, while the Congregation’s own general decree promulgating the code, printed a few leaves later and dated 26 July 1960, gives “die 25 iulii huius anni.” Only the latter is consistent with this decree’s own “postero die.” The discrepancy is recorded in `research/edition-manifest.md` and left unresolved; no argument here depends on which date is right.

³The rights position is set out in the terminal scope appendix. In brief: the Latin *editiones typicae* are quoted; the ICEL English of the Roman Missal and the Lectionary pericopes are never reproduced at any length; public-domain English for the 1962 texts is available and is used where an English rendering is needed, always from an identified public-domain witness and never composed by this study.

⁴*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), *Proæmium* n. 6, in *Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, artifact p. 10: the Council mandated that certain rites be restored “ad pristinam sanctorum Patrum normam,” “iisdem videlicet usum verbis ac S. Pius V in Constitutione Apostolica ‘Quo primum’ inscriptis, qua anno 1570 Missale Tridentinum est promulgatum,” and from that agreement of wording “notari potest, qua ratione ambo Missalia romana, quamvis intercesserint quattuor sæcula, æqualem et parem complectantur traditionem.” The article then adds the reform’s own evaluative claim: “intellegitur etiam, quam egregie ac feliciter prius perficiatur altero.”

⁵*Missale Romanum*, editio typica (1962), front matter, unnumbered leaf (artifact p. 3 of the registered facsimile), running head *Bulla “Quo primum”*; the text continues onto the following leaf, headed *Breve Clementis Pp. VIII* at artifact p. 4. Both leaves were collated visually at the page images, 25 July 2026.

⁶*Missale Romanum*, editio typica (1962), *Breve Clementis Pp. VIII*, artifact p. 4, collated visually 25 July 2026: “... tum in primis fel. rec. Pius Papa V Missale Romanum ex Decreto sacri Concilii Tridentini ad veterem et emendatiorem normam restitui, Romæque imprimi curavit. Qui etsi multis propositis pœnis severissime caverit, ne quid illi vel adderetur, vel ulla ratione demeretur; tamen, progressu temporis ...”

⁷*Missale Romanum*, editio typica (1962), *Breve Urbani Pp. VIII*, artifact pp. 5–6, read at the artifact’s embedded text layer 25 July 2026: “... iterum examinari, et si quid forte in iis assiduus (quod plerumque contingit) temporis cursus corruperit, restitui iusserimus ... Nam rubricæ, quæ sensim ab usu rituque veteri degeneraverant, in pristinum restitutæ.”

⁸Benedict XVI, apostolic letter given motu proprio *Summorum Pontificum* (7 July 2007), preamble: succeeding pontiffs saw to it “that the rites and liturgical books were brought up to date and, when necessary, clarified. From the beginning of this century they undertook a more general reform. Such was the case with our predecessors Clement VIII, Urban VIII, Saint Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XII and Blessed John XXIII.” Official English text on the Holy See portal, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026 (registered artifact; re-fetch byte-identical).

⁹Paul VI, apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum* (3 April 1969), complete text, read in the official English web state (registered artifact, re-fetched byte-identical 25 July 2026) and in the promulgated Latin as reprinted at artifact pp. 4–7 of the registered reproduction of the third typical edition. The additions of the three Eucharistic Prayers, the identical words of consecration, and the enlarged lectionary are named in the constitution itself, as is the concluding force clause and its date.

¹⁰*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, front matter, artifact pp. 1–3: the 1970 decree *De editione typica Missalis Romani*, the 1975 act *De editione typica altera*, and the 2000 decree *De editione typica tertia*. These are the registered source-library records for the three acts; each is a segment of the same reproduction.

¹¹Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, instruction *Universae Ecclesiae* (30 April 2011), nn. 24–26 and 28; official English text, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026 (new source-library record). Number 28 states that the motu proprio, “by virtue of its character of special law, within its own area ... derogates from those provisions of law, connected with the sacred Rites, promulgated from 1962 onwards and incompatible with the rubrics of the liturgical books in effect in 1962.”

¹²Francis, apostolic letter given motu proprio *Traditionis custodes* (16 July 2021), arts. 1–8, official English text on the Holy See portal, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026 (registered artifact; re-fetch byte-identical).

¹³Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Responsa ad dubia* on certain provisions of *Traditionis custodes* (4 December 2021), response and explanatory note on the use of the full biblical text for the readings; official English text, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026 (registered artifact; re-fetch byte-identical). The same note observes that the publication of the Lectionary “overcame the ‘plenary’ form of the *Missale Romanum* of 1962” by returning to distinct books for distinct ministries—a structural point taken up in section 6 below.

¹⁴*Rescriptum ex Audientia Ss.mi* of 20 February 2023, official English text, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026 (registered artifact; re-fetch byte-identical).

¹⁵*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, *Ordo Missæ* at printed pp. 503ff. (artifact pp. 303ff.), with the shorter order for Mass with one minister at artifact pp. 383ff.; *Missale Romanum* (1962), *Ordo Missæ* at printed p. 216 (artifact p. 297) and *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ* at printed pp. LIV–LXV (artifact pp. 56–67).

¹⁶1962: “... quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, verbo et opere ... Ideo precor beatam Mariam semper Virginem, beatum Michaellem Archangelum, beatum Ioannem Baptistam, sanctos Apostolos Petrum et Paulum, omnes Sanctos, et vos, fratres ...” (*Missale Romanum* 1962, *Ordo Missæ* n. 1017, artifact p. 297, collated visually 25 July 2026). 2002: “... quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, verbo, opere et omissione ... Ideo precor beatam Mariam semper Virginem, omnes Angelos et Sanctos, et vos, fratres ...” (*Ordo Missæ* n. 4, artifact p. 303).

¹⁷1962: *Ordo Missæ* n. 1117, artifact p. 396: “Libera nos, quæsumus Domine, ab omnibus malis, præteritis, præsentibus et futuris: et intercedente beata et gloriosa semper Virgine Dei Genetrice Maria, cum beatis Apostolis tuis Petro et Paulo, atque Andrea, et omnibus Sanctis, ... da propitius pacem in diebus nostris ...” said with the paten, silently. 2002: *Ordo Missæ* n. 125, artifact p. 365, said *manibus extensis* and concluded by the people’s *Quia tuum est regnum*.

¹⁸Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, decree *De editione typica tertia*, Prot. N. 143/00/L (20 April 2000), artifact p. 3: “In appendice ad Ordinem Missæ inveniuntur etiam Prex Eucharistica pro Reconciliatione, necnon Prex Eucharistica peculiaris, quæ pro variis necessitatibus adhiberi potest.”

¹⁹*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), n. 31, artifact p. 25: “Ubi a rubricis statuitur, celebranti licet eas aliquatenus aptare ut participantium captui respondeant; curet tamen sacerdos ut sensum monitionis quæ in Missali proponitur ipse semper servet eamque paucis verbis exprimat.” The article also reserves to him the introductions before the Mass of the day, the liturgy of the word, and the Eucharistic Prayer—the last “numquam vero intra Precem ipsam,” never within the Prayer itself.

²⁰*Missale Romanum* (1962), *Rubricæ generales Missalis romani* n. 64, printed p. XV (artifact p. 13).

²¹*Rubricæ generales* n. 513(f), printed p. XXXV (artifact p. 33), collated visually 25 July 2026: “In Missa solemni, celebrans: ... f) omittit ea quæ a ministris sacris vel a lectore proferuntur.” The same number’s preceding paragraphs assign him what he does sing and say; n. 514 extends the rule, with adjustments, to sung Mass without sacred ministers. The corresponding provision in *Ritus servandus* VI, 4 has the subdeacon sing the Epistle “quam celebrans sedens auscultat”—which the celebrant listens to, seated.

²²*Rubricæ generales* n. 523, printed p. XXXVI (artifact p. 34).

²³*Rubricæ generales* n. 503, printed p. XXXIV (artifact p. 32): “Quoties sancta Communio infra Missam distribuitur, celebrans, sumpto sacratissimo Sanguine, omissis confessione et absolutione, dictis tamen *Ecce Agnus Dei* et ter *Domine, non sum dignus*, immediate ad distributionem sanctæ Eucharistiæ procedit.”

²⁴1962: *Ordo Missæ*, marginal nn. 1033 (*In spiritu humilitatis*), 1041 (*Orate, fratres*) and 1042 (*Suscipiat*), printed pp. 220–222 (artifact pp. 301–303); pp. 220–221 collated visually 25 July 2026 and p. 222 read at the artifact’s text layer. 2002: *Ordo Missæ* nn. 26 and 29, artifact pp. 309–310. The two texts are word-for-word identical apart from the punctuation of the newer edition and the older book’s parenthetical (*vel meis*) for the case in which the priest supplies the response himself.

²⁵*Rubricæ generales* n. 511, which lists among the things said aloud in a low Mass “*Dominus vobiscum, Oremus* et antiphona ad Offertorium, necnon verba *Orate, fratres*” and concludes “*Cetera dicuntur secreto*” (printed p. XXXV, artifact p. 33, collated visually 25 July 2026). *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ*, VII (De offertorio), printed p. LIX (artifact p. 61), specifies that the priest says *Orate, fratres* “voce aliquantulum elata” and continues “et secreto prosequens: *ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium*, etc.”

²⁶*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, *Ordo Missæ* nn. 23 and 25, artifact p. 309: “Si vero cantus ad offertorium non peragitur, sacerdoti licet hæc verba elata voce proferre; in fine populus acclamare potest: *Benedictus Deus in sæcula*.”

²⁷Council of Trent, session XXII (17 September 1562), *De sacrificio missæ*, canon VI: “Si quis dixerit, canonem missæ errores continere, ideoque abrogandum esse: anathema sit.” Read at the page image of *Canones et decreta sacrosancti œcumenici Concilii Tridentini*, editio stereotypa undecima (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1887), printed p. 121, Internet Archive item [canonesetdecreta00coun_0](#), leaf n128, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026; verified visually.

²⁸The collation is between *Missale Romanum* (1962), *Canon Missæ*, printed pp. 300–311 (artifact pp. 381–392), and *Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, *Prex eucharistica I seu Canon romanus*, nn. 83–98, artifact pp. 347–354. Within the 1962 witness, printed pp. 306–307 (artifact pp. 387–388) were collated visually 25 July 2026; the remaining pages were read at the artifact’s embedded text layer. The 2002 witness is a secondary digital reproduction, not the printed altar book; see the scope appendix.

²⁹*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), n. 365(a), artifact pp. 55–56: “Prex eucharistica prima, seu Canon romanus, qui semper adhiberi potest, opportunius profertur diebus quibus assignantur *Communicantes* propria, aut in Missis quæ *Hanc igitur* propriis ditantur, necnon in celebrationibus Apostolorum et Sanctorum, quorum mentio fit in ipsa Prece; itemque diebus dominicis, nisi, ob rationes pastorales, præferatur Prex eucharistica tertia.”

³⁰*Missale Romanum* (1962), *De defectibus in celebratione Missæ occurrentibus*, V, *De defectibus formæ*, printed p. LXVII (artifact p. 69), collated visually 25 July 2026. The same paragraph continues: “Si quis autem aliquid diminueret, vel immutaret de forma Consecrationis Corporis et Sanguinis, et in ipsa verborum immutatione verba idem non significarent, non conficeret

Sacramentum. Si vero aliquid adderet vel detraheret, quod significationem non mutaret, conficeret quidem, sed gravissime peccaret.”

³¹Council of Trent, session XXI (16 July 1562), chapter II, *Ecclesiae potestas circa dispensationem sacramenti eucharistiae*: “Præterea declarat, hanc potestatem perpetuo in ecclesia fuisse, ut in sacramentorum dispensatione, salva illorum substantia, ea statueret vel mutaret, quæ suscipientium utilitati . . . magis expedire iudicaret.” Read at the page image of the Tauchnitz 1887 edition, printed p. 108, Internet Archive item `canonesetdecreta00coun_0`, leaf n115, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026; verified visually. The chapter is about Communion under one kind and the withholding of the chalice, and it is cited here for the principle it states, not for its immediate subject matter.

³²1962, *Ordo Missæ* n. 1104, printed p. 307, collated visually: “qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.” 2002, *Ordo Missæ* n. 90, artifact p. 353: “qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.” The identical wording recurs in Eucharistic Prayers II, III and IV.

³³The 1962 gestural rubrics are printed within the Canon text itself at printed pp. 300–312 (artifact pp. 381–393); the postconciliar rubrics at *Ordo Missæ* nn. 84–98, artifact pp. 347–354. The count above is of prescribed signs of the cross over the offerings and does not include the priest’s signing of himself or the blessings outside the Canon.

³⁴*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, *Ordo Missæ* n. 32, artifact p. 310: “In Prece eucharistica prima, seu Canone romano, ea quæ inter parentheses includuntur omitti possunt.” The bracketed material is printed as such at nn. 86, 87, 94, 95 and 96.

³⁵*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, *Ordo Missæ* nn. 102–103 (Prex II), 110–111 (Prex III), 117–118 (Prex IV), artifact pp. 355–366. The introductory clauses differ—“Qui cum Passioni voluntarie traderetur,” “Ipse enim in qua nocte tradebatur,” and the corresponding form in Prayer IV—but the formulas over bread and chalice are identical across the four.

³⁶*Missale Romanum* (1962), *Præfationes*, printed pp. 223–298 (artifact pp. 304–379), enumerated from the running heads of the solemn and ferial series and the *Præfatio defunctorum*; read at the artifact’s text layer. The Common preface serves every Mass without a proper one.

³⁷*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, *Præfationes*, artifact pp. 311–346, counted by heading: two of Advent, three of the Nativity, one of the Epiphany, four of Lent, two of the Passion, five paschal, two of the Ascension, eight for Sundays in Ordinary Time, two of the Most Holy Eucharist, two of the Blessed Virgin Mary, two of the Apostles, two of the Saints, two of Martyrs, one of holy Pastors, one of Virgins and Religious, six Common, and five of the Dead. Prefaces printed with their own formularies elsewhere in the book—for the Trinity, the Sacred Heart, Christ the King, the Chrism Mass and others—are additional to this count, so fifty is a floor and not the book’s total.

³⁸*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, *Ordo Missæ* n. 113, artifact p. 358: “offerimus tibi, gratias referentes, hoc sacrificium vivum et sanctum. Respice, quæsumus, in oblationem Ecclesiæ tuæ et, agnoscens Hostiam, cuius voluisti immolatione placari . . . Hæc Hostia nostræ reconciliationis proficiat, quæsumus, Domine, ad totius mundi pacem atque salutem.” Prayer IV, n. 122, artifact p. 365: “offerimus tibi eius Corpus et Sanguinem, sacrificium tibi acceptabile et toti mundo salutare.”

³⁹*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), *Proœmium* n. 2, artifact p. 8: “. . . ei gratias persolvit et sacrificium offert vivum et sanctum, oblationem scilicet Ecclesiæ et hostiam, cuius immolatione ipse Deus voluit placari, atque orat, ut Corpus et Sanguis Christi sint Patri sacrificium acceptabile et toti mundo salutare,” with notes 4 and 5 citing *Prex eucharistica III* and *IV*. The same article opens by naming Trent’s session XXII as the solemn assertion of the Mass’s sacrificial nature and quotes *Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 47.

⁴⁰Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Responsa ad dubia* (4 December 2021), explanatory note to the response on the use of the full biblical text; official English text, registered artifact, checked 25 July 2026.

⁴¹*Ordo lectionum Missæ*, editio typica altera (1981), *Prænotanda* nn. 65–69, printed pp. XXXII–XXXIV: “Ordo lectionum dominicalis–festivus per triennium explicatur, ferialis autem per biennium” (n. 65); “Quælibet Missa tres exhibet lectiones . . . cyclus trium annorum proponitur, ita ut iidem textus solummodo quarto quoque anno legantur” (n. 66); and, for weekdays, an annual Gospel cycle in Ordinary Time with a biennial first reading, Year I in odd and Year II in even years (n. 69). Read in the registered scan of the Latin typical edition; nn. 65, 66 and 69 are separately registered passages in the source library.

⁴²Counted programmatically over the embedded text layer of the registered facsimile, 25 July 2026, by matching the printed incipit formulas (*Lectio libri . . .*, *Lectio Isaiaæ Prophetæ*, *Lectio Epistolæ beati Pauli Apostoli*, and the like). Optical-character-recognition error and repeated formularies mean these totals are approximate; the tallies and their method are recorded as a bounded finding in `research/scope.md`. The count is offered to establish presence and rough proportion, not as an edition statistic, and the qualitative distribution described in the text was checked against the printed formularies themselves.

⁴³*Ordo lectionum Missæ*, editio typica altera (1981), *Prænotanda* n. 77, printed p. XXXV: “Traditio multarum liturgiarum, ipsa liturgia Romana minime exclusa, aliquando consuevit in lectionibus Scripturæ quosdam versiculos omittere. Ulro fatendum est huiusmodi omissiones non leviter fieri posse, ne sensus textus aut mens et quasi stilus Scripturæ mutilentur. Attamen, cauto ut sensus revera in sua essentia integer maneat, visum est, ex ratione pastorali, etiam in præsentis Ordinis prædictam traditionem servare.” Read in a rendered page image of the registered scan of the Latin typical edition, 26 July 2026; the English here is a working gloss.

⁴⁴*Ordo lectionum Missæ*, editio typica altera (1981), *Prænotanda* n. 76, printed p. XXXV: “Ex ratione pastorali vitantur in lectionibus, diebus dominicis et sollemnitatibus, textus b[i]blii qui revera difficiliores sunt, sive obiective eo quod altiora problemata litteraria, critica aut exegetica movent, sive etiam, quadamtenus saltem, eo quod a fidelibus difficiliter intellegi possunt.” The registered scan prints *bilici* where the sense requires *biblici*; the defect is recorded and not silently corrected.

The article continues: “Attamen divitias spiritalis quorundam textuum non licuit fidelibus abscondi, eo quod ab eis difficilius capiantur, quando hæc difficultas oritur sive ex insufficienti institutione christiana, qua nullus fidelis carere debet, sive ex insufficienti institutione biblica, qua omnis pastor animarum pollere debet”—the spiritual riches of certain texts could not be hidden from the faithful on the ground that they find them harder, when the difficulty arises from inadequate Christian or inadequate biblical formation. Read in a rendered page image, 26 July 2026; the English here is a working gloss.

⁴⁵*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), n. 361, artifact p. 55: “Caveatur tamen ne, in seligendis textibus Scripturæ Sacræ, partes eius permanentiter excludantur.”

⁴⁶*Traditionis custodes* art. 3 §3 and the *Responsa ad dubia* explanatory note cited above. The practical consequence—an older cycle read in a newer translation—is a legal fact of the current discipline, not a judgement about it.

⁴⁷*Missale Romanum* (1962), *Rubricæ generales Missalis romani* n. 64, printed p. XV (artifact p. 13).

⁴⁸Paul VI, apostolic letter given motu proprio *Mysterii paschalis* (14 February 1969), printed in *Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, artifact pp. 61–63 under the rubric *Normæ universales de anno liturgico et novum Calendarium Romanum generale approbantur*, and citing *Sacrosanctum Concilium* nn. 104 and 111. The same act approves the general Roman calendar and the universal norms and sets them in force from 1 January 1970.

⁴⁹*Rubricæ generales* nn. 11–17, at the opening of the general rubrics (artifact p. 10). Number 16 provides that a first- or second-class feast of the Lord occurring on a second-class Sunday takes the Sunday’s place “cum omnibus iuribus et privilegiis,” and that no commemoration of the Sunday is then made.

⁵⁰*Normæ universales de anno liturgico et de calendario* nn. 5–7, artifact pp. 64–65; *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* n. 394, artifact p. 59.

⁵¹*Missale Romanum*, editio typica tertia, apparatus to *Mysterii paschalis*, notes 6 and 7, artifact p. 63.

⁵²*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* n. 394, artifact p. 59, with n. 373.

⁵³*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), *Proæmium* n. 4, artifact p. 9: “Natura vero sacerdotii ministerialis, quod episcopi et presbyteri proprium est, qui in persona Christi sacrificium offerunt cœtuique populi sancti præident, in ipsius ritus forma, e præstantiore loco et munere eiusdem sacerdotis elucet.”

⁵⁴*Institutio Generalis* n. 27, artifact p. 25: “In Missa seu Cena dominica populus Dei in unum convocatur, sacerdote præside personamque Christi gerente, ad memoriale Domini seu sacrificium eucharisticum celebrandum . . . In Missæ enim celebratione, in qua sacrificium crucis perpetuatur . . .”, with note 38 citing Trent, session XXII, chapter 1.

⁵⁵*Institutio Generalis* n. 93, artifact p. 25: “Etiam presbyter, qui in Ecclesia sacra Ordinis potestate pollet sacrificium in persona Christi offerendi, exinde populo fidei hic et nunc congregato præest, eius orationi præsidet, illi nuntium salutis proclamatur, populum sibi sociat in offerendo sacrificio per Christum in Spiritu Sancto Deo Patri, fratribus suis panem vitæ æternæ dat, ipsumque cum illis participat.”

⁵⁶*Missale Romanum* (1962), *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ*, I, printed p. LIV (artifact p. 56).

⁵⁷*Ritus servandus* III, 4, printed p. LV (artifact p. 57).

⁵⁸*Rubricæ generales* n. 511, artifact p. 33, collated visually 25 July 2026.

⁵⁹*Ritus servandus* VI, 4 and 5, printed pp. LVII–LVIII (artifact pp. 59–60).

⁶⁰*Rubricæ generales* nn. 513(f) and 514, artifact p. 33: “In Missis cantatis, scilicet sine ministris sacris, celebrans tenetur servare ea quæ numero præcedenti dicta sunt, et insuper tenetur partes ministris sacris proprias cantu proferre. Epistola a lectore cani potest. Quod si non cantetur a lectore, satius erit quod legatur sine cantu ab ipso celebrante . . .”

⁶¹*Institutio Generalis* n. 32, artifact p. 25.

⁶²*Institutio Generalis* n. 33, artifact p. 25: “Sacerdos etenim, tamquam præses, nomine Ecclesiæ et congregatæ communitatis preces effundit, aliquando autem nomine dumtaxat suo, ut ministerium suum maiore cum animi attentione et pietate adimpleat. Huiusmodi preces, quæ ante lectionem Evangelii, in præparatione donorum, necnon ante et post sacerdotis Communionem proponuntur, secreto dicuntur.”

⁶³*Institutio Generalis* n. 254, artifact p. 42: “Celebratio sine ministro vel aliquo saltem fidei ne fiat nisi iusta et rationabili de causa.”

⁶⁴*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), n. 91, artifact p. 25, with n. 77 citing *Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 28.

⁶⁵*Institutio Generalis* nn. 95–107, artifact pp. 26–27; n. 107: “Liturgica munera, quæ non sunt propria sacerdotis vel diaconi . . . etiam laicis idoneis a parocho vel rectore ecclesiæ selectis, committi possunt liturgica benedictione vel temporanea deputatione.”

⁶⁶*Institutio Generalis* n. 199, artifact p. 36: “Singulo tamen sacerdoti liceat Eucharistiam individuali modo celebrare, non vero eo tempore, quo in eadem ecclesia aut oratorio concelebratio habetur. Attamen feria V in Cena Domini et in Missa Vigiliæ paschalis modo individuali sacrum litare non permittitur.” The chapter on concelebration runs to n. 251.

⁶⁷*Ritus servandus* V, 3, printed p. LVII (artifact p. 59): “Si altare sit ad orientem, versus populum, celebrans versa facie ad populum, non vertit humeros ad altare, cum dicturus est *Dominus vobiscum*, *Orate, fratres, Ite, missa est*, vel daturus benedictionem; sed osculato altari in medio, ibi, expansis et iunctis manibus, ut supra, salutatur populum, et dat benedictionem.”

⁶⁸*Institutio Generalis* n. 299, artifact p. 47: “Altare exstruatur a pariete seiunctum, ut facile circumiri et in eo celebratio versus populum peragi possit, quod expedit ubicumque possibile sit.” The article is a norm about the construction and

placement of the altar; the grammar of *quod expedit ubicumque possibile sit* has itself been disputed, and this study takes no position on that dispute beyond observing that the article legislates about an altar, not about a celebrant's posture at one.

⁶⁹Council of Trent, session XXII, *Doctrina de sanctissimo missæ sacrificio*, chapter VIII: “Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est Patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur. Quamobrem, retento ubique cuiusque ecclesiæ antiquo et a sancta Romana ecclesia omnium ecclesiarum matre et magistra probato ritu, ne oves Christi esuriant . . . mandat sancta synodus pastoribus et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter inter missarum celebrationem vel per se vel per alios ex iis, quæ in missa leguntur, aliquid exponant, atque inter cetera sanctissimi huius sacrificii mysterium aliquod declarent, diebus præsertim dominicis et festis.” Tauchnitz 1887 edition, printed p. 120 (Internet Archive leaf n127); verified visually 25 July 2026.

⁷⁰Session XXII, canon IX: “Si quis dixerit, ecclesiæ Romanæ ritum, quo submissa voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse: aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere; aut aquam non miscendam esse vino in calice offerendo, eo quod sit contra Christi institutionem: anathema sit.” Tauchnitz 1887, printed p. 121 (leaf n128); verified visually 25 July 2026.

⁷¹*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), *Proæmium* nn. 11–12, artifact p. 11, quoting Trent session XXII chapter 8 and canon 9 with Denzinger–Schönmetzer references, and *Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 36. The Latin of n. 12 runs: “Et, cum nemo catholicorum esset, qui legitimum efficacemque ritum sacrum negaret lingua latina peractum, concedere etiam valuit: ‘Haud raro linguæ vernaculæ usurpatio valde utilis apud populum existere possit,’ eiusque adhibendæ facultatem dedit.”

⁷²*Missale Romanum* (1962), *Rubricæ generales Missalis romani* nn. 84–85 (artifact p. 14): “. . . tenentur dicere, hoc die, Litanias Sanctorum cum suis precibus, lingua latina. 85. Si Litanie Sanctorum cum suis precibus, iuxta locorum consuetudinem, in processione vel aliis peculiaribus supplicationibus, lingua vernacula, una cum fidelibus dicuntur, ii qui ad recitationem divini Officii obligantur, et his supplicationibus rite intersunt, non tenentur has preces lingua latina iterare.” Read at the artifact's embedded text layer.

⁷³Second Vatican Council, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (4 December 1963), n. 36, official English web state on the Holy See portal (registered artifact, re-fetched byte-identical 25 July 2026). The article is quoted here from the official English delivery; the promulgated Latin in *AAS* 56 (1964) is the authoritative text and is registered separately.

⁷⁴*Institutio Generalis* n. 389, artifact p. 59: “Missale Romanum sive in textu latino sive in versionibus vernaculis legitime approbatis integre edendum est.”

⁷⁵*Institutio Generalis* n. 41, artifact p. 16: “Cum frequentius in dies fideles ex diversis nationibus inter se convenient, expedit ut iidem fideles aliquas saltem partes Ordinarii Missæ, præsertim vero symbolum fidei et Orationem dominicam, modulis adhibitis facilioribus, lingua latina simul cantare sciant.”

⁷⁶*Institutio Generalis* n. 392, artifact p. 59: “. . . ut, etiam servata indole cuiusque linguæ, sensus textus primigenii latini plene et fideliter reddatur . . . Sermo adhibeatur fidelibus regionis accommodatus, attamen nobilis ac litteraria qualitate præditus . . .”

⁷⁷*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), *Proæmium* nn. 6–9, artifact pp. 10–11. Number 7: “Temporibus sane difficilibus, quibus catholica fides de indole sacrificiali Missæ, de ministeriali sacerdotio, de reali et perpetua Christi sub eucharisticis speciebus præsentia in discrimen fuerat adducta, id S. Pii V imprimis intererat, ut recentiore traditionem, immerito oppugnatam, servaret, minimis tantummodo ritus sacri mutationibus inductis.”

⁷⁸Benedict XVI, letter to the bishops on the occasion of the publication of *Summorum Pontificum* (7 July 2007), official English text, retrieved and hashed 25 July 2026 (registered artifact; re-fetch byte-identical).

⁷⁹*Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 23, restated as a norm binding inculturation at *Institutio Generalis* n. 398, artifact p. 60: “Norma a Concilio Vaticano II statuta, ut innovationes in instauratione liturgica ne fiant nisi vera et certa utilitas Ecclesiæ id exigat, et adhibita cautela ut novæ formæ ex formis iam exstantibus organice quodammodo crescant . . .”

⁸⁰*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (2002), *Proæmium* n. 2, artifact p. 8: “Ita in novo Missali lex orandi Ecclesiæ respondet perenni legi credendi, qua nempe monemur unum et idem esse, excepta diversa offerendi ratione, crucis sacrificium eiusque in Missa sacramentalem renovationem . . . atque proinde Missam simul esse sacrificium laudis, gratiarum actionis, propitiatorium et satisfactorium.”

A Scope, Method, and Qualifications

Reader, question, and claim boundary

This study is written for a reader who wants to know what the two Roman Missals actually contain and what the acts governing them actually legislate, and who is willing to be told that several familiar claims on both sides do not survive contact with the books. Its governing question is textual and juridical: at the loci where each matter is settled, what does each book say, and what follows? Its one evaluative judgement is confined to the block labelled *Project synthesis* in section 10 and is stated there with its strongest counterargument and a falsifying test.

It is not a merit verdict, a ceremonial manual, a parallel Missal, a history of the reform’s execution, or an authorisation to celebrate with either book. It does not treat the postconciliar statistical record, the causal arguments built on it, or the history of the Consilium; those belong to a different inquiry.⁸¹ It does not adjudicate the disagreement between the 2007 and 2021 frameworks, which is a prudential disagreement between papal acts that the Church has governed without resolving.

Editions and witnesses

The older witness is the *Missale Romanum, editio typica* (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962), consulted in the Church Music Association of America facsimile PDF of 1,088 pages, SHA-256 recorded in the source library and re-verified on acquisition, 25 July 2026. The newer witness is the *Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia* (Vatican City: Typis Vaticanis, 2002), consulted in a registered secondary digital reproduction of 828 pages whose exact bytes were re-acquired and hash-verified on 25 July 2026. Both are cited by artifact page as well as by printed page or article number, because the two paginations diverge.

Two ceilings follow and are material.

First, the 2002 witness is a digitally typeset reproduction hosted by a non-ecclesiastical third party, not a page-image facsimile of the printed altar book. It is registered as restricted and no payload is retained. Its Latin has been read at the pages cited, and the citations reproduce what stands there; but this study cannot certify that every word of that reproduction agrees with the printed *editio typica*. Any claim in this study that turns on the exact wording of the 2002 book is bounded by that limitation, and a reader with access to the printed edition should check it.

Second, the 1962 witness is a page-image facsimile with an embedded optical-character-recognition text layer. Pages from which Latin is quoted were, wherever the quotation is load-bearing, collated visually at the rendered page image: front-matter pp. 2–4 (the 1962 decree, *Quo primum*, the brief of Clement VIII), p. LXVII (*De defectibus* V), p. XXXV (general rubrics 511–514), the opening of the *Ordo Missæ*, printed pp. 220–221 (offertory), and printed pp. 306–307 (the institution narrative). The remaining loci were read at the text layer only, and each such note says so. Where the text layer alone was used, the reader should treat the reading as reliable for substance and provisional for orthography.

Trent is cited from the *Canones et decreta sacrosancti œcumenici Concilii Tridentini*, editio stereotypa undecima (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1887), at page images acquired from the Internet Archive and verified visually. The conciliar and papal acts are cited from the official Holy See web delivery, each response acquired and hashed on 25 July 2026; every one proved byte-identical to the record already registered in the source library, which is recorded as an independent re-verification rather than a new acquisition. The Lectionary’s *Prænotanda* are cited from a registered page-image scan of the Latin *editio typica altera* of 1981, acquired and hash-verified on 26 July 2026, with printed page XXXV read in a rendered image; the approved English *General Introduction to the Lectionary* published by the Liturgy Office of England and Wales was acquired and hashed on 25 July 2026 and consulted to locate the articles, but its copyrighted English is not quoted. The scan of the Latin edition is restricted and no payload is retained; only the pages named were inspected, and the study’s lectionary claims are bounded to them.

Rights and quotation

The Latin *editiones typicae* are quoted, briefly and at the loci the argument requires. The approved English translation of the Roman Missal and the text of the Lectionary pericopes are under copyright and are nowhere reproduced; they are cited by locus and described. The Lectionary’s *Prænotanda* are quoted in Latin from the typical edition,

and the copyrighted approved English translation of them is not quoted. Official Holy See texts are quoted briefly with attribution; the Vatican portal's restrictive legal notes are recorded in the registered artifact records, and no official text is reproduced in bulk. The 2002 Missal reproduction is restricted and is not retained. Where an English rendering of a 1962 text is given, it is either a description in the third person or a translation of a phrase, labelled as a working gloss; no text is offered here for vocal prayer or recitation, and this study composes no liturgical translation.

Public-domain English for the 1962 formularies exists and is registered in the source library; it was not required in this study, whose comparisons are made in Latin. Official texts and third-party material remain outside the project's outbound licence.

Method

Research was claim-driven. For each comparison, the governing locus in each book was identified first, the two texts were set beside one another, and the difference was classified before it was described. Claims were sorted into four states and the states were kept apart in the writing: verified text (checked at an identified witness and locus); checked description (a summary of what a locus says, verifiable at the locus); source-grounded synthesis (a conclusion demonstrably supported by checked evidence); and project judgement (labelled as such and confined to the synthesis block and to the passages that explicitly announce a judgement).

Comparative counts—signs of the cross, retained and dropped prayers—were made by enumeration against the printed rubrics and are reproducible from the loci cited. The one statistical estimate in the study, the distribution of Old Testament and Pauline lesson incipits in the 1962 Missal, was made programmatically over the facsimile's text layer, is stated as approximate, and is recorded with its method in `research/scope.md`.

Bounded negative results are stated as bounded. Where this study says that a proposition has no locus in a book, it means that the loci examined do not contain it and names those loci; it does not claim a universal negation, and it invites correction.

Legal scope and currentness

Governing law. The universal liturgical law of the Latin Church: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*; the apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum* (1969) with the promulgating decrees of 26 March 1970, 27 March 1975 and 20 April 2000; the *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* in its 2002 typical text; and the *Normæ universales de anno liturgico et de calendario* approved by *Mysterii paschalis* (1969). The 1962 books are governed by *Rubricarum instructum* (1960) and the Sacred Congregation of Rites' decrees printed in the 1962 Missal. The 2023 rescript invokes can. 87 §1 of the 1983 *Codex Iuris Canonici* in reserving its two dispensations; no other canon of the Code is relied on here.

Discipline of the 1962 Missal. *Summorum Pontificum* (7 July 2007) with its accompanying letter; the instruction *Universae Ecclesiae* (30 April 2011); *Traditionis custodes* (16 July 2021) with its accompanying letter; the *Responsa ad dubia* with explanatory notes (4 December 2021); and the *Rescriptum ex Audientia Ss.mi* of 20 February 2023.

Jurisdiction and persons. Universal Latin law. No territorial adaptation, particular law, or proper law of any institute is treated, and none of the study's legal statements should be applied to an Eastern Catholic Church.

Authoritative language. The promulgated Latin governs every act quoted; where an official English delivery is quoted, it is identified as such and the Latin original is named.

As-of date. 25 July 2026. On that date the document archive of the Dicastery for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments on the Holy See portal listed the *Rescriptum ex Audientia Ss.mi* of 20 February 2023 as its most recent item, and no universal legislative or authentically interpretative act later than that rescript modifying the discipline of the 1962 Missal was located. The check is bounded to the collections consulted and is correctable. The discipline is mutable and this date is material to every statement about it. Statements about the contents of the two books are not date-sensitive in the same way; statements about who may use them are.

Not advice. This is a study aid. Concrete questions about permissions, faculties, dispensations, or the lawfulness of a particular celebration are for the competent authority—the diocesan bishop, and in the cases reserved by the 2023 rescript the Apostolic See—or for a canonist with the complete facts.

Unresolved and outstanding

The 1962 Missal prints two different dates for John XXIII's *motu proprio Rubricarum instructum*, 23 July 1960 in the 1962 decree and 25 July 1960 in the Congregation's general decree of 26 July 1960; the discrepancy is recorded in `research/edition-manifest.md` and is not resolved here. The 1969 first edition of the *Institutio generalis* and the revision of its article 7 in 1970 are named nowhere in this study because no primary witness to the 1969 text was examined; the comparison uses the 2002 text throughout and says so. The principal non-official critical literature on the reform—works by identified authors rather than acts of authority—was not examined in an identified edition, and the critical case is therefore presented in its official and papal formulations only; that is a real limitation on section 10 and is recorded as such.

Independent liturgical, historical, canonical and theological review remains outstanding. Internal checking is not independent review. This document is a **source-audited working study**. It carries no imprimatur, no nihil obstat, and no ecclesiastical approval, and it is not an official liturgical book, a critical edition, or a canonical opinion.

B References

The two Missals

- *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum*, editio typica (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962). Consulted in the Church Music Association of America facsimile PDF, 1,088 pages, media.churchmusicassociation.org, acquired and hash-verified 25 July 2026 against the registered source-library artifact. Loci used: front matter (*Decretum* of 23 June 1962; *Quo primum*; briefs of Clement VIII and Urban VIII; the Sacred Congregation of Rites' general decree of 26 July 1960); *Rubricæ generales Missalis romani* nn. 9–18, 63–70, 84–85, 503, 511–514, 523; *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ* I–VII; *De defectibus* V; *Ordo Missæ* and *Canon Missæ*, printed pp. 216–328 (artifact pp. 297–409).
- *Missale Romanum ex decreto sacrosancti Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum, auctoritate Pauli Pp. VI promulgatum, Ioannis Pauli Pp. II cura recognitum*, editio typica tertia (Vatican City: Typis Vaticanis, 2002). Consulted in the registered secondary digital reproduction, 828 pages, acquired and hash-verified 25 July 2026; restricted, not retained, and not a facsimile of the printed altar book. Loci used: front matter and promulgating decrees, artifact pp. 1–7; *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*, artifact pp. 8–60; *Mysterii paschalis* and the *Normæ universales de anno liturgico et de calendario*, artifact pp. 61–71; *Ordo Missæ* and the four Eucharistic Prayers, artifact pp. 303–372.

Conciliar and papal acts

- Council of Trent, session XXI (16 July 1562), chapter II, and session XXII (17 September 1562), *Doctrina de sanctissimo missæ sacrificio* chapters VIII–IX and canons I–IX, in *Canones et decreta sacrosancti œcumenici Concilii Tridentini*, editio stereotypa undecima (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1887), printed pp. 108, 120–121. Read at Internet Archive page images of item `canonesetdecreta00coun_0`, leaves n115, n127 and n128, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026; verified visually.
- Pius V, bull *Quo primum* (14 July 1570); Clement VIII, brief *Cum sanctissimum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum* (7 July 1604); Urban VIII, brief *Si quid est in rebus humanis* (2 September 1634). All three as printed in the front matter of the 1962 typical edition, artifact pp. 3–6.
- Second Vatican Council, constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (4 December 1963), nn. 23, 36, 47, 104, 111. Official English web state, vatican.va, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026, byte-identical to the registered artifact; the promulgated Latin in *AAS* 56 (1964) 97–138 is the authoritative text and is registered separately.
- John XXIII, *motu proprio Rubricarum instructum* (1960); cited only as recorded in the 1962 Missal's own decrees, with the internal date discrepancy noted in section 1.
- Paul VI, apostolic constitution *Missale Romanum* (3 April 1969). Latin as reprinted in the third typical edition, artifact pp. 4–7; official English web state, vatican.va, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026, byte-identical to the registered artifact.
- Paul VI, apostolic letter given *motu proprio Mysterii paschalis* (14 February 1969), as printed in the third typical edition, artifact pp. 61–63.
- Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, decree *De editione typica Missalis Romani*, Prot. n. 166/70 (26 March 1970); *De editione typica altera*, Prot. N. 1970/74 (27 March 1975); Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *De editione typica tertia*, Prot. N. 143/00/L (20 April 2000). All three as printed in the third typical edition, artifact pp. 1–3.

The discipline of the 1962 Missal

- Benedict XVI, apostolic letter given *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum* (7 July 2007), and letter to the bishops on the occasion of its publication. Official English texts, vatican.va and vatican.va, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026, byte-identical to the registered artifacts.
- Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, instruction *Universæ Ecclesiæ* (30 April 2011). Official English text, vatican.va, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026; cited for its existence and its supersession.
- Francis, apostolic letter given *motu proprio Traditionis custodes* (16 July 2021), arts. 1–8, and letter to the bishops accompanying it. Official English texts, vatican.va and vatican.va, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026, byte-identical to the registered artifacts.
- Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Responsa ad dubia* with explanatory notes (4 December 2021). Official English text, vatican.va, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026, byte-identical to the registered artifact.
- *Rescriptum ex Audientia Ss.mi* (20 February 2023). Official English text, vatican.va, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026, byte-identical to the registered artifact. The dicastery's own document archive, checked the same day, lists no later item.

The Lectionary

- *Ordo lectionum Missæ*, editio typica altera (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1981), *Prænotanda* nn. 65–69 and 74–77, printed pp. XXXII–XXXV. Consulted in the registered page-image scan of the Latin typical edition (restricted; SHA-256 recorded; acquired and hash-verified 26 July 2026); printed p. XXXV was read in a rendered page image and is the source of every Latin quotation in section 6. English renderings of these articles are labelled working glosses.
- *General Introduction to the Lectionary*, the approved English translation of the same *Prænotanda*, as published by the Liturgy Office of the Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales, liturgyoffice.org.uk, acquired and hashed 25 July 2026. Consulted to locate the articles and to check the sense of the Latin; the copyrighted English is not quoted.

Last revised (UTC): 2026-07-26T10:12:58Z

Reuse and rights. To the extent Triptych holds the rights, project-created content and design are licensed under CC BY 4.0. Scripture, liturgical or official texts, received prayers or hymns, quotations, fonts, and other third-party material retain their own status; public-domain material remains public domain. Identify changes. Attribution implies neither Triptych nor ecclesiastical approval. See `LICENSE` and `THIRD_PARTY.md` in the source.