

The Construction of the New Mass:



Some Funny Things Happened Near the Roman Forum

by Father Romano Tommasi

The “Tradition of the Fathers”¹ is the interpretive key to understanding the reform of the Roman Liturgy following the Second Vatican Council. Past issues of *The Latin Mass* have featured many essays critiquing the liturgical conciliar “reforms.” My purpose is to evaluate the reform in the light of particular principles laid down by *Sacrosanctum Concilium* of Vatican II and interpreted by the Consilium² of Paul VI, which have purported to return our liturgy to the so-called “Golden Age” of the Fathers of the Church. In this brief discussion, I will attempt to investigate the application of the principles laid down by the *Consilium*, especially as they are expressed in the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal* (GIRM).³

First, it is important to understand that liturgists today are guided by the same fundamental principle as the reformers of Vatican II: namely, that we must return to the ideal of an uninfected, pure, and ancient liturgy in use before the introduction of “corrupting” Gallic or “French” elements. Specifically, we are refer-

ring to a historical phenomenon that caused a change in the ceremonies of the Mass of Gregory the Great (sixth century). The Roman Mass books were being copied and rearranged in France around the year 750. These new arrangements and additions of the Gallic/French church have been demonized in all modern liturgical discussion. When contemporary liturgists speak of returning to the “Liturgy of the Fathers,” they mean we must do everything possible to copy the original Roman model (c. 600) and eschew any influence from Gaul/France.⁴ Examples of “Gallic” elements in the liturgy include the many private prayers of the priest found in the *Pian* (Pius V) Missal of 1570.

This general principle that Franco-German/Gallican liturgical elements constitute “corruptions” is the litmus test used by the Consilium in deciding whether to keep or reject any particular liturgical text.⁵ But it is necessary to see the arbitrary manner in which this principle was applied. The first and perhaps most unknown example

is the dropping of the Sign of the Cross at the beginning of Mass. The *Novus Ordo Missae* features the Sign of the Cross at the beginning of Mass when the celebrant prays: “In the name of the Father, etc.” In the original draft of the new Mass, this was not the case. Popular “authoritative” works such as Jungmann’s *Missarum Sollemnia* were invoked by Consilium members to argue that the historical Mass texts indicate that the Sign of the Cross was introduced through Gallic-German influences. Jungmann dates its introduction into the Roman liturgy at about the fourteenth or fifteenth century.⁶ The assumption of the reforming liturgists was that this constituted a horrible late medieval accretion that must be severed from the Mass in conformity with their concept of a pristine Roman liturgy. In fact, they considered the Sign of the Cross (which began the prayers at the foot of the altar) to be among the worst of the accretions. Therefore, according to the Consilium’s anti-Gallican principles, it was dropped from their initial draft of the new rite of Mass.⁷

Enter Pope Paul VI, who, up to this point, had offered nothing but praise for the work of the Consilium, in which he seemed to have placed a blind trust.⁸ He decided, however, that eliminating the Sign of the Cross from the Mass might seem excessive to many Catholics. Therefore, after receiving a memo to this effect from the Pope, the Consilium voted again on whether or not this prayer should be dropped. The vote of the *periti*⁹ was quite indecisive. By a vote of 17 to 13, the Sign of the Cross was reinstated in the developing new rite. This is the first example of a working principle of the Consilium being thwarted. The liturgical Sign of the Cross, a Gallican element considered to be a late medieval corruption, survived by only a narrow margin!

Lest one think this an isolated incident that does not reflect the general orientation of the Consilium, consider an even more interesting occurrence, regarding the *Orate Fratres* (Pray, Brethren) during the Offertory. The prayer, in its present form, can be placed only in the late ninth or early tenth century.¹⁰ It is undoubtedly Gallican, but interestingly enough has parallels in many of the oriental liturgies.¹¹ The *periti* had voted away this prayer, criticizing its “dated” theology because it made a distinction between the priest’s and faithful’s sacrifice. The only value the *periti* saw in the prayer was that it prompted a response from the congregation, thereby promoting their idea of “active participation.”¹² However, some of the “experts” argued against retaining the *Orate Fratres* because it was difficult to translate and might actually impede the people’s participation! When the vote of our experts was tallied, the *Orate Fratres* lost with 30 rejections, 12 in favor of the prayer, and three indicating they would vote “yea” only if it were modified. Paul VI decided the *Orate Fratres* would remain because of his personal devotion to this prayer, which he referred to as a “precious pearl.”¹³

These two examples indicate the essentially arbitrary nature of the fundamental principle from which the Consilium worked. If the “purifying process” had not been the arbitrary whim of what amounted to a liturgical political party, and if it had truly been a widely accepted liturgical principle, the sign of the cross and the *Orate Fratres* would not have been reinstated through papal intervention. The influence of personal caprice is plainly evident in the formulation of the Mass of Paul VI.

It gets worse. What follows demonstrates that, with regard to the “re-

forms” that were finally introduced into the Novus Ordo, non-Roman elements were introduced into a very “Roman” part of the Mass. The following is an example of the destruction of a prayer that dated from the “Golden Age” of the Fathers. It involves the so-called prayer of embolism, or the conclusion to the Our Father, in the Pian Missal of 1570. The parallel text may be helpful.

1570 Missal of Pius V

Deliver us O Lord, we pray, from every evil, past, present, and to come, and at the intercession of the blessed and glorious ever-virgin Mary, Mother of God, of your blessed apostles Peter and Paul, of Andrew, and of all the saints, be pleased to give peace in our days, so that with the help of your compassion we may be ever free from sin and safe from all anxiety. Through Jesus Christ, your Son, etc.

The Pian Missal’s embolism is almost a verbatim parallel with the one found in the so-called Gelasian sacramentary, which dates to about the seventh century. For the most part the prayers of this sacramentary are recognized by scholars as representing the authentic Roman tradition.¹⁴

The Missal of Paul VI deletes from this traditional embolism any reference to the traditional Roman saints and their intercession. Secondly, it adds the doxology, “For the kingdom, the power, and the glory are yours.” Now a liturgist should be elated to have an original text preserved from the days of Saint Gregory. This is the quintessence of the Roman liturgy. Why, then, was the text altered?

The secretary of the Consilium offered a rather stunning reason for dropping the intercession of the Sts. Peter, Paul and Andrew from the embolism: “[I]t did not seem appropriate to repeat intercessions made a

few moments ago in the Eucharistic Prayer.”¹⁵ This statement implies the use of Eucharistic Prayer I, which mentions the apostles Peter and Paul. However, the author fails to mention in his October 1968 statement that the decree *Prece Eucharistica* (May 23, 1968) had, five months before, just promulgated the three newly invented Eucharistic Prayers. Thus either everyone had forgotten

1970 Missal of Paul VI

Deliver us, O Lord, we pray, from every evil, and grant us peace in our days, so that we, aided in the work of your mercy, may be always free from sin and safe from every anxiety: awaiting the blessed hope and coming of our Savior, Jesus Christ.... For the kingdom, the power, and the glory are yours now and ever and into the ages of ages.

that the other Eucharistic Prayers omitted mention of Sts. Peter and Paul, or that the reason just given for changing the embolism was at best illogical.

Secondly, why was the phrase, “Deliver us...from...evil, past, present, and to come” eliminated? Cardinal Bea informed us that it was because the Consilium wanted to insert “for the coming of our Savior Jesus Christ.”¹⁶ The reference to “evil...to come” would be flat and redundant in contrast to this new and uplifting form of *Maranatha*.¹⁷ Finally, why did we add, “For yours is the Kingdom, the power, and the glory”? This is an easy one. Any time the “Golden Age of the Fathers” or “simplification” cannot be invoked, there is always “ecumenism” at work, as well as the principle of “active participation.”¹⁸ Ecumenically, the Protestant confessions and many Oriental liturgies use this phrase; with other Christians already using it, it was

therefore easy to adopt. Conveniently, these two themes were used to justify performing the contradictory task (according to the Consilium's own principles) of dismantling an ancient prayer that was truly Roman.

Another alteration involved the change from saying the prayer in a whisper to reciting it aloud. The explanation must involve the tendency of Bugnini and the Consilium to make historical hypothesis into scientific fact. Bugnini claims that the silent recital of the embolism was a corruption owing to Gallican influence.¹⁹ Joseph Jungmann, a *peritus* on the Vatican II preparatory commission and a member of the Consilium,²⁰ frankly admits, however, that it could be a custom from the pre-Gallican seventh century.²¹ Finally, instead of *reciting* the embolism as would have been done in Rome in the sixth or seventh century if it had been said aloud,²² the *periti* decided that it should have musical accompaniment. Therefore, they decided to import the music for the Our Father and the embolism. The Our Father was given Mozarabic (Visigothic) music, while the Consilium tried to adopt Gallican chants from Lyon to have the embolism sung aloud!²³ In order to “restore”

the Roman rite, the oriental-like Mozarabic and the corrupt Gallic sources were utilized to replace the likely pristine Roman usage.

The three examples in this discussion are musings on items of personal interest about which I have made mental notes during my years



...we see emphasis on active participation, adaptation to the modern mentality, ecumenical concerns, and a fickle fidelity to tradition.

of study. I intend to write further concerning aspects of new texts and prayers of the *Novus Ordo Missae* that are either lacking in their original historical context after they were “restored,” or are simply based on fictitious liturgiology.

A thorough reading of the primary and secondary documentation pertaining to the new Mass of Paul VI does not permit one to grasp its

principles in any set order of importance. Despite this difficulty we see emphasis on active participation, adaptation to the modern mentality, ecumenical concerns, and a fickle fidelity to tradition. It would be presumptuous to generalize about the hierarchy of importance of these elements in the minds of the present reformers.

A final provocative thought might be appropriate. A dearth of original documentation frequently presents liturgical studies with great historical gaps and mysteries. Modern liturgists realize the impossibility of tracing precisely the development of the Latin rite, especially in the early centuries.²⁴ Consilium members proceeded dangerously and self-deceptively when they presumed that their biased reconstructions of what consti-

tutes the authentic Roman tradition were more accurate than what had been preserved in the organically developed traditional liturgy of the West. ✠

Father Romano Tommasi received his Licentiate in Sacred Theology (S.T.L.) from the Pontifical University of San Anselmo in Rome.

Notes

- 1 General Instruction of the Roman Missal, 2000, no. 9.
- 2 The Consilium was a special “study group” set up by Paul VI with the official task of reforming the liturgy according to the “letter and spirit” of Vatican II. See International Commission on English in the Liturgy, *Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979, Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1982), hereafter referred to as DOL.
- 3 *Ibid.*, p. 203. The General Instruction is the authoritative document of the Holy See that explains the new Mass and its parts. It includes an explanation of the reasons for the reform in general.
- 4 Scientia Liturgica, *Manuale di Liturgia*, ed. Professori del Pontificio Istituto Liturgico S. Anselmo, 5 vol., Edizione Italiana (Piemme, Casale Monferrato, 1998), vol. 1, pp. 149-160. Available in English as the *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, published by Pueblo. This is a compilation of scholarly essays of important modern Liturgists.
- 5 Annibale Bugnini, *Reform of the Roman Liturgy 1948-75*, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990) pp. 339-40. The author was the Consilium’s Secretary.
- 6 Joseph Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, 2 vols., trans. Francis A. Brunner (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1951), vol. 1, p. 296. This work represents the thinking Consilium.

- 7 Bugnini, *Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, p. 175.
- 8 *Ibid.*, pp. 155-56. Paul VI’s unquestioning confidence in the Consilium is also demonstrated by his rhapsodic praise in the papal audience of April 19, 1967. See DOL, p. 86.
- 9 This was the official title of advisors at Vatican II and Consilium, who were called “experts.”
- 10 Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, p. 87.
- 11 *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.
- 12 Bugnini, *Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, p. 358.
- 13 *Ibid.*, pp. 180, 379.
- 14 Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources* (Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1986), pp. 67-68. This book is very highly praised by Anscar Chupongo, an influential liturgist. The embolism appears in the manuscript, *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae Ordinis Anni Circuli* (Codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193. 41/56). (*Sacramentarium Gelesianum*) Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, cura Pontificii Athenaei Sancti Anselmi de Urbe; Edita Moderante L.C. Mohlberg, Series vol. 4, Casa Editrice Herder, Roma 1960. Capitulum [XVII], # 1258.
- 15 Bugnini, *Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, p. 380.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 376.

- 17 This means that the new phrase is eschatological, and reminds us that Jesus will come again. It seems inappropriate, since the new Canon just mentioned “Christ has died... Christ will come again.” Even the Latin text has us mention the second coming immediately after the apex of the Consecration. A repetition here is redundant and detracts from the *Mysterium Fidei* of the Canon.
- 18 *Supra*, p. 41.
- 19 *Ibid.*, pp. 339-40.
- 20 *Ibid.*, pp. 15, 337.
- 21 Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, vol. 2, p. 289.
- 22 A. Turco, “Il Canto Gregoriano,” Corso fondamentale, Roma 1991. (Elaborazione: Ma Dolores Aguirre.)
- 23 Bugnini, *Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, p. 120.
- 24 Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 37. Concerning the Roman liturgy of the first five centuries, this most prestigious liturgist remarks, “Undoubtedly there must have been considerable liturgical activity but we have no way of evaluating either its extent or its results.”

The Construction of the New Mass

*Some Funny Things Happened
Near the Roman Forum: Part II*

by Father Romano Tommasi

Building the Cathedral – Fouquet

In my previous article, I attempted to expose a number of seeming contradictions in the decision-making process of the *Consilium* (the group of scholars commissioned by Paul VI to reform the liturgy). In this present article I will investigate other specific areas of the so-called “reform.” Recall that the *Consilium* purported to restore ancient practices which had, “by an accident of history” or other unknown reasons, fallen into disuse.¹ Using the *Consilium*’s own fundamental principles of “substantial uniformity” and “legitimate progress,”² a two-fold obstacle needed to be overcome by the *Consilium*’s reformers. In their evaluation of a legitimate restoration of formerly defunct rites, any restoration should have avoided fictitious liturgiology and made certain that neither meaning nor context was lost.

The first rite to be restored by the Council (via the *Consilium*) was the so-called “Prayer of the Faithful.”

Number 53 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* relates that the Prayer of the Faithful is to be ‘restored,’ that is, brought back from the dead. According to the liturgical opinion at the time, this prayer was originally part of the ancient Roman Rite and had been lost. The first official publication on the Prayer of the Faithful *De Oratione Communi seu Fidelium*³ nicely sums up its “history” as it was widely accepted by liturgical schol-

...If the ritual and its value can be understood in its ancient context, then in restoring the ritual one must find an appropriate way to maintain its significance and value when inserting it into modern culture.

ars at the time of the Council. This document represents the first serious official attempt to demonstrate the Prayer of the Faithful’s existence in the Roman rite and begins with a reference to St. Justin Martyr.

Justin is well known to have described the ancient *Greek* usage of largely non-Roman Christians living in Rome in the second century, which

has very little to do with the Roman rite directly. However, the real problem is as follows: the modern Roman Rite is said to have been restored to the “Tradition of the Fathers”⁴ by the New Roman Missal, which period is none other than the time dating from the fourth to the seventh centuries.⁵ What does a second century practice have to do with the Roman Rite, since it did not begin to exist until around circa 380 A.D., beginning with the translation of the Mass into Latin and the sole use of the Roman Canon? The document does not concern itself with this point.

The *Consilium* next appeals to the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome. St. Hippolytus was formerly believed to have been the author of an ancient text of worship for the Church in Rome in the third century (*The Apostolic Tradition*). Fanatical devotion of liturgists during the Vatican II period to Hippolytus’ *Apostolic Tradition* could be considered as equivalent to the deference shown to pseudo-Denys the Areopagite by the medieval Church. Yet what is the *most recent* consensus on the value of this text in understanding the Roman rite? “[T]he *Apostolic Tradition* is not the typical and official liturgy of the Roman Church;

rather, it is one example – in Greek – of the way some Roman Christians worshipped, even though it claims for itself normative and even ‘apostolic’ authority.”⁶

One could easily go on criticizing reliance on Hippolytus’ so-called *Apostolic Tradition*. He is almost certainly not the real author of the document attributed to his name, and even if he were, it is very likely that it reflects opinions during his period as a schismatic anti-pope, who was only reconciled in prison before suffering death as a martyr. The bias of the Vatican

II era liturgical reformers toward Hippolytus would prevent them from considering that this could reflect a schismatic liturgy. Although the tide of scholarly opinion has turned against Hippolytus, the New Mass' Eucharistic Prayer II⁷ (the historical and ecclesiological origins of which are now questioned) remains.

The *Consilium*'s same official text attempts to appeal to the Fathers of the Church as unassailable evidence that the Prayer of the Faithful was located before the Offertory. At first glance, there would seem to be strong evidence in favor of the reformers when the document quotes Western Fathers like Augustine, Arnobius, and Ambrose (the Father of the Ambrosian Rite), in support of the Prayer. However, new research has demonstrated rather conclusively that these texts are ambiguous and that they could very well refer to intercessions within the Canon of the Mass. The most recent liturgical research (especially at St. Anselmo in Rome) reveals that, during the "Golden Age of the Fathers" in Rome, what the *Consilium* refers to as the Prayer of the Faithful was actually the intercessions made for the Pope, bishops, clergy, laity, the living and the dead at the *Te igitur* (the beginning of the Roman Canon). These intercessions remain in the Roman Canon to this day.

Outside of Rome many are familiar that the local king was often mentioned in the Canon, and even other petitions. The latest developments rely on the clear words of Pope St. Innocent I where he writes that the *nomina*, or list of names, is to be said only after the gifts have already been offered so that the petitions are made "within the sacred mysteries."⁸ This text, along with a host of other texts, is able to be reconciled with the accounts of Augustine, Ambrose, and others.

The old interpretation of Jung-

mann (perhaps the most influential liturgist at the time of Vatican II) which argued for a separate Prayer of the Faithful is seemingly unable to be reconciled with that of St. Innocent and other accounts. Thus the most recent scholarship most convincingly leads to an unsavory position for the reformers: the re-introduction of the Prayer of the Faithful is based on a fictitious liturgical foundation.⁹ It is an historical aberration!

According to the *Consilium*, however, Jungmann had more or less demonstrated the existence of this Prayer of the Faithful in the Roman Rite.¹⁰ Jungmann held the following: the sixth century Pope Gelasius introduced the *Kyrie Eleison* at the beginning of Mass. This was a series of petitions to which the faithful would answer, "Lord have Mercy." Gelasius did not wish to retain the repetitive Prayer of the Faithful (located before the Offertory) and decided to eliminate it.

Eventually the "Lord Have Mercies" were fixed to six invocations, and three "Christ Have Mercies" were spliced in the middle. Over time the *Kyrie* petitions dropped out of the litany and thus we have the *Kyrie* as found in the Missal of Pius V.¹¹ This offers evidence for what I have previously labeled as "fictitious liturgiology," yet the secretary of the *Consilium* called the Prayer of the Faithful "a precious stone that had been lost and then recovered in all its splendor."¹²

Worth mentioning is the oddity of the appeals made by the *Consilium* to Eastern Fathers, as well as to the Visigothic and Gallican liturgies, in order to justify the present Prayer of the Faithful. Such references are puzzling because the former have nothing to do with the Roman Rite, and the *Consilium* generally viewed the

latter as corrupting influences upon the original purity of the Roman Rite.

The second "restored" rite is that of the Sign of Peace. The instructions for the New Roman Missal say: "Before they share in the same bread, the faithful implore peace and unity for the Church and for the whole human family and offer some sign of their love for each other."¹³ This is a ritual which has a tripartite significance: (1) The *faithful* exchange a sign (2) for *peace* and *unity* in the *Church* and the *human family* (3) indicating *love* for one-another. Yet what is the reality in every Catholic Church in the world? (1) The faithful and *non-Catholics* always exchange the Sign of Peace within the new Mass. No document has forbidden, or even suggested, that this is erroneous. (2) The current sign is therefore one of

...the Prayer of the Faithful is based on a fictitious liturgical foundation. It is an historical aberration

greeting and welcoming, but does not imply in the least a spiritual peace between persons present. (3) If you consider love the same as being friendly, the third objective is attained. There is not any evidence that the peace offered is considered by the faithful as an *agape*. Hence there is no reticence in offering it to those in mortal sin, nor will an official document be found to order, or even suggest, that the state of grace is necessary for the exchange of *agape*/love/charity.

I make these observations because supposedly the "sign of peace" is a "restored" rite from the "Tradition of the Fathers." It must be said that the rite exists in all the liturgies of Christendom.¹⁴ The *Apostolic Tradition*, *The Constitutions of the Twelve Apostles*, *Ordines Romani* and countless Fathers bear unanimous witness to this practice. Its significance, however, is in the expression of *communio*. The exchange of peace could be given *only* by orthodox Catholics in

good standing in the patristic Church. In fact, there were several different ranks within the Church itself. First were the pagans outside the Church. Not being baptized, they could not share in Christ's peace. They could not even be admitted into the Church during the sacred mysteries (as in the Roman Missal of Pius V's dismissal of the catechumens at the Creed, they would be forced to exit with the catechumens), so that they could not receive the peace.

Secondly, the unbaptized catechumens were unable to exchange a "holy kiss" of peace in the Holy Spirit until the Easter vigil.¹⁵ In fact, they could not even pray with baptized Christians until they themselves were baptized.¹⁶

Next were the heretics and schismatics. Although baptized, they were denied Communion and the Sign of Christ's peace since they were cut off from the bosom of the Church. They too would not be allowed to witness the sacred mysteries.

Yet the list of *personae non gratis* does not stop there! Those having committed mortal sin were relegated to a closed-off place in the back of the church, or even outside of the building, and so too were always denied the Sign of Peace.¹⁷ In the Roman Rite, only after the completion of formal canonical Penance during Lent could they receive absolution on Holy Thursday in order to once again take their place with the congregation and so exchange the bond of *communio* and *love* which they had lost through the commission of mortal sin.¹⁸

This noble reality of *communio* and *love* is expressed in the new

Roman Missal, but it is adulterated since its application does not take into account the historical context of the Sign of Peace. Nor has there been implemented a proper way to restore the ritual while retaining its rich significance.

Lost are the days of the sixth century Roman Rite where everyone but baptized and grace-filled orthodox Catholics are herded out of the Church following the Mass of the Catechumens. Gone, too, are the patristic prohibitions of men and women sitting together in the congregation and only exchanging peace among their own gender (still practiced in Judaism and by some Orientals). These universal practices from at least the third to the eighth centuries are all intimately bound up



Ultimately, it must be admitted frankly that the Sign of Peace in the Novus Ordo is a meaningless liturgical gesture.

with the kiss of peace, which is to be pure and holy. The so-called "restoration," purported to have been accomplished by the *Consilium*, reintroduced only a handshake and a smile. This is a result of the "lack of context" being achieved on the part of the

Consilium. Ultimately, it must be admitted frankly that the Sign of Peace in the Novus Ordo is a meaningless liturgical gesture.

Sadly, the required conclusion is that little more than vestiges of the ancient practice of the Sign of Peace have been re-introduced into the new Mass. Invoking the criteria of Vatican II's *Sacrosanctum Concilium* that supposedly guided the *Consilium*, if any rites have demonstrated themselves as "of little advantage" or as "accidents of history," the Prayer of the Faithful and the Sign of Peace would more than qualify. ✠

Notes

- 1 See DOCUMENTS ON THE LITURGY 1963-1979, *Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*, International Commission on English in the Liturgy, The Liturgical Press, Collegetown 1982. **DOL 1** (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, n. 50).
- 2 BUGNINI, A. *Reform of the Liturgy 1948-75*, Collegetown, Minnesota. The Liturgical Press, 1990 (1st English edition. Trans. Matthew J. O'Connell), pp. 39-45.
- 3 *Ibid.*, **DOL 239**, nos. 1-17.
- 4 INSTITUTIO GENERALIS EX EDITIONE TYPICA TERTIA CURA ET STUDIO CONGREGATIONIS DE CULTU DIVINO ET DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM EXCERPTA, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Citta' del Vaticano 2000. General Instruction of the Roman Missal A.D. 2000, no. 9.
- 5 DIZIONARIO DEL CRISTIANESIMO, ed. Luigi Bogliolo. Sinopsis Iniziative Culturali, Roma 1992 (edizione italiana), p. 372.
- 6 Vogel, Cyril. *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*. The Pastoral Press: Washington D.C., 1986, p. 33 (revised edition in English).
- 7 BUGNINI, A. *Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975*, p. 456.
- 8 19 March 416: Innocent I, epistle to Decentius. (Critical text from Cabieà, R. (ed.), La tette du pape Innocent Ier a De'centius de Gubbio (19mars 416). Louvain 1973, 22). "De nominibus vero recitandis antequam precem sacerdos faciat, atque eorum oblationes quorum nomina recitanda sunt sua oratione commendat quam superfluum sit, et ipse pro tua prudentia recognoscis, ut cuius hostiam necdum Deo offeras, eius ante nomen insinues, quamvis illi incognitum nihil sit. Prius ergo oblationes sunt commendandae, ac tunc eorum nomina quorum sunt edicenda, ut inter sacra mysteria nominentur, non inter alia quae ante praemittimus ut ipsis mysteris viam futuris precibus aperimus."
- 9 See especially: Raffa, V., Liturgia eucaristica. Mistagogia della Messa: dalla storia e dalla teologia alla pastorale pratica, B.E.L. Subsidia 100, Roma 1998, pp. 305-309.
- 10 See DOCUMENTS ON THE LITURGY 1963-1979, *Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*, International Commission on English in the Liturgy, The Liturgical Press, Collegetown 1982. **DOL 239**, no. 1917.
- 11 JUNGSMANN, JOSEPH, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: its origins and development*, 2 vol. New York, Benzinger Brothers, 1951 (1st English edition. Trans. Francis A. Brunner). vol. 1, p. 296. pp. 33-346.
- 12 BUGNINI, A. *Reform of the Liturgy 1948-75*, Collegetown, Minnesota. The Liturgical Press, 1990 (1st English edition. Trans. Matthew J. O'Connell), p.404.
- 13 INSTITUTIO GENERALIS EX EDITIONE TYPICA TERTIA CURA ET STUDIO CONGREGATIONIS DE CULTU DIVINO ET DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM EXCERPTA, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Citta' del Vaticano 1975. General Instruction of the Roman Missal 27 March 1975, no. 56b, or, DOCUMENTS ON THE LITURGY, **DOL 208**, no. 1446.
- 14 JUNGSMANN, JOSEPH, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: its origins and development*, vol. 1, p. 328.
- 15 See *Tradition Apostolica* of the so-called Hippolytus. See also *Constitutiones Apostolicae* of the 4th cent.
- 16 SCIENTIA LITURGICA, Manuale di Liturgia, ed. professori del Pontificio Istituto Liturgico S. Anselmo, 5 vol., Piemme, Casale Monferrato 1998. Edizione Italiana. (vol 4, pp. 44-45). Available in English as the *Handbook for Liturgical Studies* published by Pueblo.
- 17 *Ibid.*, vol 4, pp. 118-124.
- 18 Manuscript LIBER SACRAMENTORUM ROMANAE AECLESIAE ORDINIS ANNI CIRCULI (Cod. Vat. Reg. Lat. 316/Paris Bibl. Nat. 7193, 41/56) (SACRAMENTARIUM GELASIANUM), *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta*, cura Pontificii Athenaei Sancti Anselmi de Urbe Edita Moderante L.C. Mohlberg, Series Maior Fontes vol. 4, Casa Editrice Herder, Roma 1960. Capitulum [XXXVIII], # 339-63 (Latin only).

Father Romano Tommasi received his Licentiate in Sacred Theology (S.T.L) from the Pontifical University of San Anselmo in Rome.