

The origin of the Roman Missal in the reform of Saint Pius V¹

Jean-Marie Pommarès O.S.B.

The reform of the missal decreed by Saint Pius V in 1570 was not an isolated event, the fruit of the imagination of a pious pope, but part of a specific historical and ecclesial context, of which the demands of the Council of Trent were only the latest elements.

To understand this context, we must go back to 1450. At that time, a German craftsman developed a printing process using movable type. It became almost inevitable that the Supreme Pontiff would, sooner or later, have to study the question of the Mass and the Missal. It may seem a little surprising, but the distant cause of the bull *Quo primum* can be attributed to Gutenberg's invention more than a hundred years earlier.

1. Normative developments before the Council of Trent

Before this event, how were missals produced? They were, of course, copied by hand: to meet a specific need – from a particular cathedral, parish or chapel – a monk, cleric or professional copyist would write all the euchological formulas and readings of the missal on parchment, and later on paper.

The criterion determining the choice of prayers and texts was local custom; this was a customary law accepted by all. In fact, a consultation of collections of ecclesiastical laws and council decrees reveals only a small number of rules – about ten in a thousand years! – relating to specific details, and no overall regulations for the drafting of liturgical books.

Moreover, the "titles" of altar books clearly express the reality of this customary law, even in the early days of printing. Thus, the *Missale secundum consuetudines Romane Curie*, *Missale ad sacro sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae usum*, and *Missale ad consuetudinem insignis ecclesie Remensis*, etc.

In practice, it does not take much imagination to reconstruct the process followed, based on the known facts. A specific need prompted the work to be undertaken: the need to replace a missal that was now in poor condition, or for a newly built church or chapel... The copyist would usually copy the text verbatim from the copy used as a model or, if he had to make some adaptations to local customs, would have his work checked by a canon of the cathedral or an ecclesiastical c r other

¹ Proceedings V. Versailles. 11 to 13 November 1999.

clergyman sufficiently familiar with the customs in question. Then, this copy, which is necessarily unique – or at most one of a small number in the case of a particularly active workshop – is sent to the sanctuary for which it is intended, never to leave it again. There was therefore no question of comparing one text with another. If two missals were found in the cathedral sacristy, any discrepancies were viewed with indulgence, given the difficulties involved in their production.

With the advent of printing, things changed. As early as 1474, a missal was printed in Milan, presented as *an editio princeps*, but in fact it seems that the Church of Constance had printed one as early as 1470. By 1504, the same diocese was on its third edition. Even though print runs did not number in the thousands as they do today, there was nevertheless a certain circulation of books, and differences began to be noticed, even inaccuracies or innovations that no custom could justify.

Admittedly, the Roman Canon is the only one in force, with a few exceptions, accepted throughout the Christian West, with only minor variations that could be described as accidental, although sometimes quite numerous. For example, Father Robert Amiet's study of twenty-two pre-Tridentine missals from the Aosta Valley revealed ninety-three variations, solely for the ordinary of the Mass – which is certainly broader than the Canon alone. Furthermore, from one church to another, there are variations in the list of saints mentioned in the *Communicantes* or *Nobis quoque*. There are also minor differences in rites and rubrics.

On the other hand, there are considerable differences in the readings for both the Temporal and the Sanctoral. The same is true for the Offertory and the prayers before Communion.

In short, there is a lack of uniformity, and there are calls from various quarters for a review and control of the editions.

Thus, at the beginning of the aforementioned Constance Missal of 1504, there is a letter of promulgation from the local bishop, Mgr. Hugues de Landenberg. He refers to the cathedral missal as the model to which all must conform; he also states that he has carefully checked the present work to remove errors and certain features that do not conform to local customs.

Less explicit is the Mainz Missal printed in 1507, which bears the inscription *denuo accuratissima cura recognitum et a prioribus quibusdam mendis... emendatum*, without it being possible to know who commissioned this revision work and to whom it seems that customary law still governs the matter.

Then, in 1515, the decree of the Fifth Lateran Council, convened by Pope Julius II, certainly better known for his military "exploits", gave the first legislative echo of this debate, even if it did not specifically concern the missal. The decree stipulated that books dealing with faith and morals must henceforth be submitted to the bishop for approval before publication². Liturgical books are not explicitly mentioned, but they are certainly included in this measure. Their drafting, or at least the control thereof, now falls, at least in theory, under episcopal law.

Protestants also noticed the variations, errors and other "imperfections" in the missals and did not fail to reproach Catholics for them. Luther, moreover, did not limit himself to these detailed criticisms: for him, the holy sacrifice of the Mass as celebrated was "the abomination of desolation". Consistent with their beliefs, the Protestants then composed a whole series of "Communion services" intended to replace the Mass.

Faced with this situation, the Diet of Speyer (1526) proposed that the bishops carry out certain reforms deemed urgent, in particular the prohibition of certain sequences and votive Masses, which were considered inconsistent with the deposit of faith and the dignity of the liturgy³. In France, the provincial synods of Bourges and Sens-Paris (1528) stipulated that future liturgical books could only be printed with the approval of the respective ordinaries⁴.

However, the dissemination and application of ecclesiastical laws did not happen as quickly as they do today – we will see this phenomenon again with the bull *Quo primum*. We are therefore not surprised to find a *Missale insignis ecclesie meldensis* – referring to the diocese of Meaux – from 1517 bearing the words *hoc mediocri volumine parisiis recentius impressum*. We seem to be in the presence of a reprint, with a few inevitable local additions, of a Parisian Missal, but without any reference to the decree of the Fifth Lateran Council or to any episcopal intervention. I would point out in passing that this book, although printed, contains numerous abbreviations that make it rather difficult to read, particularly some of the rubrics.

A very interesting Missal of Liddes, a manuscript from 1523, preserved in the rich library of the Hospice of the Great Saint Bernard, represents local particularism in all its beauty. Its title is *Incipit ordo missalis ad usum Sancti Bernardi Montis Iovis, ad opus parrochie Sancti Georgi de Liddes*. It therefore follows the customs of the Congregation of the Great Saint Bernard as practised in their

² Conc. Latran V, sess. X, 4 May 1515, in J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum [...] collectio*, T. XXXII, Col. 912-913.

³ Hubert JEDIN, *Chiesa della fede, Chiesa della storia*, Brescia: Morcelliana, 1972, p. 394.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 395.

mountain parish of Liddes. It should be noted that there are no Offertory prayers; the text goes directly from *the Creed* to the Preface – in fact, we can assume that these prayers were to be found on the altar canon or known by heart by the celebrant.

On the other hand, a few years later, in 1539 to be precise, there is a Parisian Missal that announces itself as being *Missale ad usum ecclesie parisiensis noviter impressum ac emendatum per deputatos a Rmo Dno J. de Bellayo Parisiensi episcopo ac a venerabilibus decano et capitulo ejusdem ecclesie canonicos ac doctores theologos*. Here, episcopal law is clearly asserted; it is true that Cardinal Jean du Bellay was a great lord and intended to assert his authority, including in the liturgical sphere. But there is also reference to the canons of the cathedral and the theologians of the diocese, i.e. to local customs and practices. In fact, this work differs very little from the Roman Missal of the time; there had already been a certain amount of standardisation to the detriment of some local riches, which Dom Guéranger regretted⁵ .

2. The work of the Council of Trent

Many other examples could be cited, but we must limit ourselves. Thus we arrive at the opening of the Council of Trent in 1545 with a situation that was virtually unchanged: few dioceses had seriously undertaken to reform their missals, and relative anarchy remained in this area.

The following year, in 1546, the Fathers of this illustrious assembly lamented that, due to insufficient ecclesiastical control, many inappropriate things had crept into the printed missals. Furthermore, there were already calls for a single missal for the entire Latin rite, a request repeated by the Archbishop of Braga, then in an Italian *memorandum* in 1562 and in the Spanish memorandum for reform in the same year, not to mention the request made in 1562 by Emperor Ferdinand I himself⁶ . However, in 1547, a commission was set up to draw up a list of abuses "in the celebration of Mass, practices concerning indulgences..."; this was the *De abusus* commission. Its lengthy work did not come to fruition until 1562.

That year, while the final discussions on the dogmatic aspects of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass were taking place, the Fathers of the *De abusus* commission worked to reduce the long lists of abuses that had been submitted to them. Among these, we find many complaints relating to votive Masses, Mass fees, certain Marian additions to *the Gloria*, differences in rites from one place to

⁵ Prosper GUÉRANGER, O.S.B., *Institutions liturgiques*, vol. I, p. 457.

⁶ H. JEDIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 399, 407 and 408.

another, certain practices that were unworthy or simply arbitrary, but also concerning prefaces of suspicious origin. It is rather curious to see in the list the complaint that in many missals, during the Offertory, the bread that has not yet been consecrated is called *hostia sancta et immaculata*⁷; this may be an infiltration or an echo of Protestant grievances.

This led to an initial *compendium*⁸, which was further revised before being presented in September 1562 to the plenary assembly of the council for deliberation, under the title *Canones de abusibus circa celebrantes vel audientes missam*⁹. The first of the two schemes presented begins with a request for the unification of the rite of celebration of Mass for the whole Church, which would in fact be the imposition of the rite of the Roman Church on everyone: not only are the abuses presented, but the scheme also provides a solution to remedy all those concerning the missal, both past and future¹⁰.

The minutes of the discussion in *the aula* that have come down to us do not tell us much: the secretary merely notes dryly that such and such a Father approves the schema but would like this or that proposal to be developed, or that another to be omitted, without informing us of the reasons for this or that request¹¹.

After a final revision, which was in fact only minor, the project was finally approved without difficulty at the XXII session on 17 September 1562, without any mention of revising the reform of the missal itself: this was the *Decretum de observandis et vitandis in celebratione missae*¹².

This issue returned to the agenda the following year, and work began in Trent on the reform of the missal – as well as the breviary. But time was pressing; both Rome and Trent wanted the council to be brought to a close. On the other hand, it was clear that time was needed to gather and examine the materials necessary for this work. Nevertheless, valuable manuscripts were sent from Rome and a "delegation" was tasked with this study during the general congregation of 27 and 28 October

⁷ *Concilii tridentini actorum* VIII, (ed. by Stephan EHSES), Freiburg im Breisgau, 1934, pp. 916-920. This last "grievance" concerns a prayer that was already in the Offertory of the Roman Missal at that time, the *Suscipe sancte Pater...* and which was nevertheless retained by St. Pius V.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 921-923.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 926.

¹⁰ H. JEDIN: *Il concilio di Trento*, Brescia: Morcelliana, 1979, IV/1, p. 298.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 928-947.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 962-963.

1563¹³ . However, the work did not produce any concrete results... due to lack of time.

Thus, during the last session of the council, it was decided to entrust this work – as well as the publication of a catechism for the universal Church, the reform of the breviary and the revision of the Latin text of the Holy Bible – to the Supreme Pontiff¹⁴ .

It is interesting to note that, in the end, the genesis of pontifical law in this matter, which governs almost exclusively – with a few exceptions – the drafting of the missal, is indeed of conciliar origin. Admittedly, we can assume that behind this decision lies the influence of the papal legates and the Secretary of State, the powerful and holy Cardinal Charles Borromeo, but ultimately, the founding act, so to speak, of this exclusive pontifical law in liturgical matters was laid down by all the bishops gathered in Trent. It was they themselves who renounced any rights they might have had in this area and created the exclusive pontifical right in matters of liturgical books¹⁵ .

It should also be noted that the reform of the breviary played a decisive role in the reform of the missal. The disorders relating to the divine office were more serious and more glaring. In the liturgical books concerning it, many pieces that were dubious to say the least had been introduced: legendary lives of saints, hymns smacking of heresy, as they said at the time...

Multiple attempts to reform them had been made here and there, but these had mainly resulted in breaking the unity of the office throughout Christendom. Finally, in Rome itself, under the pontificate of Paul III and with his approval, Cardinal Quiñones published a new breviary, which was adopted in many dioceses but strongly criticised elsewhere, thus further increasing the division.

The Fathers of the Council were therefore strongly encouraged to work on this reform of the breviary. But since the divine office and the sacrifice of the Mass are closely linked, particularly in terms of the calendar and euchologies, these same prelates saw this as a decisive reason to start work on both projects as soon as possible.

After the Council closed, Pius IV summoned the members of the Tridentine commission for the reform of the liturgical books to Rome in 1564, to which he added a few other specialists. But the Pope died the following year.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 413–414.

¹⁴ *Concilii tridentini actorum*, IX, 1935, 1106, *De indice librorum et catechismo, idemque... de missali et breviario fieri mandat.*

¹⁵ H. JEDIN, *Il concilio di Trento*, Brescia: Morcelliana, 1981, IV/2, p. 346.

3. The reform of Saint Pius V

In 1565, the fiery Dominican Michele Ghislieri succeeded him under the name of Pius V—Saint Pius us V after his canonisation in 1712—and immediately set about completing this work under difficult circumstances.

Born sixty-one years earlier, he entered the order founded by Saint Dominic at the age of fourteen and had a career as both a theologian and a pastor, combining the bishopric with the office of Grand Master of the Inquisition, thus providing him with excellent pastoral and doctrinal preparation. Once he had been crowned with the triple papal crown, it would be wrong to think that he only had liturgical problems to deal with. He had to deal with the disciplinary reforms promulgated by the recent council and face political and religious crises in France, Spain, England and Germany. On the other hand, the Turkish threat was becoming pressing.

A quick overview of the ecclesiastical and political circumstances will give us a better understanding of the context in which the reform of the missal and its promulgation were prepared.

The recent Council of Trent, in addition to its well-known doctrinal work, had promulgated a whole series of disciplinary measures concerning the clergy, seminaries, bishops, etc. The Pope had to put them into practice and make them part of everyday life. Given the inertia of the time and the opposition of certain countries for a variety of reasons, this was no small task. Fortunately, holy prelates such as St. Charles Borromeo, in his archbishopric of Milan, set an example.

With the preparation of the catechism well advanced, he was able to publish it at the beginning of his pontificate.

He began by reforming the Curia to banish scandals and abuses. He also took care of the City and the Papal States. He banished courtesans and took measures to provide for those who wanted to abandon this way of life. He purged the country of brigands, in particular through agreements with neighbouring states to prevent them from taking refuge there...

In France, it was the beginning of the reign of the very young Charles IX, dominated by his ambitious mother, Catherine de Medici. Her devious politics allowed the Protestants to gain such strength that the Pope felt compelled to send reinforcements to the eldest daughter of the Church, drawn from the Papal States and obtained from other Catholic states. Despite this, excesses beget excesses, and a few months after the death of Saint Pius V, the sinister St. Bartholomew's Day

massacre took place.

In England, the Protestant Queen Elizabeth persecuted Catholics and had her cousin, Mary Stuart, put to death, even though Mary's claim to the English throne was at least as strong as Elizabeth's, if not stronger. The Pope went so far as to excommunicate the sovereign.

In Spain, whose possessions in Milan and Naples surrounded the Papal States, the great King Philip II reigned. He tended to push religious zeal too far at times, particularly in his direct states, and not far enough at other times, as in Flanders. The Pope had to threaten the King with excommunication in order to obtain the release of the unfortunate Archbishop of Toledo, Mgr. Carranza, suspected of heresy, from the prisons of Castile and his transfer to Roman ecclesiastical justice.

The Holy Father was also very busy with affairs in Germany, where Emperor Maximilian, weak and strongly influenced by the Protestants, constantly threatened to make undue concessions to the Lutherans.

Finally, there was the Turkish threat. After being repelled on land in Hungary in particular, their maritime hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean threatened even the coasts of Italy. The Pope called for a crusade against them and, through diplomatic tenacity, managed to assemble a formidable fleet. Supported by considerable prayer, this fleet achieved the saving victory of Lepanto (1572), which unfortunately was not exploited as it should have been.

This list of interventions by the Supreme Pontiff represents only a few of the most significant chapters. There is still more to say about the Imperial Diets, Poland, the Netherlands...

Despite all this, the bull promulgating the missal can truly be called *Quo primum*: from the very beginning of his pontificate, he applied himself to it. Despite the pressing urgency of many dramatic problems concerning ecclesiastical policy in this or that country, the holy Pope never ceased to concern himself with matters more closely related to the good of souls, and first and foremost, the liturgy. He did not allow himself to be monopolised by external affairs.

To speed up the work of the commission responsible for revising the missal, he added new experts to its ranks. However, the memoirs of this commission's work have not been found, despite

the research of J. Schmid, P. Batiffol, S. Baumer and H. Jedin¹⁶. Therefore, in order to find out who was on this commission and how its work progressed, we are practically limited to the information provided in the bull itself, which does not say much. At best, we can only make a few conjectures. For example, in the Vatican Apostolic Library there is a missal with corrections in the hand of Cardinal Sirlet¹⁷. Should we conclude that the eminent prelate was a member of the commission, or was this a personal work, offered or not to the commission?

As might be expected, given the relative urgency of the matter, the reform of the breviary was the first to be completed. In 1568, in the third year of his pontificate, the Holy Pope, by the bull *Quod ad nobis*, promulgated the new books for the divine office, making them in principle obligatory for all, except for bicentennial usage – that is to say, more or less the same exceptions as those we shall see for the missal.

What we can therefore glean from the work on the missal, which was carried out at the same time, is that the group of specialists worked mainly on the missals in the Vatican Library and on certain other missals brought together for this purpose. On the other hand, one of the criteria was to harmonise the prayers, especially the collects, as well as the liturgical calendar, with the Roman Breviary, published in 1569¹⁸.

The result was the *Missale Romanum ex decreto sacrosancti concilii tridentini restitutum*, Pii V Pont. Max. iussu editum, Rome, 1570, accompanied by the bull of promulgation *Quo primum* of 14 July 1570.

The missal reproduced the Roman Missal as it was then known, with a few differences. In this regard, the Holy Father's statement that "they restored the missal itself according to the ancient rule and rites of the Holy Fathers"¹⁹ may come as a surprise. Indeed, given the current state of liturgical scholarship, one would be more inclined to say that the Tridentine missal reflects the missal of the 16th century and that it differs in certain respects, particularly in terms of rubrics, from that of

¹⁶ Amato Pietro FRUTAZ, *Contributo alla storia della riforma del Messale promulgato da san Pio V nel 1570*, in AA. VV., "Problemi di vita religiosa in Italia nel Cinquecento," Padua: Antenora, 1960, p. 191.

¹⁷ Francesco CAMALDO, *The Preface of the Eucharistic Prayer in the Roman Missal from the Council of Trent to the Second Vatican Council*, Doctoral thesis, Pontifical Athenaeum of Saint Anselm, Rome, 1996.

¹⁸ Saint PIUS V, Bull *Quo primum*, 14 July 1570, in "Bullarum Diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum romanorum pontificum," Naples: Taurinense editio, 1882, VII, p. 839.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

the^{8th} century, for example. Let us leave it to further advances in this field of scholarship to shed more light on this question.

Among the differences from the average model of missal then in use, we note, on the one hand, the rubrics that specify when votive Masses and Masses for the dead may and, above all, may not be celebrated – *Rubricae generales missalis*, IV and V. On the other hand, the number of saints' days is significantly reduced; practically only those celebrated in Rome before the^{11th} century are retained²⁰, with a small number of others added. This measure provoked protests from several quarters, which led to the reintroduction of some of the saints' days that had been removed.

The new missal also retains only five sequences – *Victimae paschali laudes*, *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, *Lauda Sion*, *Stabat Mater*, *Dies irae*. *The Ordo missae* is practically the same as that of *the Missale secundum usum romanae curiae* of the^{13th} century, with a few minor variations.

The bull of promulgation, after summarising the circumstances and the work that led to the present work, made the Roman Missal obligatory for all Latin Rite churches of the Roman Church, except those that could justify a rite at least two hundred years old, "*super duecentos annos missarum celebrandarum in eisdem Ecclesiis assidue observata sit*". Furthermore, it prohibited any changes, deletions or additions.

Here we see that the predominant concern is the unity of worship throughout the world.

It must be said that some people were wrong to use these clauses to question the validity of the new missal promulgated by Paul VI after the Second Vatican Council. What one legislator has established can be modified by his successor. What one pope has done, another can undo: there are no purely ecclesiastical laws that are, like those of the Persians and Medes, irrevocable in perpetuity. The same is not true, of course, of divine laws and the deposit of faith.

The clause protecting liturgies that are at least two hundred years old may come as a surprise, given that much shorter periods are generally required for a custom to be entitled to special protection – in certain matters, one hundred or even forty years. But on the one hand, this can be seen as an effort to further emphasise and achieve unity of celebration, and on the other hand, one of the reasons for the revision of the breviaries and missals for the universal Church was, let us remember, the justified fear that heretical elements had crept in. The aim was therefore to root out evil at its source and, to this end, to go back to the emergence of the heresies that directly paved the way for the emergence of Protestantism, namely the times of Wycliff and Jan Hus.

²⁰ Josef Andreas JUNGSMANN, *Missarum sollemnia: Explication génétique de la messe romaine*, Paris: Montaigne, 1954, p. 176.

Then a paragraph gives everyone permission to celebrate according to the reformed missal, specifying that no one may forbid them to do so. This must apply especially to those who have another authorised missal, particularly one that has been in use for two hundred years. Even in the latter case, they may therefore use the *Missale Romanum*.

Finally, the Roman Pontiff specifies the deadlines for the application of this liturgical norm: one month for the Roman Curia, three months for the rest of Italy and six months for the whole of Christendom, or as soon as it is possible to obtain the new altar book in the shops. These deadlines were very short for the time and above all underlined the urgency with which the Pope wanted unity to be achieved. But in practice, we shall see that it took several years because many churches, relying for example on more or less well-founded claims to have a bicentennial tradition, continued to publish their own missals.

This great legal act accomplished a certain "revolution", not on the liturgical level, since it only consecrated the rites that already existed, but on the canonical level: from then on, the liturgy, at least as far as missals were concerned, fell exclusively under the authority of the Supreme Pontiff. However, Roman centralisation agreed to respect rites that were at least two hundred years old; customary law, in one of its most venerable expressions, was not entirely lost.

4. The application of the post-Tridentine reform

However, the application of such measures was to create many problems and give rise to many disputes. To resolve both, Sixtus V created, by the bull *Immense aeterni Dei* of 22 January 1588, at the same time as the fourteen other permanent cardinal congregations, the Sacred Congregation of Rites, *Congregatio pro sacris ritibus et caeremoniis*²¹. Its responsibilities are as follows: to ensure that sacred rites are performed correctly everywhere; to reform liturgical books where necessary; to examine the offices of patron saints and to deal with all causes of canonisation.

A number of churches obtained recognition of the bicentennial nature of their Eucharistic liturgy.

²¹ *Bullarium romanum* VII, 985-999. It should be noted that there is some confusion regarding the date of this document. The bull is indeed dated 1587, and this is how St. Pius X refers to it in his C.A. *Sapienti Consilio* (1908). However, Paul VI in his C.A. *Regimini Ecclesiae universae* (1967) dates our document to 1588, and John Paul II (C.A. *Pastor Bonus*, 1988) refers to it as being from 1588, "which was the^{1587th} year of the Incarnation". It would seem that the confusion is due to a change in the way time was counted, with the year beginning in Rome until 1908 on 25 March.

Among these, we can mention, first and foremost, that of Milan, whose archbishop at the time was Saint Charles Borromeo. On the other side of the Alps, Lyon achieved the same result. Similarly, the Carthusians and Dominicans were allowed to retain their liturgical practices in this area. Paradoxically, the Mozarabic rite found new vigour: whereas before the bull it had been confined to one church and one chapel in Toledo Cathedral, after the papal act it spread more widely due to its "legitimation" and perhaps a certain Spanish particularism, content not to allow itself to be imposed upon, even by Rome.

On the other hand, several dioceses failed in their attempts to establish the antiquity of their *Ordo missae*. Aosta, for example, had a real tradition in this area, due to the fusion of local customs and certain customs from neighbouring regions, but there seemed to be a certain lack of stability: we have already mentioned the ninety-three variations noted by Father Amiet with regard to the ordinary of the Mass in twenty-two missals of the time. Perhaps some also lacked a sufficient number of altar books to establish a consistent tradition over 200 years, as missals were destroyed when they were no longer in a condition to be used during celebrations.

The problem also arose in Paris, a church that certainly had ancient traditions. But did lack a sufficiently persevering leader to bring the project to fruition? Or did a certain "reason of state" prevail, leading to the abortion by authority of the attempt at demonstration? Traces of these attempts can be found in the correspondence between the nuncios of the time, Dandino and Frangipani, and Rome; the conflict involved not only the bishop and the cathedral chapter, but also the king himself.

The other aspect of the question is how the dioceses complied with the Roman norm of 1570. We can see that the deadlines were not "exactly" met everywhere. It is interesting to note Rome's patience and tolerance in this matter.

Several dioceses, while adopting or complying with the Roman Missal, allowed themselves to make minor changes, such as substituting the texts of the old *Itala* version, which St. Pius V had kept for the ancient chants, with the so-called *Vulgate* version. Pope Clement VIII (1592-1605) therefore appointed a commission including Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmin to revise the missal: no changes were made, but the pontiff was able to republish it with an injunction to all to adhere to it in future – the bull *Cum sanctissimum*.

Urban VIII repeated the same operation in 1634 (*Si quid est*).

Let us now look at some specific cases of the application of the post-Tridentine reform.

The diocese of Langres, which published a missal in 1572, is a somewhat extreme example. Although this missal was published two years after the bull *Quo primum*, its design is in fact entirely in keeping with the previous period: clearly, St. Pius V's decree had no influence at that time in the Church of Franche-Comté – and would have little influence for a long time to come, as we shall see later.

The title of the work is: *Missale secundum verum insignis ecclesiae lingonensis usum*. As we can see, there is no mention of any effort to revise or align it with the Roman liturgical books. It is not introduced by any episcopal presentation text, but begins with the liturgical calendar, indicated as being that of Langres.

Then comes the ordinary of the Mass – *Incipit ordo missae* – which begins with the verse *Quam dilecta tabernacula*, before the priest puts on his vestments. This is followed by various prayers before the altar, which differ from those of the Roman rite. Then the priest ascends to the altar and kisses the foot of the crucifix; then he pronounces the *Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini...*

The Offertory is partly in the Roman mode – with variations in almost every prayer – but also includes Gallican and Germanic prayers.

Much later, we find the annotated *Gloria* and *Credo*, with embolisms for various feasts and annotated prefaces. The Canon is strictly Roman. As for the prayers before Communion, the prayer *Habete vinculum pacis* is inserted, which also appears in several pre-Tridentine Germanic missals. Otherwise, there is nothing noteworthy to report, except for an original prayer after the last Gospel, *Protector in te sperantium...*

This missal was used during the 17th and 18th centuries. As copies of this edition became scarce, churches that did not have one were authorised to use the Roman Missal, but in reality, the Langres Missal was still the official missal²². However, there is no mention anywhere of the bishop being troubled or of the diocese being placed under interdict – at most, there were a few rather general lamentations from the nuncio in Paris.

²² D. VIDRANGES, *Traité de la messe, sur les usages particuliers de l'Église de Langres*, n.d., pp. 163-165 and 190, n. 1.

The 1580 Missal of Troyes, for its part, shows little sign of having been "influenced" by Pope Saint Pius V's bull: changes can be seen in relation to the 1514 missal of the same diocese that we examined earlier, which do not necessarily follow the Roman line. The work begins with an episcopal mandate from Mgr. Claude de Bavefremont, Bishop of Troyes, in which he declares the need for uniformity and imposes the present missal on his entire diocese. There is no reference to any Roman documents or norms, at least in the volume consulted.

Thus, the Offertory described here differs from that of the Roman Missal, but it also differs in part from that of *the Missale Trecense* of 1514, with, for example, a prayer during the offering of wine: *Domine Deus noster, qui suscepisti munera Abel, Noe et Moysi, Aaron, et Samuel, et omnium sanctorum tuorum, sic et de manu mea suscipere digneris.*

Other Churches, such as Metz, took no account of St. Pius V's Bull during the 16th century. In Würzburg, in 1613, the bishop had a missal published with the title *Missale herbipolense iussu et auctoritate Reverendissimi et Illustrissimi Principis Iulii Episcopi Herbipolensis et Franconiae Ducis*. This was followed by a preface letter from the same prelate in which he expressed his concern for the purity of worship, but made no mention of the Acts of the Roman Pontiffs on the subject. On the surface, Roman legislation was ignored, but in practice, with the exception of the lectionary, it was fully complied with.

The diocese of Constance, for its part, provides an example of "delayed" submission: the deadlines set in the Acts of the Pontiffs were considered too restrictive, but the Roman decision was nevertheless applied.

The title of the 1603 missal already makes this clear: *Missale constantiense ad romani formam et normam reuocatum atque a S.D.N. Clemente VIII approbatum. Rdi et Ill. principis ac domini Ioan. Georgi... auctoritate et iussu editum*. It then begins with the bull *Quo primum*. This is followed by the decree of promulgation by the Bishop of Constance, recalling how his predecessor had published transitional liturgical books to gradually accustom his clerics to Roman norms and forms, and stating how he himself had published this missal in accordance with the typical Roman edition of St. Pius V, with the addition, however, of the office of the patron saints of the diocese, an office – or principle of addition, it is not clear – approved by Clement VIII. The rest of the work keeps its promises and is entirely in accordance with the Roman liturgy.

The Church of Paris also followed its own particular path, which we can study in its successive

stages. Initially, as we have seen, there was an attempt to establish the bicentennial liturgy. When this failed, the Roman Missal was adopted – since it was necessary, according to the king's will.

The title of the 1611 missal is: *Missale romanum ex decreto sacro sancti concilii tridentini restitutum*. And the work, faithful to its title, fully conforms to the Roman liturgy. It should be noted that after the Roman bulls there is the inevitable "Privilege of the King" allowing printing, but this is not necessarily a form of royal *exequatur*; it could be considered merely an administrative measure affecting all printed books systematically.

Another Parisian Missal, published in 1636, is entitled, like the previous one, *Missale romanum ex decreto sacro sancti concilii tridentini restitutum*. It is entirely Roman, except for the supplement – without any explanatory introduction – which mainly contains Masses from the Sanctoral. But, curiously enough, not all the saints celebrated are French; for example, there is a feast for the reception of holy relics (4 December), a special sequence for the Immaculate Conception (8 December), a special *Alleluia* for the feast of Saint Agatha (5 February), a Mass for Saint Mary of Egypt (1 April)... Local particularities are beginning to be reintroduced.

The 1648 missal is entitled: *Missalis parisiensis cum missali romano ex decreto sacrosancti concilii tridentini restituto, Pii V Pont. max. iussu edito et Clementis VIII auctoritate (sic) recognito, concordantia una cum supplementum festorum quae in parisiensi diocesi celebrantur*. This time, the Parisian character of the work is clearly affirmed, along with its fidelity to Rome. This is evident, in a way, in the introduction preceding the supplement: there is no mention of Roman approval for the latter, but rather of how to combine the Roman calendar with the particularities of the Parisian calendar. After this section, there is another *Concordantia dominicarum et feriarum missalis parisiensis cum romano*, with euchological formulas and readings, specific to certain Sundays and feasts; of note is a feast of the Five Wounds of Christ, on the Friday after Ash Wednesday.

The 1654 missal was entitled *Missale parisiense ad formam SS. Conc. Trid recognitum et emendatum*, and was published by the authority of Mgr. de Gondy, Archbishop of Paris. It seems that the local authorities, after initially bowing to pressure, became increasingly assertive, leading in the following century to liturgical compositions that were largely independent of Rome, such as the *Missale parisiense* of 1744: the archbishops of Paris, in particular NN. SS. Vintimille and de Harlay, no longer made any mention of papal bulls, as if the question of the publication of missals had once again become a matter of diocesan law²³.

²³ Cf. *Missale Parisiense anno 1738 publici iuris factum*, (C. Johnson and A. Ward, eds.), Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1993 and P. GUÉRANGER, *Institutions liturgiques*, op. cit., T. II.

To finally answer the initial question, it seems to me that we must say that the reform of St. Pius V was simply the brilliant implementation of the final demands of the Council of Trent: the latter had proposed the reform of the catechism, the breviary and the missal so that these books could be used uniformly throughout Christendom. The Pope did not come to the papacy with a personal project of liturgical reform, but found himself faced with the Council's request and the work already undertaken by his predecessor. He therefore continued and completed this work, with the genius of the saint and great theologian that he was, beginning first with the breviary and then bringing the missal into line with it.

Once again, he did not carry out a work of innovation and creativity, but rather a codification of what already existed, with, at most, the judicious choice of this or that text for this or that prayer... when the different missals in use presented variations.

We owe him immense gratitude for having presented to the universal Church a unified text in accordance with the thousand-year-old tradition of the Latin rite Mass.