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This project studies the contributions made by Rev. Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C., to the liturgical movement in the United States during the twentieth century. After first introducing the details of Mathis’ education and early work in the field of missions, the dissertation details Mathis’ contributions to the liturgical movement in three major sections. First, it treats Mathis’ work with liturgical education, examining the origins and development of the graduate program in liturgy at the University of Notre Dame and considering related projects before comparing Mathis’ work with similar liturgical education programs. Next, it considers Mathis’ work with the Divine Office, particularly in the form of his Vigil Service publications, and compares his work with other writings promoting the Divine Office and modified breviaries produced to facilitate the use of the Divine Office from his time. Finally, it examines Mathis’ contributions to the Liturgical Conference and the translation of the Collectio Rituum, as well as his work preparing
American Catholics for the new rites of Holy Week in 1956 and organizing the American delegation for the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy in 1956.
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PART 1:

INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Liturgical Movement and Michael Mathis

During the twentieth century a movement for liturgical renewal began to grow on both a pastoral and an academic level throughout the Catholic Church. This liturgical movement aimed to reinvigorate the church’s worship, particularly by promoting awareness of the importance and riches of the liturgy. Characteristic of the movement was an appeal for greater understanding and participation in the liturgy, especially among the laity. Together with increased research into the history and development of liturgical rites, the liturgical movement helped lay the groundwork for the liturgical reforms before and after the Second Vatican Council.

The liturgical movement had its roots in monastic and liturgical revival in the nineteenth century, beginning with Dom Prosper Guéranger and the Abbey of Solesmes; from Solesmes, other Benedictine establishments also began various liturgical initiatives in countries throughout Europe. Growing from these initial efforts, the liturgical movement proper began in the first decades of the twentieth century in various Benedictine monasteries in Europe, such as Beuron, Maredsous, Mont César, and Maria
Laach, which became centers of liturgical renewal. These monasteries pioneered liturgical scholarship, published research, and hosted liturgically centered conferences, retreats, and other gatherings in their efforts to promote increased liturgical participation and awareness. The movement grew throughout Europe, especially in Germany, France, Belgium, and Austria, and included not only Benedictines but also diocesan priests and members of other religious orders.¹

The liturgical movement made its way to the United States in the 1920s as Benedictines and other American priests who had been exposed to the movement in Europe brought the ideas of the movement to the United States. Among the early American liturgical reformers was Virgil Michel, a Benedictine from St. John’s Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota, who was instrumental in the founding of both the journal *Orate Fratres*, later *Worship*, and the Liturgical Press. Michel was not alone in his zeal for the liturgy, however, and other early liturgical leaders in the United States included William Busch, Gerald Ellard, Martin Hellriegel, and Michel’s abbot, Alcuin Deutsch. These and

other prominent reformers worked both in print and in pastoral ministry to educate Catholics about the importance of the liturgy and reinvigorate liturgical practice.²

The work of one American liturgical leader, Rev. Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C., represents an important and lasting contribution to the liturgical movement of his day. Mathis began his career in liturgical studies relatively late in life, having previously worked extensively in the field of missions, but this did not diminish the significance of his liturgical work. Mathis’s most influential contribution to the liturgical movement was his establishment and early leadership of the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame, the first degree program in liturgical studies in the United States. While many leaders of the liturgical movement have been the subjects of in-depth academic or biographical treatments, Mathis has been largely overlooked. The purpose of this investigation will therefore be to provide a detailed look into the liturgical work of Father Mathis and an examination of his role in the liturgical movement.

1.2 State of the Question

Michael Mathis’ role in the liturgical movement has been largely unstudied by modern scholarship, with only a few short essays dedicated to evaluating his contributions. Robert Kennedy, who has authored three essays on Mathis’ liturgical

contributions, is responsible for the majority of the published work on Mathis. A few short reflections on Mathis’ legacy may also be found in an issue of Assembly commemorating the 100th anniversary of his birth. Other scholarship about Mathis is limited to a few comments about him in larger works on the liturgical movement. Finally, while they serve more as memorials than scholarly treatments, there are a couple of articles published immediately after Mathis’s death that also provide some assessment of Mathis’ work.

Robert Kennedy has written about Mathis’ work in three separate essays, published from 1985 to 1990, that covered largely the same material. The first of these essays, “Centennial: The Contribution of Michael Mathis,” was a three-page treatment of Mathis in the September 1985 issue of Assembly.³ This was followed in 1987 with a longer, twenty-five page discussion of Mathis and his work, Michael Mathis: American Liturgical Pioneer in the American Essays in Liturgy series.⁴ Finally, Kennedy contributed an entry on Mathis to the anthology How Firm A Foundation: Leaders of the Liturgical Movement in 1990.⁵ Since the three essays treat very similar material, an


examination of the longer essay *Michael Mathis: American Liturgical Pioneer* is sufficient to identify Kennedy’s major contributions to the study of Mathis’ work.

*Michael Mathis: American Liturgical Pioneer* provides a general overview of Mathis’ life, discusses his work on the Vigil Service, the Notre Dame Liturgy Program, and the American Ritual, and offers a few important conclusions on Mathis’ work, naming four “operating principles” in Mathis’ work and highlighting four important contributions. The first principle, Kennedy claims, is that Mathis wanted to bring the liturgy of the church to its fullest enacted potential. Clearly not a liturgical rebel or radical innovator, he might best be described as a “Pius X Liturgist” who wanted to demonstrate that the liturgy as it then existed could be celebrated correctly and well. This is especially demonstrated in the practical style of liturgical celebration that he implemented: the fully chanted Mass and office, the restoration of fuller texts at matins, the inclusion of the homily in the Eucharistic liturgy and offices, and an initial resistance to the use of the vernacular. The inclination toward the liturgical status quo is also evidenced in his own writings and those he edited.6

Kennedy identifies the second principle guiding Mathis’ work as the belief that “liturgy was an art as well as a science… it was of the hearts and lives of people,” and the third principle as “a commitment to enable the full participation of the faithful with understanding.”7 Concerning this third principle, Kennedy claims, “Literally everything Mathis did… was governed by a simple purpose: to promote fruitful participation in the liturgy by fostering an understanding of it.”8 Finally, he argues that the fourth operating


7 Ibid., 22.

8 Ibid., 22.
principle is that Mathis saw his work as “an apostolate, a service meant to build up the body of Christ” and claims that the four add up to “a strong catechetical concern.”

Kennedy’s assessment of Mathis’ significance is heavily focused on his work with the Notre Dame Liturgy Program. The first three contributions he lists are the establishment of the Liturgy Program, which he says “gave the American liturgical movement an academic center and a vision that wedded theory and practice,” the inclusion of European scholars in the Liturgy Program, and the publication of the *Liturgical Studies* book series, which he claims remains useful in the present. The final contribution that Kennedy highlights is Mathis’ work on the American Ritual, which he claims “aided the pastoral care of the faithful, enabled their participation with greater understanding, and paved the way for the fuller use of the vernacular in the liturgy.”

As a whole, Kennedy’s publications about Mathis provide a helpful introduction and basic outline of his works. Their short length precludes an extended and in-depth treatment of any area of Mathis’ work. Kennedy discusses the Vigil Service, but he does not consider its relationship with the existing Office and only briefly outlines the stages of its development. Additionally, there is only limited discussion of Mathis’ work with the Liturgical Conference or his talks published with the proceedings of the National Liturgical Weeks. Finally, while Kennedy does describe the foundation of the Liturgy

---

9 Ibid., 22
10 Ibid., 23.
Program and considers its overall importance, more detailed analysis of the content of the program and of the later years of Mathis’ leadership is necessary to understand the extent of its significance. Overall, Kennedy provides a helpful starting point for consideration of Mathis, but a more thorough study is required.

In addition to Kennedy’s essay on Mathis’ contributions to the liturgical movement, the September 1985 issue of Assembly includes two more reflections on Mathis’ work. The first reflects on certain qualities that made him effective and suggests how those may apply to liturgical leaders today. This editorial highlights Mathis’ competence, focusing on his diligent study of the Fathers, his creativity, pointing to his use of varied resources “to convey to others the riches he discovered in the liturgy,” and his courage to speak on behalf of the liturgy’s importance.12 The second piece, Mark Searle’s “A Place in the Tradition,” also reflects on Mathis in light of the author’s contemporary situation. In particular, he notes the significance of Mathis’ understanding of history, reflecting on the importance of history for religious identity and renewal, and he highlights Mathis’ emphasis on missions and liturgy, saying that these reflect the importance of “Word and Sacrament.”13 He concludes with an appeal to liturgists to be responsible stewards for the sacraments passed down to them.14 Ultimately, none of these

14 Ibid., 303.
texts advance the state of scholarship on Mathis’ career but rather offer reflections on the continued meaning of both his life and work for liturgists in the mid-1980s.

More recently, Stephen Wilbricht, a member of Mathis’ religious order, has written a one-page article on Mathis as part of a series on liturgical reformers in *Pastoral Liturgy*. This brief treatment gives a basic timeline of his life and highlights some of Mathis’ more important contributions. Wilbricht focuses on the Liturgy Program, especially noting the program’s publications, on Mathis’ production of the Vigil Service, and on his work on the American Ritual. The article is light on evaluative comments, noting only that Mathis is best known for the Liturgy Program and adding that “Mathis was more a pastoral workhouse than a trained scholar.”

While the article is only a basic summary of Mathis’ work, its inclusion in a series on liturgical leaders does speak to Mathis’ perceived importance.

No other authors have presented a study on Mathis or his career in any detail, though a few have given brief mentions to his work in larger studies related to the liturgical movement. First, Mathis is briefly mentioned in two histories of the liturgical movement from the 1960s. William Leonard discusses the Liturgy Program in his survey of the liturgical movement in the United States, saying,

Something should also be said about the educational work that went on in summer schools, institutes, and the like... The most influential has been the Liturgy Program at Notre Dame, established in 1947 by the beloved Father Michael Mathis, C.S.C. Father Mathis assembled each summer a faculty made up for the

most part of distinguished European scholars… and published their lectures. The school also profited by the musical talents of men like Father Ermin Vitry, O.S.B., and Mr. Theodore Marier. The fact that Europeans had to be brought over in such numbers is a commentary on the poverty of American liturgical scholarship during those years.¹⁶

Mathis also appears in a consideration of liturgical centers in the liturgical movement in a text edited by Lancelot Sheppard, *The People Worship: A History of the Liturgical Movement*. This text provides only two sentences on Mathis, reporting, “Father Michael Mathis, C.S.C., was another significant figure in the American movement. Perhaps his best known contribution is the founding of the Summer School of Liturgy at the University of Notre Dame.”¹⁷

Mathis and his work with the Liturgy Program are also discussed in more recent scholarship. James White mentions Mathis and the Liturgy Program in his discussion of American liturgical leaders in *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today*. Citing Kennedy, he reports,

> In the summer of 1947, the first American degree program in liturgy began at the University of Notre Dame under the leadership of Michael Mathis (1885-1960). After 1965 this led to the graduate program in liturgical studies which, so far, has produced over fifty Ph.Ds. In the early years, Mathis relied heavily on European scholars. He invited such men as Joseph Jungmann, Louis Bouyer, Jean Daniélou, and Johannes Hofinger. Many of their lectures were published in book form by

---


the University of Notre Dame Press, helping to establish a tradition of solid liturgical scholarship among American publishers.\(^\text{18}\)

Keith Pecklers also discusses Mathis’ program in his chapter on “The Liturgical Movement and Education” in *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America*. Also citing Kennedy, he provides a brief overview of the first year of the program and lists some of the European professors involved. He suggests that the heavily European faculty may have been responsible for the lack of connection between liturgy and social action in the Liturgy Program and assesses the program, saying, “There is no question as to the central role which the Notre Dame Liturgy Program has played in the advancement of serious academic study of the liturgy in the United States.”\(^\text{19}\)

André Haquin makes brief reference to Mathis in his chapter on the liturgical movement in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, where he lists Mathis as among the “other American liturgists to be mentioned.”\(^\text{20}\) Virgil Funk also acknowledges Mathis’ work with the Liturgy Program, listing the courses for the first year and highlighting the excellent faculty and the publication program. He also briefly mentions Mathis’ role in translating the American Ritual.\(^\text{21}\) Finally Kathleen Hughes briefly mentions Mathis at a few points in her biography of Godfrey Diekmann. These references


to Mathis are largely related to places where Diekmann’s work intersected with Mathis, particularly the Liturgy Program and the Assisi Congress. Most significantly, she reports, “But it was Mathis who, in 1947 established the Notre Dame summer sessions in liturgy, which grew into the premier graduate program in liturgy in this country. What he contributed by establishing this program was the scientific and academic underpinning of the liturgical movement in the United States.”22 In general, these sources do not make significant additions to the existing literature on Mathis, but they serve to confirm a general sense of his importance to the American liturgical movement.

Though not scholarly studies of Michael Mathis’ life, there are also a number of memorials written shortly after Mathis’ death. Among these is a short reflection from Robert McManus at the beginning of the proceedings of the 1959 Liturgical Week, which notes the importance of Mathis’ work with the Notre Dame Liturgy Program.23 A second memorial text was written by Godfrey Diekmann and appeared in Worship. Here, Diekmann says that the Liturgy Program is of “capital importance.”24 While these are not lengthy scholarly treatments of Mathis’ life, they do represent a basic assessment of his life and work by important American liturgical scholars at the time.

---


24 Godfrey Diekmann, “Michael A. Mathis, R.I.P.” Worship 34:5 (April 1960), 276-278
A third, slightly more detailed, memorial comes from Leo Ward, C.S.C., in the journal *Perspectives*. This text offers a general outline of Mathis’ life, focusing on his liturgical work and offers some assessment of his career. Ward highlights in particular Mathis’ work with the Liturgy Program and the associated publications, which Ward believes will be an enduring contribution to liturgical scholarship, and Mathis’ work with the Vigil Service.\(^{25}\) Most significantly, Ward claims,

> With the possible exception of the pioneering and incomparable Father Virgil Michel, the late Michael A. Mathis of the Congregation of Holy Cross was the most tireless American worker to date for the liturgical life. And with the exception of Father Virgil, he made the greatest stir. Liturgically minded people all over the nation, and some far beyond the nation, are permanently indebted to him and grateful to him. He had a lot of drive in him, and a lot of fire, and he set people on fire.\(^{26}\)

Beyond this assessment of Mathis’ significance, Ward also claims that Mathis was too old to “become a scholar in liturgy,” though “He could collect books on the liturgy, and map out the vital centers… and he could acquire a respectable acquaintance with the literature.”\(^ {27}\) Finally, he points out the energy with which Mathis approached his liturgical projects, commenting in particular on his tendency to speak at great length on the liturgy and his continued work during his illness in the last year of his life.\(^ {28}\)


\(^{26}\) Ibid., 20.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., 21.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., 22-23.
The most complete of these memorials was authored by one of Mathis’ co-workers in the Notre Dame Liturgy Program and member of his religious order, George Schidel. Schidel’s work gives a chronological account of Mathis’ life and work, providing a moderate amount of detail about his various projects, the occasional assessment of individual aspects of Mathis’ work, and some personal anecdotes that paint a more complete picture of Mathis. Lengthier than most of the scholarship on Mathis that would follow, Schidel’s remembrance of Mathis has served as a starting point and major source for some of the scholarly work done on Mathis and his contributions.

In sum, scholars’ limited treatment of Mathis, while covering the essentials of his work and contribution, does not go into any great detail about his projects or their relationship to similar aspects of the liturgical movement. In particular, existing sources confirm the importance of Mathis’ work with the Notre Dame Liturgy Program, but they do not discuss how it compares with other programs of liturgical study. Apart from the Liturgy Program, many of Mathis’ projects receive only a cursory discussion or are not mentioned at all in existing studies. Further investigation into these projects, their impact, and their relationship with the rest of the liturgical movement will make Mathis’ contributions more clear.

1.3 This Project

The present study examines the liturgical work of Rev. Michael A Mathis, C.S.C., from the mid-1940s until his death in 1960. In particular, it closely examines Mathis’ work with the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame, projects connected with the Liturgy Program, Mathis’ Vigil Service and other projects related to the Divine Office. Mathis’ less-discussed contributions to the liturgical movement, including work with the Liturgical Conference and with the translation of the American Ritual, are also considered.

This dissertation is split into five sections, ranging from one to three chapters each. The first section serves as an introduction to the project as a whole, including both this general introduction and a summary of Mathis’ life and work. Sections two, three, and four make up the main body of the study and will explore Mathis’ work with the Notre Dame Liturgy Program and related projects, his work on the Vigil Service and other attempts to adapt the Divine Office, and Mathis’ projects connected with the wider liturgical movement. The final, concluding section considers the significance of Mathis’ contributions and his overall impact on the liturgical movement.

Part 1 of this dissertation introduces Mathis and his work. Following this broad introduction, the second chapter provides a basic chronological view of Mathis’ life and discusses his education and work prior to his liturgical “conversion.” This chapter begins with an overview of Mathis’ early life and education, noting his time in seminary and his theological training in biblical studies. This is followed by extensive discussion of
Mathis’ work with missions, focusing on his various efforts in support of Holy Cross missions, his written work about missions in India, and his involvement in the establishment of the Medical Mission Sisters. The chapter’s final section gives an overview of Mathis’ liturgical work, paying particular attention to his early work at Notre Dame prior to the founding of the Liturgy Program and, for the sake of a complete overview of his life, also giving a few comments about programs that are discussed further below. This section particularly benefits from Schidel’s discussion of Mathis’ work.

Part 2 of this study discusses Mathis’ largest projects, his work in liturgical education. This section consists of three chapters, the first examining the Notre Dame Liturgy Program, the second looking at projects connected to the Liturgy Program, and the third comparing Mathis’ work with the Liturgy Program to other liturgical education schools and programs.

Chapter 3, on the Notre Dame Liturgy Program, explores Mathis’ most important work. The chapter opens with a consideration of the origins of and inspiration behind the founding of the Liturgy Program. This is followed by a close look at the first two years of the program, 1947-1948. Using materials in the Michael Mathis Papers from the University of Notre Dame Archives, particularly Mathis’ annual reports about the Liturgy Program, the chapter studies Mathis’ goals for the program and how the program’s curriculum, as well as liturgical schedule, was established during this period. The chapter then describes the evolution of the program over the next twelve years, ending with Mathis’ death in 1960. Here, it considers the professors the program attracted, the
changes in course offerings on the graduate and undergraduate level, and the growth of the program. Like the discussion of the program’s early years, this review relies primarily on Mathis’ annual reports. Finally, the chapter evaluates the Liturgy Program based on its own self-assessment, growth reflected in reported numbers of students and courses, and outside assessment in major publications. It also appraises the program in light of its stated purpose and goals.

Chapter 4 expands on the previous chapter’s discussion of the Liturgy Program by discussing other enterprises associated with the program. In particular, the chapter looks at the conferences Mathis organized in connection with the Liturgy Program, the Liturgy Program’s publishing initiative, and the attempt to launch a year-round academic program focused on language skills. Each project is discussed and evaluated individually, using resources that include Mathis’ annual reports, workshop and seminar schedules and proceedings, proposals for the expanded academic program, and reviews of works produced by the publication program.

Chapter 5 places Mathis’ work on the Liturgy Program within the context of the wider liturgical movement by comparing it to other liturgical education projects. In order to accomplish this, the chapter includes a survey of major liturgical education programs in the first half of the twentieth century, including programs in the United States at St. John’s Abbey and Boston College. This survey discusses each program’s history, courses offered, professors, and other distinguishing characteristics, making particular use of announcements and reviews of the various programs in Orate Fratres and Worship.
Mathis’ program is then compared with these programs in order to establish its place and contribution to the liturgical movement.

The third part of this study focuses on Mathis and the Divine Office. This is treated in two chapters, with the first looking primarily at Mathis’ work and the second comparing it to other projects involving the Divine Office in the liturgical movement in the United States.

Chapter 6 traces the development of Mathis’ work with the Divine Office and evaluates the quality of this undertaking. It seeks to describe the origins of Mathis’ work with the Vigil Service, his understanding of the Divine Office, and the evolution of the service, cataloguing the various forms the Vigil Service took. The chapter begins by examining possible precursors to Mathis’ work with the Vigil Service, as suggested by both Schidel and Kennedy. Next, using Mathis’ introductions to the Vigil Service publications, as well as statements made at the national Liturgical Weeks, the chapter investigates Mathis’ hopes and intentions for the Vigil Service. The main body of the chapter consists in describing the different versions of the Vigil Service, comparing the published texts of Mathis’ service to the existing official texts, and giving a close look at the commentary contained within the services. A brief account of Mathis’ attempt at creating a Lauds and Vespers service with commentary follows, drawing primarily on the sample text for the First Sunday of Advent and advertisements for the projected publication. Finally, the chapter concludes with an assessment of Mathis’ work in this area, appraising the scope of its impact, the quality of both the commentary and prayer service, and the relationship of Mathis’ projects to the history of the Divine Office.
Chapter 7 places Mathis’ work on the Divine Office into context with other projects on the Office, especially in the United States. This requires investigation into several types of abbreviated or simplified breviaries meant to be used by the laity, as well as other attempts to popularize one or more hours of the Office. The chapter also studies various American writings on the Divine Office during Mathis’ time period in order to establish what views liturgical leaders commonly held about the role of the breviary in the liturgical movement. Mathis’ liturgical compositions and writings on the Divine Office are then compared to the work of his contemporaries, with particular attention given to the methods each used in attempts to popularize the services.

Part 4 of this study explores Mathis’ other contributions to the liturgical movement in the United States beyond the Liturgy Program, along with its related projects, and the Vigil Service. This section’s only chapter, Chapter 8, begins with an exploration of Mathis’ work with the Liturgical Conference. This includes consideration of how he became involved with the conference, his administrative work on the conference’s board of directors, and most importantly, his contributions as a speaker in the annual liturgical weeks. Subsequently, the chapter treats Mathis’ role in producing an English-language ritual for use in the United States. Here, the chapter presents Mathis’ role in producing the text and discusses the significance and reception of this particular vernacular ritual. The third part of this chapter looks at Mathis’ work to assist in preparations for reception of the revised Holy Week in 1956. This provides a summary of the presentations given during a conference organized by Mathis on the new rites as well as a discussion of a missal aid published by the Notre Dame Liturgical Committee and an
assessment of the importance of Mathis’ contributions on the topic. The main sources for this discussion include the published proceedings of the Holy Week conference and the published missal aid created by the liturgy committee. Finally, the chapter concludes with a look at Mathis’ role in preparing the American delegation for the First International Liturgical Congress of Pastoral Liturgy in Assisi in 1956. Since Mathis himself did not participate in the congress, this section of the chapter focuses particularly on his organizing work.

The study concludes with a chapter evaluating the significance of Mathis’ work. After summarizing the findings of the preceding chapters, the conclusion highlights Mathis’ specific contributions and discusses his legacy. Finally, the concluding section argues for Mathis’ place of consequence in the liturgical movement.

Ultimately, this study argues that Michael Mathis played an essential role in the liturgical movement in the United States of America. In the first place, the excellence of Mathis’ contribution as the founder and first director of the Notre Dame Liturgy Program upon liturgical education in the United States is demonstrated. However, this work also shows that Mathis’ contributions were not limited simply to his work as the founder of an academic program but rather extended to multiple levels of the liturgical movement. It highlights the quality of Mathis’ work as a liturgical author, focusing on his production of prayer services designed to prepare participants for the Mass and introduce them to the Divine Office. Further, this study also demonstrates the diversity of his liturgical contributions through its discussion of his work with the Liturgical Conference, with the American delegation to the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy, and in his
work on the American Ritual. As a whole, this investigation shows that Mathis was not only involved in the liturgical movement through a wide range of activities but that he made a number of significant and meaningful contributions to the movement.
CHAPTER 2:

INTRODUCTION TO THE LIFE AND WORK OF REV. MICHAEL A. MATHIS, C.S.C.

This chapter aims to introduce readers to Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C., by providing an outline of the details of his life and a brief introduction to the major projects of his pastoral and academic career. While the chapter will provide a preliminary mention of the majority of Mathis’ major projects for the sake of a complete review of his life, particular emphasis will be given to his work in biblical studies as a student, his work promoting Catholic missions, and his transition to liturgical studies. As a result, the majority of the chapter will focus on the period following his ordination in 1914 through his initial assignment to St. Joseph’s Hospital in South Bend in the early 1940s. Major liturgical projects, such as the summer school in liturgy at the University of Notre Dame, will be discussed briefly here in order to provide a complete picture of Mathis’ life; these will be treated again in greater detail in the following chapters. Some attention will also be given to memorials and assessments of Mathis’ life and work published shortly after his death.
2.1 Early Life and Education

Michael Ambrose Mathis was born to Jacob and Elizabeth Mathis in South Bend, Indiana, on October 6, 1885. After beginning his elementary schooling in South Bend, Mathis’ family moved to Fitzgerald, Georgia, where they lived until his mother’s death a few years later. Following his mother’s death, Michael, who was about ten years old at the time, was moved to an orphanage in Lafayette, Indiana. According to George Schidel, the young Mathis was encouraged to consider a priestly vocation during his time at the orphanage, and in 1901 Mathis began formation with the Congregation of Holy Cross at Notre Dame.¹

Mathis’ education continued with the Congregation of Holy Cross in the following years, with his novitiate beginning in 1905 and his final profession coming in July of 1907. In 1910 he completed his studies at Notre Dame, receiving a B.Litt., and began studying theology in preparation for his ordination at Holy Cross College in Washington, D.C. Schidel’s account of Mathis’ life says that near the end of Mathis’ time at Notre Dame, and shortly before he would begin his studies in theology in 1910, the provincial superior, Andrew Morrissey, suggested Mathis should go to Rome for his theological studies, but Mathis replied that he wished to serve in the missions instead and turned down the opportunity. Given the chance to reconsider, Mathis still expressed his

desire to serve as a missionary, and the provincial sent him to Washington for his theological studies instead.²

Mathis was ordained in 1914, but travel restrictions associated with the First World War prevented him from traveling to the missions.³ Instead, Mathis began graduate work at The Catholic University of America. At the request of John Cavanagh, the president of Notre Dame, Mathis initially began studying architecture. However, after a year Mathis told Cavanagh that architecture did not hold his interest and that his passion for the missions remained. He was given permission to stop studying architecture at the end of the year.⁴

Schidel reports that after Mathis gave up architecture, the C.S.C. superior at Holy Cross College in Washington, James Burns, asked him to study Scripture in order to teach it at Holy Cross. Mathis agreed but requested that he be allowed to join the missions when it became possible.⁵ Taking up biblical studies, Mathis began teaching at Holy Cross immediately and completed his S.T.L. in 1917 and his S.T.D. in 1920. His dissertation in biblical studies, *The Pauline ΠΙΣΤΙΣ-ΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ According to Heb. XI, 1: An Historico-Exegetial Investigation*, explores the Pauline understanding of “faith,”

---

² Ibid., 4-5.
³ Ibid., 5
⁴ Ibid., 5-6.
⁵ Ibid., 6
focusing on the interpretation and translation of *hypostasis* as the key to understanding the text’s definition of faith.

Mathis’ treatment of *hypostasis* begins by examining the history of the understanding of this word, both in references to this biblical passage and in general usage, from the patristic period to his own time. He claims that the primary patristic understanding of the word was as a “reality in contrast with non-reality” and a “guarantee of future reality.”⁶ This meaning, he says, shifted somewhat in the medieval and Reformation periods, with “reality” continuing to be a major interpretation of the phrase, but with new interpretations divorced from the original patristic understanding, including “firm expectation” or “confidence” emerging over time.⁷ In his own day, Mathis reports that “confidence” has become the dominant way of understanding and translating *hypostasis*, while “reality” remained an important way of interpreting the text.⁸

After establishing the history of interpretation of this text in the first section of his work, Mathis argues that the exegesis of the passage depends on determining the understanding of *hypostasis* at the time the epistle was written.⁹ Mathis examines the literary history of *hypostasis* in both Greek literature prior to and contemporary with the New Testament, as well as in both the Septuagint and the New Testament. He reports that

---
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his survey of the Greek literature shows development to the point where *hypostasis* clearly meant “reality” as opposed to “mere appearance,” while the biblical literature shows a similar use of *hypostasis* in the Epistle to the Hebrews and, he argues, in the Second Letter to the Corinthians.\textsuperscript{10} He then argues that both are typical of the usage of Paul, though he acknowledges that there are concerns with the authorship of Hebrews, and the context of the passage in the letter support the understanding of *hypostasis* as reality. He concludes by asserting that the only possible meaning for *hypostasis* in the passage is reality, resulting in a definition of faith as the “reality of things hoped for.”\textsuperscript{11}

Mathis would only put his studies to use as a professor of Scripture through 1922. After this period, he moved to academic positions that were more administrative and taught other subjects, including apologetics and liturgy. However, his work in this period would provide him with essential formation and background for his later work in the liturgy. Mathis’ background in biblical studies would no doubt prove helpful both in preparing commentaries for his Vigil Services and preparing his lectures on the liturgy of the day for the Liturgy Program. Language work associated with his biblical studies may have also assisted Mathis in his initial liturgical study and was possibly influential on his later emphasis on language preparation in the Liturgy Program. Schidel suggests

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., 123-124, 140.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 141-151.
something similar, reporting that Mathis made use of his background in Scripture, architecture, and missions when planning the program.  

2.2 Mission Work

Ultimately, circumstances as well as the needs of his order prevented Mathis from serving as a foreign missionary. However, while he was unable to serve in the missions personally, he was able to find other ways to be involved with his order’s mission work. Beginning during his graduate work and continuing until after he was reassigned to South Bend, Mathis worked to support the missionary activities of both the Congregation of Holy Cross and the Catholic Church in general. Support for the missions would define his work in ministry for the next twenty-five years, during which time he raised funds and awareness for the Holy Cross Missions in Bengal, supported medical initiatives in mission lands, helped to establish a missionary order of women religious, and was involved in the early years of an initiative to engage high school and college students in support of the missions.

Mathis began actively working to support the Holy Cross missions in 1915, becoming procurator for the congregation’s missions. His first major action in this role was to help organize the Bengal Foreign Mission Society in 1917. This group, which was

12 Schidel, Never Too Much,” 24.
established at St. Joseph’s Parish in South Bend, would become the Holy Cross Foreign Mission Society in 1925.\textsuperscript{13} According to Schidel, Mathis thought it essential to establish a magazine to inform supporters about what was happening in the Holy Cross missions in Bengal and to raise funds for those missions. He began to lobby his superiors for permission to begin the publication, and, while initial appeals were unsuccessful, Mathis gathered enough supporters to have the magazine approved by the 1919 provincial chapter.\textsuperscript{14}

Schidel reports that publication of \textit{The Bengalese} began in 1919, with Father James French initially serving as the editor. The next year, however, the offices of \textit{The Bengalese} were transferred from South Bend to Washington, D.C., and Mathis took over more complete control of the publication.\textsuperscript{15} A typical issue of the magazine during Mathis’ time as editor might include brief notes on the assignments of new priests and other happenings in the Bengal missions, an article or two about life in the missions and those things particular to church life in Bengal, news from other Holy Cross missions, and news about benefactors.


\textsuperscript{14} Schidel, “Never Too Much,” 7-8.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 7-8. However, while Schidel attributes the founding of the magazine to Mathis, R.W. Timm, in his history of the Holy Cross missions in Bengal, credits the founding of \textit{The Bengalese} with its first editor, James French (37). It is likely that both French and Mathis played a role, as Schidel reports that Mathis enlisted the help of French to gain support at the provincial chapter. Schidel is also not the only one to describe Mathis as the founder, as Leo Ward also says that he founded \textit{The Bengalese} (Leo R. Ward, “Father Michael Mathis,” \textit{Perspectives} 6:4 (July-August 1961), 21).
Another major project for Father Mathis was the creation of a dedicated seminary for men entering the Congregation of Holy Cross who intended to serve in the missions. *The Bengalese* introduced the news about the creation of the new seminary in 1920, announcing that the general chapter for the Congregation of Holy Cross had approved a program for the construction of both a preparatory seminary for mission students in the United States and a seminary in Bengal for native vocations.16 A few months later, another article described the original plan of studies for the mission students. As initially planned, the seminary would be a living facility built near Sacred Heart Seminary in Detroit, which was under construction at the time. High-school-aged prospective missionary students would study at Sacred Heart while living in the mission seminary’s facility. After completing their preparatory education in Detroit, students would travel to Notre Dame for their novitiate year and four years of college with some emphasis on subjects that would be helpful to them in the mission field. After the completion of their bachelor’s degree, the students would attend both Holy Cross College in Washington for their theological studies and Catholic University to supplement their theology with medicine and architecture.17

*The Bengalese* played an important role in the campaign to build the seminary, making frequent appeals for donations to help fund the construction, with a particular emphasis on Lenten giving and updates about the state of fundraising and construction.

16 “A New Era For the Bengal Missions,” *The Bengalese* 2:2 (October 1920), 18-19.
17 “A Holy Cross Foreign Mission Seminary” *The Bengalese* 2:6 (February 1921), 89.
The March 1921 issue, for example, spoke of the need for prayers to support the seminary fundraising effort, saying,

What Lenten work could be more worth-while, more pleasing to the heart of the Master, than to assist in establishing an institution so potent for good? We ask our readers to take this project close to their hearts – to give not only their own support to it, but to secure the support of a friend as well.\(^\text{18}\)

A major part of the fundraising efforts promoted by *The Bengalese* was in Lenten mite boxes that it called “bricks.” Issues regularly gave updates on the brick campaign, often including stories of interesting ways groups raised funds for their contribution and excerpts from letters accompanying the “bricks.”\(^\text{19}\)

Eventually, the plans for building the seminary in Detroit were discarded, with a facility instead being built in Washington, D.C., near both Holy Cross College and the Catholic University of America. This new facility would serve as a home for seminarians bound for the missions, allowing them to study theology at Holy Cross and take courses in the missions at the mission seminary. It would also house the offices for *The Bengalese*. In his capacity as editor of *The Bengalese*, Mathis reports that the change in the planned location of the seminary was due to more immediate needs for missionaries. While the original plan had called for training at the mission seminary during the high school years, which would have required twelve years to form new missionaries, construction of the seminary in Washington, D.C., instead allowed for this training to be

\(^{18}\) Editor, “Notes and Comment,” *The Bengalese* 2:7 (March 1921), 107.

\(^{19}\) Advertisement, “Bricks in America Will Save Souls in Bengal,” *The Bengalese* 2:7 (March 1921), 124; Editor, “Backing Up the Missionaries,” *The Bengalese* 2:9 (May 1921), 158.
focused on men closer to their ordination. The mission seminary was ready for occupation by the end of August of 1924, with August 25th serving as the moving day for The Bengalese. The building was dedicated by Michael Curley, the Archbishop of Baltimore, on September 23, 1924. Father Mathis became the first superior of the new seminary when it opened, and he would continue in that position until 1931.

Outside of the Congregation of Holy Cross, Mathis also worked to support medical missions. In 1922 Mathis became involved in the early years of the Catholic Medical Mission Board and dedicated part of a trip to India in the same year to survey the medical missions in that country. While on his travels through India, Mathis came to recognize a need for additional medical missionaries, eventually helping to found the Medical Mission Sisters. In 1924, he helped to organize a group of nurses to travel to a region where the hospital had no nurses, sending four women from an applicant pool of fifty. Unfortunately, this plan was unsuccessful, and the nurses returned home. Schidel reports that Mathis believed that this failure was due to conditions that required a form of community life that the young women were unprepared for.

---
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The failure of his first attempt to send missionary nurses to India did not stop Mathis, and he soon began to work with Anna Dengel to make another attempt. In early 1925, the two met and decided that a religious community should be founded to minister to the sick in the missions. Unfortunately, at the time religious and clergy were prohibited from studying and practicing medicine, and the original group of mission sisters would not be able to take public vows. This did not stop the plan, however, and after Mathis helped to convince the Archdiocese of Baltimore to approve the foundation of the order as “a religious Society without public vows,” the Society of Catholic Medical Missioners was founded in September of 1925.25

The foundation of the order was celebrated with a High Mass with chant sung by the C.S.C. seminarians. Reflecting on Mathis’ role and influence in this celebration, Dengel claims, “In those days Father Mathis did not even know himself that he had liturgy in his blood, but he had. The taste and love for it, is his great contribution to our Society.”26 While it is tempting to view this event as proof that Mathis had an early interest in liturgy before he was “converted to Liturgy,” an incident which will be discussed below, Mathis’ role in the episode Dengel refers to is simply as the choir’s organizer. It is possible that Dengel’s assessment was influenced more by knowledge of


Mathis’ later liturgical work with this order and outside of it than by his actions at its founding.

Mathis supported the Medical Mission Sisters from their beginning, but he began serving the group full time as the chaplain from 1933 to 1938. In this role Mathis championed the Medical Mission Sisters by fundraising and introducing new types of publicity. Concerning Mathis’ promotion of the order, Dengel says,

He also introduced us to the practical side of promotional work. He spent long hours making a film, The Good Samaritan. It was an innovation in mission films as it was the first one with sound. Father made himself a beggar for us and preached for us at Church Collections.

Schidel adds that in addition to promoting the Medical Mission Sisters through film, Mathis wrote a brief recruitment pamphlet about the sisters called Blazing a New Trail. Mathis’ conversion to the liturgy, which will be discussed in more detail below, also took place during this period of his life, and he introduced the sisters to his new interest in the liturgy.

Mathis was also involved in the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade. This organization, founded in 1919 by two seminarians of the Divine Word Fathers, Clifford King and Robert Clark, sought to encourage Catholic students in seminaries, colleges,

and high schools to support the missionary endeavors of their church. Groups were formed at schools across the country, and the students were encouraged to pray for the missions, learn about them, and support them financially.\textsuperscript{31} Schidel reports that Mathis began working with the group in the year following its 1919 founding, saying, “Father Mathis was an early (1920) and a leading contributor to the development and spread of this society which has done so much to make the Catholic youth of America mission-conscious.”\textsuperscript{32} Though Schidel does not give any details about Mathis’ work with this group in its early stages, Mathis would lead the Notre Dame chapter of the organization when he returned to the university in the late 1930s.\textsuperscript{33}

Mathis’ work in the missions also resulted in some of his major writing projects outside of liturgical studies. A trip to the missions in India and Burma in September of 1922 was directly responsible for two of these texts: a report on Medical Missions in India and a short book on the Holy Cross missions in Bengal.\textsuperscript{34} Later in his career, Mathis would return to writing about India in another short book, \textit{Modern Missions in India}.
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With the Holy Cross in Bengal contains several reports of Mathis’ 1922 trip to India that were first published in The Bengalese. The book version of these reports is split into five chapters, covering the history, geography, and character of the area, the religious background of the people of Bengal, Mathis’ visits to the missions in the north of the region, his visits to the south of the region, and a special section dedicated to some of the educational ministries in the area. Mathis’ treatment of the religions of the region presents some of the distinct variations of each religion particular to its setting in Bengal and describes his understanding of the beliefs and typical prayer services of each group. Mathis does present some positive aspects of the local religious beliefs, especially highlighting the Muslim devotion to their regular prayers and the heartfelt prayers and financial sacrifices of the local Buddhists. However, at times he is also quite negative in his descriptions, most noticeably in his description of the temple for Kali, where he says, “There was something diabolical about the dark temple, the staring goddess, and the worship of her devotees.” In general, Islam and Buddhism tend to receive a more positive treatment from Mathis than Hinduism, though he is critical of all three.

In the chapters about his visits to the specific missions, Mathis offers a variety of details about life and work in each community. For example, in his description of a visit to the mission at Toomiliah, Mathis describes the process of the village assembly for settling disputes out of court, presided over by one of the priests and with twenty-four

36Ibid., 12-13.
locals serving as judges. Speaking of the activity of the mission, Mathis notes that confessions took place throughout the afternoon and into the evening on Saturday and describes a packed church for two Masses on Sunday. The participation in the children’s Mass that Mathis recounts is particularly interesting. Mathis reports that the children prayed and sang during the Mass, and he praises their activities, saying, “The prayer was obviously meant to pierce Heaven, and the singing was such as I never heard before.” He also describes mystery plays, or jatras. According to Mathis, each village around the mission put on its own jatra and even the local non-Christians enjoyed them to the point that they invited the Christians to perform them in their villages; Mathis saw mission possibilities in this. Mathis gives similarly vivid descriptions of his journeys to other mission centers, often adding details about the difficulty of travel and the history of Catholicism at the mission center in each region.

Mathis’ “India and Its Medical Missions,” a chapter in an anthology on Catholic medical missions in different regions of the world, reports on the health conditions and state of medical practice in India as observed during his six month trip there and gathered from the responses of a medical questionnaire sent to mission leaders in the region. The essay provides a generally negative description of healthcare in 1920s India, noting that outbreaks of cholera, smallpox, and malaria are commonplace and adding that rates of

---
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infant mortality and death in childbirth are exceptionally high.\textsuperscript{40} It claims that the systems in place for healthcare are largely inadequate because of small numbers of medical professionals, lack of concern about hygiene on a cultural and religious level, restrictions on women seeing male doctors, and an abundance of untrained midwives that often harm the women they are trying to care for. On this topic, Mathis also points out that the restrictions placed on women’s interactions with men from outside of their family put a large burden on the undertrained and superstitious midwives. He argues that many women and children cared for by these midwives are victims of tetanus because the midwives cover the children and wounds with “sacred cow dung.”\textsuperscript{41}

Mathis also claims that only a very small portion of the population of India is able to benefit from Western medicine to the point that he is able to estimate that there is only one practitioner for every 38,000 people in Bengal, which he believes to be the most medically advanced region.\textsuperscript{42} However, in addition to Western medical practice, he describes traditional healing practices practiced by local physicians. Though Mathis has some reservations about these practices, noting that there are some exaggerated claims made about the local medicines, he believes they help to fill some of the need for medical care and, when possible, should be supported by Western medical science.\textsuperscript{43}
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Mathis ultimately argues for increased support for medical missionary activities in India, with a focus on supporting existing medical foundations in the missions. Claiming that medicine is strongly connected with religion in India, Mathis argues that it will be advantageous for missionaries to be able to present themselves as sources of healthcare. He justifies the use of healthcare as a tool for mission by appealing to divine commands to charity and the example of the healing ministry of Jesus. Further, he suggests that an additional benefit of supporting medical missionary work may be an increase in the Catholic population in India through a decrease in the infant mortality rate among Catholics. Following his consideration of the importance of medical missionaries, Mathis lists the supply, financial, and staffing needs of both existing and prospective missions and finally concludes his essay by appealing in particular for support for traveling dispensaries that minister to rural populations.44

Much later in his career, Mathis would return to writing about the missions in the 1947 study Modern Missions in India. This short book largely provides a history of the missions in India up until the mid-1940s, with a brief look at problems faced in the 1940s and a potential solution. Mathis’ first chapter provides a simple outline of the history of Catholic missions in the country, briefly discussing the St. Thomas Christians before beginning a survey of missions beginning with the Portuguese in the sixteenth century

44 Ibid., 146-148, 164
and concluding with an overview of the present state of missions in India in 1947. After this historical survey, Mathis discusses both the common types of missionary initiatives in India and the various cultural, religious, and governmental factors that impact these efforts.

Mathis’ final chapter identifies three problems facing Catholic missions in India during his time, discusses efforts for ministering in places where there are caste differences, and suggests an outlook for the future. The three chief challenges facing the missions are the question of Christianity’s place and religious freedom in a self-governed India, the necessity of developing native clergy, and the evangelical value of Catholic schools despite restrictions on what may be taught and, in some cases, a predominantly non-Christian student body and staff. Turning to the question of caste, Mathis says that Catholic missionaries take a practical approach. He notes that early converts to Christianity tended to continue to observe caste distinctions and that certain churches only allowed people of higher castes, while others were set up for lower castes. While Mathis acknowledges that the Portuguese missionaries attempted to gradually break down caste distinctions by requiring a break from one’s caste, he notes that others were successful in conforming to caste restrictions. He argues that the social and religious
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situation that distrusts Christianity because of its lack of class distinctions requires a patient and gradual movement towards the elimination of caste distinctions. Mathis concludes his treatment of problems affecting these missions by arguing that though there are uncertainties facing missions in India, there remains confidence in ultimate spiritual victory.

Though he never became a full time foreign missionary, Mathis spent twenty years successfully promoting and supporting missionary activities in India. However, mission work would not be the only major apostolate of Mathis’ life. In 1939, he was unexpectedly reassigned from his position as chaplain to the Medical Mission Sisters to teach at Notre Dame. Schidel says Mathis found the change very difficult and adds, “The months that followed were the darkest period of his life.” However, Mathis would eventually come to accept the change, even seeing it as providential. Though he would hold on to his passion for the missions throughout the rest of his life, the relocation allowed Mathis to focus more completely on the liturgy.

---
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2.3 Working in Liturgical Studies

During his time as the chaplain to the Catholic Medical Mission Society, Mathis first became interested in the study of liturgy. Schidel reports that in 1936 Mathis was introduced to the work of Pius Parsch by a German priest, Kaplan Goertz, who gave him the first volume of Parsch’s *The Church’s Year of Grace*. Though Mathis was suspicious of liturgists at the time, he grew more interested in liturgy when he read Parsch’s book.\(^52\) Years later, he would reflect on this experience in an interview with a Notre Dame magazine, *The Scholastic*, saying,

> I was converted to studying the sacred liturgy in 1936 when I bumped into a famous book by Pius Parsch called *Das Jahr Des Heiles*. And I do mean converted. I was in Washington, D.C., at the time, and I remember that I read the book for about an hour and a half and, and it was getting hotter all the time. I found out it was just the first of three volumes, so I sent to the publisher for the rest of the set – I couldn’t wait to get them.\(^53\)

A similar report of Mathis’ experience may be found in an article in the Summer 1958 issue of *Apostolic Perspectives*, which begins,

> Back in 1936 Father Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C., came across a book called *Das Jahr des Heiles* by Pius Parsch. Here, he thought, was something pretty close to heresy. But as he read on his attitude began to change. Suddenly he found himself exclaiming: “This is the real stuff!” He bought three volumes of that work, and from that day onwards the liturgy was to be the predominant passion of his life.\(^54\)

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 12-13.


Reading Parsch changed Mathis’ outlook about liturgical studies so completely that he calls it a “conversion” to the liturgy. The book would plant the seed for an interest in liturgy that would continue to grow over the following years until it eventually came into full bloom when Mathis’ direct work with the missions concluded in 1939.

Mathis’ time at Notre Dame served as a bridge between his missionary and liturgical interests. In 1939 Mathis began working on a small group on the campus of Notre Dame to support the missions. The earliest announcements and advertisements for the group were made in October of 1939 in The Scholastic and the University of Notre Dame Religious Bulletin. The first mention of the group in the Religious Bulletin is in a brief announcement titled “Love For the Missions Through Love of the Liturgy.” It claims that “the first step to mission zeal… is personal holiness,” which itself comes through the liturgy, and urges people to “Learn to know all about the Mass and to love it with Father Mathis.”55 The group met daily in the afternoon for instruction on the following day’s Mass and met again the following morning for the celebration of a dialogue Mass in a chapel in Notre Dame’s Main Building.56

Mathis’ group had moved to a chapel in Sacred Heart Church by the beginning of the 1940-1941 academic year. In September of that year, The Scholastic described the service and noted,


56 “One Man Tells Another,” University of Notre Dame Religious Bulletin, 2 February 1940.
Perhaps the most striking feature of this Mass is at the Offertory when all who are to receive Holy Communion come forward and place an unconsecrated host upon the paten, where it is consecrated and distributed by Father Mathis with the other hosts at Communion time.57

The brief article from September of 1940 was followed by a longer treatment of the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade a month later. This article includes a brief history of the program and discusses how “professional” missionaries are those that travel to other countries for mission work, while “ordinary” missionaries perform missionary work in their regular life through “good example, making articulate Catholic doctrine, and practice in his contacts with others, especially in his work.”58 In addition to describing the group’s services, the article quotes Mathis’ explanation of the importance of liturgy to the Mission Crusade. This interest, Mathis explains, is because “this [the liturgy] is a practical means of preparing missionaries spiritually for their work.”59 The article goes on to say that the Mission Crusade group studies Mass “for its power to teach a lesson in the spiritual life, and then to do what no teacher can do, give its students the power to put that lesson into practice.”60

With this program, Mathis tried to create effective missionaries in everyday life by making ordinary Catholics who did not travel to another country into more
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knowledgeable and better Catholics. He believed that this could be accomplished by creating a more spiritually profitable liturgical experience with an emphasis on greater participation and detailed intellectual preparation for each day’s liturgy. In this way, Mathis’ projects with the Mission Crusade began to display the first fruits of his new understanding of the importance of liturgy. Though his work continued to be connected with the missions, the liturgy in general, and liturgical preparation and education in particular, began to play a greater role in Mathis’ life during this period.

Mathis’ work with the Mission Crusade also begins to highlight Mathis’ understanding of the role of the liturgy in Christian life. At this early stage, Mathis presents the liturgy as a major source for both Christian holiness and spiritual formation. Most importantly, Mathis’ explanation of his work here indicates that he believes that the liturgy provides formation by both teaching a lesson and offering the grace to put that lesson into practice. This concept would also play an important role in Mathis’ later work with the Vigil Service. These articles also give an early glimpse into Mathis’ approach to liturgical participation. Mathis’ emphasis on preparation for the Mass, with a daily lecture on the Mass of the following day, shows that he wished to maximize the interior and intellectual participation in the liturgy. Kennedy correctly identifies this focus on developing greater understanding of the liturgy to be the major aspect of Mathis’ approach to fuller participation.61 However, this emphasis does lead to a focus on the

__________________________
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individual, internal experience of the liturgy by the participants. Nevertheless, he did not neglect the external aspect of liturgical participation; his Masses with the Mission Crusade are described as dialogue Masses, and particular emphasis is given to the offertory procession.

After a short time at Notre Dame, Mathis was next assigned to serve as a chaplain at St. Joseph’s Hospital in South Bend in 1941. Mathis used his time at the hospital to study liturgical scholarship, and said of his assignment that it was “the best thing that ever happened to me because it gave me a chance to study liturgy.” Of course, Mathis’ work at the hospital was not chiefly liturgical study; his primary duties involved ministering to the sick. However, this would also have an impact on his liturgical work, as Schidel claims that Mathis’ experience at the hospital would eventually be very important to his later reflections on ministry to the dying.

Building on his research into the liturgy, Mathis began his work on both his weekly Vigil Service and the summer school in liturgical studies at Notre Dame while continuing to serve as the hospital chaplain until 1953. In the Vigil Service, Mathis created a weekly prayer service that was both celebrated by Mathis and distributed to subscribers in printed form. For this service, Mathis modified the Office of Matins and provided commentary on the prayer texts and readings in order to give participants prayerful preparation for the week’s Sunday Mass. Next, Mathis began the largest project

of his life, the summer school in liturgy, in the summer of 1947. It began as an undergraduate program and became a graduate program a year later. In addition to founding the program, Mathis also planned the annual sessions, recruited students and faculty, and even served as an instructor in some of the early years of the program. The Notre Dame Liturgy Program and its associated components will be one of the major focuses of the chapters which follow.

During the 1950s, Mathis continued his work with the Liturgy Program, expanding it to include workshops for priests and seminarians, architecture workshops, and a successful publishing program. Outside of the summer school in liturgy, Mathis was active in the National Liturgical Weeks, making presentations at a number of the annual conferences and serving on the board of directors from 1948 until 1956. His service to the Catholic Church in the United States in this period also included work on an English translation of the Roman Ritual in the early 1950s. Additionally, Mathis organized and hosted a workshop to introduce priests to the revised rites for Holy Week in 1956.

In the last years of his career, Mathis also served on a committee coordinating the American delegation for the International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy in Assisi and Rome in 1956, and he began to attempt to organize a year round program in languages and liturgy at Notre Dame. Intended to begin in the 1957-1958 academic year, this
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program was never able to gather enough interest and was, ultimately, unsuccessful.

Finally, Mathis also began work on a daily English Lauds and Vespers service with a short commentary in 1957; however, his declining health prevented him from completing the work.\textsuperscript{65}

2.4 Death and Commemoration

For much of the 1950s Mathis fought declining health. After a trip to Europe in the fall of 1953, he was diagnosed with diabetes and spent several months in the infirmary. Following his release, he was moved to a first floor room in the presbytery at Notre Dame to ease the strain on his body. Schidel reports that though Mathis was encouraged to not overwork himself after this diagnosis, he rarely listened and was constantly adding more work. Mathis continued to labor so hard that Schidel even attributes Mathis’ first heart attack, in October of 1958, to his work. A second heart attack followed in April of 1959, and, though he showed some signs of recovery over the following months, Mathis eventually died on March 10, 1960, after contracting the flu.\textsuperscript{66}

Mathis’ death was followed by a number of print memorials recognizing the great value of his work in the liturgical apostolate. In the preface to the proceedings of the Notre Dame Liturgical Week, Frederick McManus noted Mathis’ important work with
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the Liturgy Program at Notre Dame and his work with the Liturgical Conference, highlighting the 1959 Liturgical Week and the seminar on the restored Holy Week rites. He concluded, saying, “Father Mathis was a man of God, humble and simple in his ways, with diverse talents and extraordinary vision. His profound interest in the liturgical apostolate was a holy climax to his life.”  

Schidel wrote about his untiring efforts in all of his apostolates, claiming that “he died of exhaustion more than anything else,” and that “Never could he be reproached for sowing sparingly.”  

Leo Ward, a member of the Congregation of Holy Cross and a professor at Notre Dame, also reflected on the efforts of Mathis, arguing that at the time, no one in the United States with the exception of Virgil Michel was more tireless in his work for the liturgy than Mathis.  

Finally, Godfrey Diekmann, the editor of Worship, discussed his great energy and devotion to his projects, joking that the rest they prayed for at his funeral was unsuitable to Mathis, and reflected on his influence on the North American liturgical movement, noting the huge importance of the Liturgy Program.  

In his seventy-four years, Michael Mathis dedicated his energies to a number of important apostolates, earning his degree in biblical studies, serving as a hospital chaplain, and enthusiastically promoting Holy Cross missions and medical missionary
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work. Though Mathis’ work in these fields played a meaningful role in his life and may have had an impact on his later career, his work in liturgical studies in the last twenty years of his life remains Mathis’ most important contribution and will therefore be the primary concern of subsequent chapters. Because the first decades of his ministerial career after the completion of his education were dedicated almost completely to his work with the missions, Mathis only spent about twenty years of his life working in liturgical studies. However, his zeal for the subject after his “conversion” was considerable, and his work made a significant impact on the liturgical movement and influenced the future of liturgical studies in the United States. The next chapters will closely examine the various projects to which Mathis was dedicated during the final decades of his career.
PART 2:

LITURGICAL EDUCATION
CHAPTER 3:

MICHAEL MATHIS AND THE NOTRE DAME LITURGY PROGRAM

The most important liturgical work in the life of Michael Mathis was his work founding and directing the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame. Beginning in 1947 with three undergraduate courses, this program would reach hundreds of students, growing to over a dozen classes per summer session in the year that Mathis died. Mathis’ role in this project was absolutely essential; without Mathis, there would have been no Liturgy Program. Not only did Mathis propose and design the Liturgy Program, he also directed each year’s summer session, promoted the program, recruited professors to teach its courses, and even taught courses himself during some summer sessions.¹ Though Mathis did not work alone, his vision and hard work guided the program and made its success possible.

This chapter will examine the development and evolution of the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame from its founding in 1947 through the summer session following Mathis’ death in 1960. It will look at the program’s origins, founding goals, curriculum, and other major features of the program. The chapter will pay special attention to the types of classes offered and to changes made from the beginning of the program through Mathis’ death. The discussion of the Liturgy Program will conclude with a consideration of the program’s success.

Finally, it should be noted that the program was not limited to the courses offered in the summer session. The Liturgy Program also included a number of seminars and workshops for non-students, a publishing program that brought some of the program’s courses to print, and an attempt to expand into the fall and winter semesters. These important projects will be treated in the next chapter, while this chapter will be limited to consideration of the main summer session.

3.1 The Origins of the Liturgy Program

Mathis’ proposal of the Liturgy Program at Notre Dame was not his first attempt to educate others about the liturgy, nor was it the first time he had tried to establish a specialized school for education in a particular field. Mathis had previously succeeded in establishing a mission seminary for the Congregation of Holy Cross and had served as its first superior. Further, after his “conversion” to the liturgy, Mathis took every opportunity to spread his enthusiasm for the liturgy and help people to better understand it.
Beyond acting as the principal fundraiser for the construction of the mission seminary and serving as its first superior, Mathis also dreamed of creating a graduate school dedicated to the missions. George Schidel discusses this ambition in his memorial on Mathis and suggests that it may have been Mathis’ inspiration for starting the Liturgy Program. Schidel says that Mathis wrote a long letter to his superiors detailing the reasons for the creation of this proposed school. He also adds that, later, after he had begun the Notre Dame Liturgy Program, Mathis hoped to combine liturgy and missions in a single graduate program. Schidel’s proposal that Mathis’ experience with the missions influenced his work founding the Liturgy Program may be correct, as Mathis had previously connected liturgy and the missions while serving as the chaplain for the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade group at Notre Dame. Whether or not there is a direct link between Mathis’ hopes for a graduate school to study missions and the Liturgy Program, his work proposing the graduate school in missions gave Mathis experience in proposing a new graduate program, even if his first attempts were unsuccessful.

Though Mathis had a strong background in education and had begun to educate people about the liturgy after his “conversion,” it is not clear precisely when he began to envision the Liturgy Program. Mathis himself reports that the idea of beginning a school at Notre Dame was first suggested to him by Ermin Vitry, saying that it was “years ago.”

---


3 Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, Michael A. Mathis Papers (Hereafter CMTH) 6/21, University of Notre Dame Archives (UNDA), 2.
He also writes in his 1947 annual report that the program was first proposed in December of 1946, and that the history of similar projects was considered in its formation. Schidel reports that the first mention of the program of which he is aware is a letter to Mathis’ provincial in January of 1946, giving permission to negotiate with the university to start the program. Kennedy reports that no records of this negotiation exist and argues that it seems they were unsuccessful, because Mathis was only allowed to begin an undergraduate program for 1947. While it was not the school of liturgy Mathis had hoped for, this undergraduate program would serve as the first step towards establishing the first graduate degree program in liturgy in the United States only one year later.

3.2 The First Years of the Liturgy Program (1947-1948)

The first two years of the Liturgy Program laid the essential foundation for its success by establishing the standards and patterns that would guide it as it grew. Though there were few precedents in establishing an academic program in liturgical studies, Mathis was able to form a curriculum, establish a high level of academic excellence, recruit professors and students, and incorporate the regular celebration of the liturgy into the life of the program. It is essential to study these early years in order to gain a better understanding.

4 “The Notre Dame Liturgy Program,” CMTH 14/10, UNDA, 1.
6 Kennedy, Michael Mathis, 11-12.
understanding of the heart and goals of the Liturgy Program and to establish a standard to see how the program grew and changed over the years. This section will investigate the first years of the program by examining the courses making up the early curriculum, the liturgical schedule, the makeup of the student body, and the program’s funding.

3.2.1 Courses

1947

The first courses for the liturgy program were offered during the summer of 1947, from June 17 to August 13. Though there were only three courses, all on the undergraduate level, they were led by well-qualified professors and covered a wide range of relevant liturgical topics. Mathis lists these courses and provides a lengthy description of each in his first annual report to the university president. According to Mathis, the three courses were “History of the Liturgy According to the Latin Rite,” “Gregorian Chant,” and “Aspects of the Liturgy.”

The content and subject matter of the first two courses are apparent from their titles. Mathis’ annual report describes the history course, taught by Thomas Michels of Maria Laach, as “the keystone of the academic instruction.” The Gregorian chant course

7 “The Notre Dame Liturgy Program,” CMTH 14/10, UNDA, 2.
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was taught by Edmund Kestel of Conception Abbey and focused on both the practice of Gregorian chant and its history.\footnote{Ibid., 15-16.}

The “Aspects of the Liturgy” course requires further explanation and comment. This course was taught by a team of professors, each lecturing on a single topic for about a week. Among the topics covered were “The Christian Way of Life – The Sacramental Way,” “Ecclesiastical Places – Churches and Cemeteries,” “A Layman Looks at the Liturgy,” “The Place of Liturgy in Catholic Action,” “Aims of the Liturgical Movement,” and a couple of lecture series treating various aspects of the liturgical year. The roster of professors included notable leaders in the liturgical movement in the United States, including H.A. Reinhold, Martin Hellreigel, Godfrey Diekmann, and Gerald Ellard. In addition to a daily lecture, the course also featured a nightly forum for questions and discussion with the week’s professor. Both the forum and the lectures in general were open to other students at the university outside of the Liturgy Program. Mathis notes that students in disciplines such as architecture and journalism attended sets of lectures and associated liturgical forums that were particularly relevant to their field.\footnote{Ibid., 6-15.}

More than the other courses in the first summer, this course shows the potential of Notre Dame’s summer Liturgy Program. The presence of such a large number of important figures in the liturgical movement in the United States anticipates the excellence of the professors that would come to Notre Dame in the years to follow. In
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fact, some of the professors who spoke for only a week in the first summer would later teach courses for an entire summer at the graduate level. The topics covered in the course also give a preview of future courses, as entire courses would later be dedicated to church architecture, aspects of the liturgical year, and the sacramental life. Further, the course’s open forum at the end of each day shows early signs of the program’s commitment to expanding the impact of the program beyond the students enrolled in the course either for credit or as an auditor.

1948

After the successes of the first year of the summer liturgy program, Mathis hoped to expand the program to include graduate courses. His proposal was not immediately successful, however. Schidel’s account of Mathis’ life notes that Mathis’ first proposal to expand the program to include a Master of Arts degree was rejected because the proposal was not deemed sufficiently academic, but a second proposal was accepted with advice from the university president, John Cavanaugh, that Mathis should get the best possible professors in the field and find funding for the program.¹¹

This new graduate program began in the summer of 1948 with three classes, “Gregorian Chant” with Ermin Vitry, “The Jewish Background of the Liturgy” with Aloys Dirksen, and “Liturgy of the Day” with Mathis. These courses were supplemented by three undergraduate courses, an introductory course with Diekmann, “Gregorian

Chant” with Kestel, and “The Liturgical Principles Governing Church Construction” with Reinhold and Walter Knight Sturges.\textsuperscript{12} Two sources from the session are particularly helpful for understanding this year of the program and its role in establishing the pattern of the curriculum for the years to follow. A special lecture given at the end of the summer session describes the types of courses the program will offer and discusses other priorities of the program, and the 1948 annual report sent to Cavanagh, the university president, gives an overview of the 1948 courses and highlights the goals for both the graduate and undergraduate programs.

In the special lecture, Mathis provides a helpful description of his vision for what classes the program would offer and how the classes offered in 1948 fit into this vision. Mathis says the undergraduate courses would continue to play an important role in the program, with the courses both serving to prepare students for graduate study and offering an introduction to liturgy for students who would not continue to take courses beyond the undergraduate level. Mathis hoped that these goals for the undergraduate courses would be accomplished with annual course offerings that included a basic overview of the liturgy, a chant course, and an elective course.\textsuperscript{13} For the graduate program, Mathis says he planned to offer three regular courses. These would include a course on liturgical history, a course on the interpretation of liturgical texts, and a

\textsuperscript{12} Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 2-3.

\textsuperscript{13} Michael Mathis, “Special Lecture,” CMTH 14/4, UNDA, 1.
Gregorian chant course.\textsuperscript{14} These three courses represent the core of what Mathis believed was fundamental for a graduate education in the liturgy, and they merit a closer look.

Mathis envisioned a four-year cycle for the liturgical history course. The first course in the cycle would look at the Jewish and biblical background of the Christian liturgy and would be offered during the 1948 school year. Mathis felt that this course offered something that was really groundbreaking and offered a look at the liturgy that could not be found at any other Catholic university. He claimed that while many schools may have had a course that discusses the Old Testament sources, he knew of no program that presented the rabbinic background to the liturgy. This course would be followed by a course dedicated to the early Christian liturgy and two courses to cover the history of the Latin liturgy. For students entering after the first year of the graduate program, these courses might be taken out of order. Mathis was not particularly concerned with this, however, because he believed that the main focus of the history courses was to “become acquainted with the problems and to learn the tools that are necessary to be used in the particular field and to get actual work experience using these tools,” rather than strictly learning the details of liturgical history, which the students would eventually get when the cycle began again.\textsuperscript{15}

The second course was intended to offer a closer look at liturgical texts. In the first year of the graduate program, this aspect of the curriculum was represented by

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 4.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 4.
Mathis’ own course on the “Liturgy of the Day.” Using the liturgy for each day that the class met, Mathis explored the origins and development of the text and looked into the meaning of the day’s biblical texts, especially as interpreted through the patristic homily in Matins. This course also included a project that required the students to research the origins of the different texts for a feast not covered by the class lectures. The goal for this course in particular is two-fold. First, Mathis suggests that he wants the students to understand how the liturgy gives criteria for interpreting the meaning of the day’s celebration. Beyond that, the course allowed for the development of research tools through exposure to important primary liturgical texts in the process of researching for their project. Though he gives a detailed description of his own course, Mathis does not indicate in his “Special Lecture” how the course on interpreting liturgical texts would change from year to year.

The final major component of Mathis’ initial plan for the cycle of graduate courses was an annual course in chant. Mathis reports that he wished to make chant “an integral part” of the program, but he came to find that it was necessary only for students who lacked musical background. The course aimed to prepare students to be able to use chant to participate in the liturgy and to promote chant in liturgical life. Mathis claims that, though Pius X supported chant, the liturgical movement had not put a lot of emphasis on it, saying that one of the weakness of the movement is that “We have not

\footnote{Ibid., 5-7.}
made the Chant an integral part of our liturgy…”  

Yet, Mathis reports that chant brings great benefits to Christian worship, and he says that the people working in the program had “stuck our necks out” in deciding to emphasize chant.  

Throughout his special lecture, Mathis returns to the importance of research for the program. He says that liturgy is an excellent field for a research-focused program because there is so much that needs to be discovered and because there are very few schools that offer a program in liturgical research. In the United States, he adds, there is no school at all offering a program for research in the field. Mathis also discusses the importance of both research and language skills, saying that people writing or talking about the liturgy without this relevant knowledge “can do a lot of harm in the liturgy,” and that they “won’t have a solid foundation and they could hurt the liturgy…”  

Ultimately, he felt that research in the field of liturgy is important because of the impact it has on liturgical renewal. Mathis ties the progress of research and renewal together, claiming, “progress is going to be made in the liturgical movement very largely in proportion to the results of academic research.”  

17 Ibid., 8.  
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A few months after the 1948 summer session, Mathis wrote an annual report to the university president. In this report, he expands upon the description of his plans for the program by offering goals for both the undergraduate and graduate levels of study. Concerning the undergraduate courses, he says that the program’s aims are
to give students a comprehensive understanding of the liturgy, to introduce them to its artistic side (especially church building and decoration), and to teach Catholic students plain chant sufficiently to take their proper and active part in the sacred liturgy.\footnote{22 Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 2.}

Mathis gives three main goals for the graduate program as well, saying that the program’s ambitions were
to train students in the methods of research in the field of sacred liturgy for the practical work of teaching liturgy, contributing to liturgical literature so badly needed by students and the Catholic public, and deepening the liturgical foundations of those assigned to leadership in parishes, schools and diocesan administration.\footnote{23 Ibid., 2.}

These three goals show a both scholarly and practical concern that would extend to the entire program.

In its infancy, the curriculum of the Liturgy Program included an important integration between pastoral and scholarly concerns. Mathis and the Liturgy Program considered the development of research skills of paramount importance, and they were given a place in the curriculum reflecting this priority. Further, he hoped that the Liturgy Program could help to produce additional scholarly research. At the same time, Mathis
and his colleagues also believed that students should learn Gregorian chant for the promotion of both chant itself and active participation in general. Finally, Mathis is clear in his annual report that he hopes the program will provide scholarly training for teachers and a liturgical background for pastoral leaders. These various objectives gave the program’s curriculum its initial academic direction, and, in future years, the courses, liturgies, and extracurricular activities of the program would all be oriented in some way toward these initial goals.

3.2.2 Liturgical Services

While classes and academic work take a central role in Mathis’ understanding of the Liturgy Program, the actual celebration of the liturgy received almost equal billing in his initial descriptions of the program. In his 1948 special lecture, Mathis regularly refers to the liturgy as both an “art” and a “science,” which must both be experienced and studied. In the special lecture, Mathis contrasts Notre Dame with other universities that offer liturgy courses but which treat liturgy only as a science and do not include the art, i.e. the liturgical celebrations themselves. Mathis says that the study of liturgy without liturgical functions is like “a study on chemistry without a few explosions” or “studying art without drawing pictures.”

---
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done without the experience of liturgy caused Mathis to include an ambitious liturgical schedule as part of his program.

The first year of the program had a very full schedule of liturgical services that set a high standard for future years. During the summer session, there was daily Lauds in Sacred Heart Church at 5:40 A.M., followed immediately by a Missa Cantata with a homily at 6:00; during the weekends these were moved an hour later to 6:40 and 7:00. Terce and None were also offered during the day in the lecture hall, and None was followed by a lecture by Mathis on the liturgy of the following day. The day’s liturgical schedule came to a close each night with Compline and Benediction in Sacred Heart Church. The only significant absence from this schedule was a regular celebration of Vespers, with Compline instead serving as the program’s primary evening prayer.

While it is not difficult to see a logical connection between the study of liturgy and its performance, the scope of the prayer schedule Mathis designed for the summer school is impressive. The liturgies, combined with the daily lectures for the courses, filled the day with liturgy. In a sense, Notre Dame offered a program of full immersion in the liturgy. Centering the schedule around the liturgical celebrations would make it impossible to separate the academic discussions from their practical and pastoral implications. This schedule also allowed for the possibility of mutual enrichment between the liturgies and the classes. The lessons of the day, especially those in Mathis’ “Liturgy

of the Day” course in the early years, could be reinforced by the liturgical celebration, and the students’ liturgical experiences could be deepened by their growing knowledge of the liturgical rites in which they were participating.

3.2.3 Students

In its first two years, Mathis’ Liturgy Program was able to attract both a large and a vocationally diverse student body. The annual report of the first year provides a breakdown of the number of students in each class and the types of students taking them. This is helpful for determining both the size and relative impact of the program’s first year and can help establish a benchmark to judge the future growth of the program. The report indicates that each class had at least eight students enrolled in the course for credit, with “Gregorian Chant” being the smallest, at eight, and “Aspects of the Liturgy” being the largest with twenty-six. However, these were not the only students attending the courses. The history course had twice as many auditors, twenty-two, as students, eleven, and the “Aspects of the Liturgy” course had thirty-six auditors.26

The second annual report also gives numbers for individual classes rather than for the program as a whole. The numbers for these classes appear to have remained relatively steady at the undergraduate level, with seventeen students in the introductory

26 Ibid., 2.
course, fourteen in the church architecture course, and thirteen in the chant course. There were fewer auditors for the undergraduate courses in general than there had been in the previous summer. The introductory course proved to be the exception to this, as it had twenty-nine auditors, including fourteen sisters, three lay men, and eight lay women. At the graduate level, both “The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy” and “The Liturgy of the Day” had fourteen students, while “Gregorian Chant” had thirteen. The trend of fewer auditors also extended to the graduate courses, which had only four auditors each in the history and liturgical text courses and only two in the Gregorian chant course.27

The first two years of the program attracted students from a diversity of vocations, including priests, seminarians, religious brothers and sisters, and lay men and women. Large numbers of priests and seminarians came to the summer program, with seminarians forming the majority of students in the undergraduate courses in the second year. Religious women made up the majority of the students in each of the three classes in the first year, but fewer sisters were involved in the second year, though they maintained a strong presence. Most classes also included one or two lay men or women taking the course for credit.28

27 Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 3-4.

28 “The Notre Dame Liturgy Program,” CMTH 14/10, UNDA, 2; Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 3-4.
TABLE 1

STUDENT BREAKDOWN - 1948 GRADUATE COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Priests (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Seminarians (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Brothers (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Sisters (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Lay Students (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of the Liturgy (Credit Students)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgy of the Day (Credit Students)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorian Chant (Credit Students)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Numbers and student types taken from: Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 3-4.
3.2.4 Funding the Liturgy Program

According to Schidel, one of the important conditions for launching the Liturgy Program was that Mathis should find the funding to pay for the program’s expenses. This, both Schidel and Kennedy note, was accomplished through a grant from a former student, Michael P. Grace II. The funding from the Michael P. Grace II Trust was given for the remainder of Mathis’ life. 30 Among the program’s activities and expenses covered by this trust were scholarships for seminarians, the acquisition of important texts for the program’s library, the printing and postage for all promotional materials, the preparation of course lectures for mimeographing or publication, communications with liturgical leaders and prospective professors, travel for the European professors, and other expenses for professors that were not supplied by tuition. 31

3.2.5 Conclusion

The first two years of the Liturgy Program established a strong blueprint and foundation for Mathis to build upon in future years. In this initial period, Mathis established an academically strong curriculum that provided students with both an


31 Michael Mathis to Gerard L. Carroll, 16 November 1948, CMTH 6/26, UNDA; Kennedy, Michael Mathis, 13-14.
essential introduction to liturgy and the tools for advanced research in the field. At the same time, Mathis was able to balance rigorous academic study of the liturgy with regular liturgical celebration. Additionally, Mathis and his program succeeded in attracting both well-regarded professors and a large student body. In the years that follow, Mathis would continue to expand the program, attracting more students, recruiting well known scholars to teach classes, and offering more courses.

3.3 The Evolution of the Program Under Mathis (1949-1960)

Michael Mathis’ Liturgy Program continued to grow in the years following its initial launch. The program saw an increase in students, began to attract well-known European professors, and introduced new and different course offerings. As the program underwent changes, some of the initial ideas from the first years were expanded, some evolved and changed, and some were gradually minimized. This section will examine how the program developed as it grew during the period in question, with reference to the professors, the undergraduate component, the graduate courses, the liturgical schedule, and the student body.

3.3.1 Staffing the Liturgy Program

One of the important components of the Liturgy Program from its first days was the inclusion of prominent scholars in the liturgy from both the United States and Europe.
When Mathis received approval for the Liturgy Program, the university president counseled him that it was important to find the best possible professors to teach for the program. Mathis was immediately successful in this enterprise, bringing a number of high-profile leaders in the liturgical movement in the United States to Notre Dame to teach part of the “Aspects of the Liturgy” course in 1947, and in 1948, recruiting Diekmann and Reinhold to teach undergraduate courses.

While the program would successfully attract a number of well-known professors over the years, Mathis’ work filling the posts was not always easy or successful. Schidel mentions that for every scholar Mathis got to come to Notre Dame, several others declined. Among the obstacles to bringing highly regarded professors to Notre Dame were existing obligations and commitments, sudden illnesses, and potential language barriers. For example, Mathis was forced to cancel a course on symbolism in the Old Testament in 1957 when Damasus Winzen had a heart attack only a month before the summer session was scheduled to start. In his efforts to find the best professors for courses, Mathis frequently wrote to various liturgical leaders, asking for recommendations for professors to teach various courses; some of these letters provide details about some of the difficulties Mathis faced. In one case, when attempting to find a professor for a liturgical history course in the 1949 summer session, Mathis reports that he found one scholar, Theodor Klauser, who was interested in working with the program.

33 Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 13 December 1957, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1.
but who was unable to come because his duties as rector of Bonn University would not end until the following fall.\textsuperscript{34} Seeking another professor for the same course, Mathis suggested that it might be possible for a professor in Rome who did not know English well to take lessons from American Holy Cross seminarians living in Rome.\textsuperscript{35} While neither of these professors was able to teach a course at Notre Dame in 1949, Mathis eventually succeeded in obtaining Josef Jungmann to teach the course.

When European professors were found, other difficulties presented themselves. In particular, funds had to be found to bring the professors to Indiana from their European homes. At times, the program was able to take advantage of travel grants for scholars from the Fulbright Foundation, though at other times funding had to be taken from the money given by the Grace Trust.\textsuperscript{36} Finding suitable housing for the professors could also be difficult. In a letter requesting to use the Old College building on the campus of Notre Dame for various uses of the Liturgy Program, including housing for visiting professors and a place for the program’s offices and library, Mathis mentions these frustrations, saying, “Suitable living and working conditions for these distinguished men have been a problem never adequately solved in the twelve years that the Liturgy Program has been

\textsuperscript{34} Michael Mathis to Reynold Hillenbrand, 26 November 1948, CMTH 9/75, UNDA, 2; Michael Mathis to Godfrey Diekmann, 21 November 1948, CMTH 8/2, UNDA, 1.

\textsuperscript{35} Michael Mathis to Godfrey Diekmann, 21 November 1948, CMTH 8/2, UNDA, 1-2.

\textsuperscript{36} Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 20 December 1954, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 8.
operative. Sometimes these professors have had rather noisy rooms, or those without the domestic atmosphere to which they are accustomed.”

While there were some difficulties finding professors, for the most part, Mathis was able to find excellent and well-known European and American professors to teach in the program. Among the professors that Mathis and his colleagues successfully recruited were Louis Bouyer (1952, 1956, 1960), Josef Jungmann (1949), Pierre-Marie Gy (1954), Jean Daniélou (1950), Balthasar Fischer (1950), Johannes Hofinger (1954, 1955, 1957, 1958), H.A. Reinhold (1948, 1950, 1952), Martin Hellriegel (1955), Christine Mohrmann (1956, 1958-1960), Boniface Luykx (1953, 1958-1960), and Josef Goldbrunner (1958-1959). The presence of so many excellent professors helped to create a reputation for excellence for Notre Dame and allowed the program to offer to its students the best possible education with up to date research from prominent scholars. This aspect of Mathis’ program remains one of its best known aspects today, and is frequently commented on by scholars discussing Mathis.38

---
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3.3.2 Undergraduate Program

Though the program was founded with three undergraduate level courses, the courses leading to the master’s degree quickly became the focus of the program. In 1949, there were four main courses at the undergraduate level, two introductory chant courses, the basic liturgy course, and a course on the eastern rites with Donald Attwater. Mathis does not, however, indicate how many students were involved in these courses. In the next year, 1950, the undergraduate program included only two courses, the introductory liturgy and beginning chant courses, and there were only two undergraduate students enrolled in the program. Despite this low number, Mathis felt that these courses continued to serve an important purpose. He says that though there were only a few undergraduate students, a number of graduate students used the course to fill in deficiencies in their background in liturgical education. Additionally, the courses had a large number of auditors, including students from courses in other departments and a number of visiting priests, religious, and lay persons.

The annual reports after 1950 do not give a lot of additional details about the undergraduate program and its students. In his 1951 annual report, Mathis mentions that Vitry taught a chant course on the undergraduate level and also makes note of a course on “The Sacramental Life” led by Diekmann that was particularly popular. Though it is
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placed under “Liturgical Program for Graduate Students,” Diekmann’s course is listed in the university bulletin with a number in the 100s, rather than the 200s like the other graduate courses, and it is singled out as a course that undergraduates might take. The 1952 annual report indicates that there were again two undergraduate students but does not specify what courses were offered on the undergraduate level. The university bulletin for this year lists a chant course and choir practice as the undergraduate courses and says that students may take certain courses for credit, including the course in church architecture, “Liturgical Piety,” “Patristic Latin Literature,” and the “Workshop in Gregorian Integration,” with permission from the department head. 1953 brings a shift in the way undergraduate courses are offered, as there is no mention of them in the annual report, and the university bulletin simply indicates that undergraduates may take the courses for credit with the approval of the head of the department; this would continue in 1954. In both years, “Liturgical Latin and Literature” and the course associated with choir practice received course numbers in the 100s, while the other liturgy courses all had numbers in the 200s.

41 Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 20 December 1951, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 1; University of Notre Dame, Summer Session of 1951, vol. 48, no. 2 of University of Notre Dame Bulletin of Information (Notre Dame, IN, 1951), 36.
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43 University of Notre Dame, Summer Session of 1952, vol. 49, no. 2 of University of Notre Dame Bulletin of Information (Notre Dame, IN, 1952), 36.

However, in the annual report for 1954, Mathis indicates that many of the program’s students are arriving unprepared for their studies in liturgy. He feels that no satisfactory answer has been found to remedy the problem, but says that the liturgy faculty is convinced of the need to offer an introduction to liturgy and chant annually.\(^45\)

To a certain extent, it is possible to see the courses of the following year, which included an introduction to liturgy, taught by Martin Hellriegel, as well as the introduction to Gregorian chant and the church architecture course, all with course numbers in the 100s, as a response to the need for greater preparation. While the chant course only had six credit students and five auditors, the introduction to the liturgy course had forty-four credit students and twenty-six auditors, making it the second most popular class of the summer. It is unlikely, however, that the large number of students reflects how many needed to take an introductory course; Mathis attributes the popularity of this course, along with the course on liturgy and foreign missions, to both interesting subject matter and the excellence of the professor.\(^46\)

In the following year, another introductory course was offered by John Miller, a member of Mathis’ order; fifteen students took this course for credit.\(^47\)

By 1958, the course in “Basic Liturgy” would receive a graduate level numbering, and the only courses with numbers in the 100s would be introductory

\(^45\) Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 20 December 1954, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 8.

\(^46\) Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 15 December 1955, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1-2.

\(^47\) Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 19 December 1956, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1.
language courses. This would continue to be the pattern through the rest of Mathis’ tenure as the head of the program.

3.3.3 The Graduate Program

As the undergraduate component of the Liturgy Program was increasingly minimized, the graduate program began to grow, soon becoming the focus of the program. In doing so, it did not stay static but began to evolve to offer more classes on a wider range of topics. Originally offering classes on only three topics with a plan to rotate some of the classes within these topics, by the time of Mathis’ death the Liturgy Program listed twelve courses with graduate numbers in the university bulletin. This list of course offerings shows substantial growth and some shifts from Mathis’ original plans in every type of course. It will be helpful to examine the changes in each of these to understand how the core of the Liturgy Program, its classes, changed and evolved under Mathis’ leadership.

First Cycle of Courses – 1948-1951

In the first years following the foundation of the program’s graduate component, the Liturgy Program largely followed the plan that Mathis plotted in his special lecture

and the 1948 report for courses in the interpretation of liturgical texts, liturgical history, and Gregorian chant. Promotional materials during this period described the program as having “two chief subjects,” namely history and the interpretation of liturgical texts, and claimed that Gregorian chant was “an integral part of the whole program.”

These promotional pamphlets also indicated that there was “a third series of lectures on auxiliary subjects.”

From 1949 through 1951, the courses in the interpretation of liturgical texts were the “Temporal Cycle,” taught by Mathis, “The Psalter as Christian Prayer Book,” with Balthasar Fischer, and “The Ritual and Pontifical,” taught by Cornelius Bouman. History courses were also offered in 1949, with Jungmann’s course on the early liturgy, and in 1951, focusing on the Middle Ages with Boniface Luykx. Strangely, there was no history course offered in 1950. For electives, or auxiliary courses, the program offered a course in Latin paleography in 1949 and Jean Daniélou’s course on “The Typological Sense of Sacred Scripture” in 1950.

Gregorian chant continued to play an important role in the program during these years, with regular offerings at the graduate level in Gregorian chant and the addition of a

---

49 1951 Liturgy Program Promotional Pamphlet, Notre Dame Printed Materials Collection (Hereafter PNDP) 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, University of Notre Dame Archives (UNDA).

50 Ibid.

daily choir practice for all students. Additionally, in 1949, the program added a “Chant Demonstration Class,” led by Vitry. This course, which would remain on the program’s schedule in some form for the remainder of Mathis’ time leading the Liturgy Program, sought to teach the program’s students how to instruct grade school students in methods of chant. Lester Lacassagne described the first edition of this course in detail in the September-October 1949 issue of *Caecilia*. Lacassagne says that the course was focused on teaching Gregorian chant through “living technique” rather than a strictly technical method, though instruction in the technical elements was an important aspect of the course. Each session, the students would begin by reading the text that they would learn for the day. This was supposed to be done in a joyful manner, but coaxing the students into reading in this tone was difficult. Next, the students were given an explanation of the message of the text, with particular emphasis on application to life. The students were then taught the melody and rhythm through motion, particularly arm motions. The article praises the methodology, noting that many of the Liturgy Program students did not believe it would work at the beginning of the classes but were convinced of its efficacy by the conclusion of the summer.

---

52 Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 15 December 1949, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 1; Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 1-2; Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 20 December 1951, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 1.

During the first years after the launch of the graduate program, Mathis largely kept to the courses he had established at the outset, making only minor changes. Most importantly, with the single exception of the history course in 1950, each of the primary course types was offered on an annual basis. Beyond this, the program was further enriched by the inclusion of a select number of elective courses that offered, in the case of the paleography course, helpful tools for research, in the case of the chant instruction course, tools for the promotion of chant, and, in the case of the course on typology and scripture, additional depth to the program’s academic offerings. Overall, the program continued on its original path, growing with regards to both the number of courses and students, and successfully continuing to attract well-respected scholars as professors.

*Shifts in 1952*

The first significant shifts to the graduate components of the Liturgy Program came in 1952 with three major changes. The first of these changes was the creation of two different tracks for the master’s degree, a research and a non-research option. The second was an alteration in the number of credits for the program’s graduate courses from two credits per course to three per course. Finally, beginning in 1953, there is evidence of a dedicated major in Gregorian chant within the Liturgy Program.

The first change offered a second path to the program’s master’s degree with the introduction of the research and non-research degree. At the program’s founding, the university’s requirements for the graduate degree included twenty-four credits of coursework, as well as reading knowledge of French or German, and a dissertation. With the creation of the two options, the newly named research degree adopted these existing
The non-research degree required thirty credits of course work, but it did not require French or German or a dissertation; it was expected that this program would be completed within five summer sessions of study. Discussing the reasons for introducing the non-research M.A. in general, the 1951 university bulletin wrote,

Recognizing that the improvement of instruction in our elementary and secondary schools is of utmost importance, the University has introduced this program of training which is designed to meet the special needs of prospective teachers in such schools. The principal aim of the program of study is to assist the student in the acquisition of a well-rounded background in his chosen field as the foundation for effective teaching and in deepening his appreciation of the fundamental ideas of his subject. Although no dissertation and no foreign language are required, the student is introduced to the current literature in his field and is made aware of the importance of research.

While this is an evolution from the program’s initial insistence on the importance of research for all liturgy students, the non-research degree continued to provide students with significant academic training in the liturgy. Additionally, while the non-research degree did not require French or German, prerequisites for the program included knowledge of Latin. This non-research degree would serve well to prepare those tasked with liturgical education in parishes and Catholic schools. At the same time, the research

---

54 University of Notre Dame, Summer Session of 1948, vol. 45, no. 1 of Bulletin of the University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame, IN, 1948), 24-26; Notre Dame, Summer Session of 1952, 25-28, 36.
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option would allow the program to continue its focus on the development of research with the students that chose this option.

The second change, a shift in the number of credits per course, resulted in changes to the number of courses that students could take each summer. In the first years of the Liturgy Program, courses were two credits each, allowing students to take three courses per summer session within the graduate school limit of six credit hours for the summer session.\(^{58}\) This would allow for a total of twelve courses over the period of four summer sessions. With a move to three credit hours per course in 1952, students would only be able to take two courses during the program’s summer sessions and eight courses over four summers.\(^{59}\) This would mean that, if research degree-seeking students wanted to take both the annual history course and the annual liturgical texts course, which the program’s promotional materials referred to as the “two chief subjects” of the graduate program, in each year, they would be unable to take any courses in chant or any of the elective courses.

The third significant shift to the program during this time period was in the form of a major or concentration in Gregorian chant. The first mention of this concentration is in the program’s promotional pamphlet for 1952, which, in describing the purpose of the Liturgy Program, claims, “The training of both the research and non-research programs should qualify students, who have majored in Gregorian Chant, to train others in the

---

\(^{58}\) See, for example: Notre Dame, *Summer Session of 1951*, 23, 36-37.

\(^{59}\) Notre Dame, *Summer Session of 1952*, 22, 37.
communal action of liturgical singing...” Mathis also mentions a major in Gregorian chant in his 1952 annual report to Father Hesburgh, saying “The new feature of the 1952 Summer Session was a basic course for all graduate students majoring in Gregorian Chant to be repeated each year from now on for all new students in that department. This includes the basic principles of Gregorian Chant and the beginning for those students sufficiently advanced.” Neither of these sources nor the Liturgy Program’s entry in the university bulletin for the 1952 summer session provide any additional information about this major. Despite this lack of further details, the formation of a dedicated Gregorian chant concentration is a natural progression for a program that considered chant to be an “integral” part of the curriculum and sought to facilitate liturgical participation through education in chant. The major in Gregorian chant allowed the program to form leaders who could support Gregorian chant in parishes and schools.

Outside of the Liturgy Program, the Music Department’s entry in the summer 1952 university bulletin describes liturgical music as one of five possible majors in the master’s degree, saying, “The candidate for the master’s degree may take Music Education, Music Theory, Composition, Applied Music or Liturgical Music…” The outline of program requirements goes on to note that students in liturgical music should

60 1952 Liturgy Program Promotional Pamphlet, PNDP 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, UNDA.

61 Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 15 December 1952, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 2.

take ten credits in liturgical music, four credits in history of church music, eight credits in applied music, and six elective credits in liturgy and should dedicate two credits to a project.  

It is not entirely clear if the Liturgy Program materials and the Music Department are describing the same major, but evidence suggests that there is at least a connection between the programs. The Music Department’s course offerings for summer 1952 do not appear to have provided for any of the liturgy-related requirements for the concentration, and the description of the liturgical music concentration in the Music Department indicated that the concentration could only be taken in the summer, pointing to a relationship with the summer-only Liturgy Program. Additionally, though none of the courses were listed in the Music Department’s entry in the summer bulletin, all of the Liturgy Program’s music courses were listed with a music number; for example, “Theory of Gregorian Chant” was “Music 260s,” and the “Workshop in Gregorian Integration” was “Music 264s.” Finally, it is unlikely that the university would have two separate summer-only programs in liturgical music beginning in the same year.

The courses in 1952 and 1953 reflect a continued commitment to the original course plan of the Liturgy Program with selected additions, and, apart from additions to the Gregorian chant courses, do not reflect significant changes in the program. The

63 Ibid., 63.
64 Ibid., 63.
65 Ibid., 36-37.
annual history course continued in 1952, examining the liturgy from 1300 to the present, and returned to the beginning of the four-year cycle in 1953 with a course on the relationship of Christian worship to Jewish liturgy. The liturgical text courses also continued, with courses on the Mass (1952) and the Divine Office (1953). A significant elective course, Louis Bouyer’s “Liturgical Piety” was offered in 1952, and courses in liturgical Latin and church architecture were also available for graduate students. Music courses included the basic Gregorian chant course, discussed in Mathis’ 1952 annual report, the annual workshop course, and the addition of courses in “Vocal Training” and “Chant Accompaniment.” The Gregorian chant offerings grew further in 1953, including both the basic Gregorian chant course and a more advanced “Theory of Gregorian Chant” class.66

1954 and Beyond

Following the shifts begun in 1952, the Liturgy Program underwent changes in course offerings by the summer session of 1954 that significantly modified Mathis’ original plans for the program’s annual offerings. This is most clearly seen in changes to the program’s history courses, but the addition of a large number of courses that do not easily fit previously established course categories gives further evidence of the change. A closer look at these course changes will highlight this shift.

The graduate courses offered by the Liturgy Program in the summer of 1954 included “Participation in the Liturgy on Foreign Missions,” “Commentary on the English Ritual,” “Church Building and Decoration,” “Workshop in Gregorian Integration,” “Theory of Gregorian Chant,” “Sacred Scripture as a Basis of Spirituality,” and “Vocal Training.” This schedule, and the schedule in the years to follow, lacked a course from the four-year cycle of history courses that Mathis projected at the outset of the graduate program. One specifically designated history course would follow in 1955, but this course covered the entirety of liturgical history, rather than being focused on one of the four periods Mathis had designated for the courses. Though the course was described as being offered every four years, it was not offered again during Mathis’ lifetime, suggesting that this plan was abandoned.

At the same time, a large number of additional courses began to be added to the schedule. This included an encore of the course on liturgy and the missions in 1955, as well as another course on “Kerygmatic Theology,” from Johannes Hofinger in the same year. Other additions included “The Meaning of Sacred Scripture,” “The Holy Mother of God in the Liturgy,” “Introduction to the Eastern Rites,” and “Early Christian Prayer

67 University of Notre Dame, Summer Session, 1954, 57-59.

68 University of Notre Dame, Summer Session, 1955, vol. 52, no. 2 of University of Notre Dame Bulletin (Notre Dame, IN, 1955), 72. The course, “History of the Liturgy,” had Cornelius Bouman as its instructor and was described as follows: “This course of lectures will cover the historical high lights of Christian liturgy from the Primitive Liturgy to that of our own time.”

69 1955 Liturgy Program Promotional Pamphlet, PNDP 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, UNDA.
Life." The program also began to offer a large number of classical language courses beginning around 1956, with Christine Mohrmann’s course on “Liturgical Latin.” Introductory and advanced courses in Latin and Greek were offered from 1957-1960, and Mohrmann returned in 1958 and 1960 to teach courses in Christian Latin, as well as “Ordinary of the Mass Philologically” (1958) and “Philological Commentary on the Liturgy of Baptism” (1960).

Additionally, a number of courses with a clear practical focus were added to the curriculum. These included courses on catechesis or education, such as “The Place of Liturgy in Religious Education” (1957), “Kerygmatic Approach for Teachers” (1958), “Catechetical Initiation into Liturgical Life” (1958), “The Glad Tidings in Catechetical Instruction” (1959), “Cathecetics on the Sacraments” (1960), and “Catechetical Introduction to the Mass” (1960). Other pastorally oriented courses included “Kerygmatic Approach to Theology for Clerics” (1958), “Pastoral Care for the Individual” (1958), and “Pastoral Care of the Parish as a Corporate Body” (1959). None of these courses fit particularly well into the three categories of courses established at the beginning of the program and, by their number, suggest an emphasis in the course offerings on the development of pastoral leaders and educators during this period.

---

70 “The Liturgy Program of the University of Notre Dame and Its Founder-Director Rev. Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C.,” PNDP 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, UNDA, 4-5.
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Though Mathis does not discuss the changes in his annual reports, one document may potentially provide some insight into the structure of the program’s course requirements in the later 1950s. This text, titled “Proposed Curriculum for Liturgy Program,” appears to come from 1957 or 1958 but offers no author or context to indicate what occasioned the proposal or if it was accepted.72 Despite its unclear provenance, however, there is some correspondence between the courses outlined by the curriculum and the courses offered during the late 1950s.

The “Proposed Curriculum” provided course requirements for both the research and non-research option, as well as requirements for a music concentration. The proposal indicated that eight courses were required for the research degree, including an introductory course and courses on Gregorian chant, on Scripture in the liturgy, on comparative liturgical study, and on the history and theology of the Mass, Divine Office, liturgical year, and sacraments and sacramentals. The introductory and Gregorian chant courses would be offered annually, while the remaining six courses would be offered on a three-year cycle. Students would take the two introductory courses in their first year and, in the following year, begin taking courses from the three-year rotation. The non-research degree required the same courses as the research program, as well as an option to choose two electives from options covering catechesis, liturgical arts, liturgical theology, and selected special topics.73

72 “Proposed Curriculum for Liturgy Program,” CMTH 12/42, UNDA.
73 Ibid., 1-3.
The course rotation suggested by this text describes a well-rounded program that could produce scholars, teachers, and liturgical leaders. At the level of the research degree, prospective students would receive introductions to both liturgical studies in general and Gregorian chant in particular, while also receiving both historical and theological training in all of the major liturgical rites. On the non-research level, prospective teachers and liturgical leaders would receive the same overview of the liturgy and its texts, while also potentially receiving instruction in more practical fields of art and catechesis.

This text also suggests a moderate shift in Mathis’ approach to what is fundamental for graduate study of liturgy. The new approach continues to emphasize the interpretation of liturgical texts and Gregorian chant, but liturgical history no longer has dedicated courses and is instead given as an element of other courses. It also highlights the importance of the relationship between the Bible and the liturgy and gives new emphasis to comparative liturgical study. Finally, it also gives a central place to an introductory course, which the university bulletin presents as studying “the place of the liturgy in the life of the Church, its structure and its central themes.”

In addition to an outline of requirements for the research and non-research degrees in liturgy, the “Proposed Curriculum” also provides partial course requirements for a degree in liturgical music. The proposal calls for music students to take the courses in the history and theology of the Mass and of the Divine Office, as well as the

---
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introductory liturgy course offered annually. It does not, however, provide any details about the music requirements, saying only that the students should take the courses required by the Music Department.\textsuperscript{75}

At least some of the classes described in this proposal for the degrees in liturgy do appear in the following years. “Basic Liturgy” was offered each year from 1958-1960, and though it is not clearly the same course described in the proposed curriculum, there was a Gregorian chant course offered each year as well. From the cycle of courses on liturgical texts, the Divine Office was offered in 1958, the course on the Mass was offered in 1959, and a comparative liturgy course was offered in 1960.\textsuperscript{76} Courses in catechetics for the non-research option were also offered from 1958-1960. There is, however, no course that clearly fulfills the requirements for the courses on Scripture in the liturgy, the sacraments and sacramentals, or liturgical arts during this period. Additionally, a large number of courses do not fit easily into any of the categories other than the special questions course.

While these omissions may be the result of a number of variables, ranging from the availability of professors to student interest, they suggest that the “Proposed Curriculum” is not an absolutely accurate portrayal of the program. Still, it does appear that the program was likely operating under a curriculum that was at least similar to the

\textsuperscript{75} “Proposed Curriculum for Liturgy Program,” CMTH 12/42, UNDA, 3.

\textsuperscript{76} “The Liturgy Program of the University of Notre Dame and Its Founder-Director Rev. Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C.,” PNDP 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, UNDA, 4-5.
one described in the proposal. As a result, it offers at least a sense of the type of courses Mathis’ program sought to offer in this period.

A second text that offers a different view of the program is the program’s promotional pamphlet from the 1959 summer session. This pamphlet describes recommended courses for different types of students, including new students, new priests taking an additional year of studies, those majoring in Gregorian Chant, teachers, religious interested in the Divine Office, students interested in liturgical Latin, and other liturgy students. The courses for new students include the introductory courses in liturgy and chant, along with courses on the Mass and early Christian prayer. Continuing students were encouraged to take the courses on the Mass or early prayer, or “Liturgy of the Day,” “Pastoral Care of the Parish,” or the course on catechetical instruction.77

These recommendations are not completely opposed to the structure of the proposed curriculum. New students would take the introductory course and either one of the courses from the cycle described in the proposal, while continuing students would take courses from the cycle of additional requirements or courses, such as the class on catechetical instruction, which may satisfy additional requirements for the non-research degree. Some of the courses do not fit neatly within the structure of the proposal, such as the courses on pastoral care or “Liturgy of the Day,” but it is possible to describe these as

77 1959 Liturgy Program Promotional Pamphlet, PNDP 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, UNDA.
courses on special questions that were an option for the non-research degree in the proposal.

The other recommendations show how the program could cater to specific interests. For example, for students that were taking additional classes after ordination, the promotional materials recommended “Liturgy of the Day,” the pastoral care course, or the course on early Christian prayer. Recommendations for teachers included the courses on catechetical instruction, “Liturgy of the Day,” or the course on pastoral care, as well as “Workshop in Gregorian Chant,” which demonstrated how to teach chant to young children. For religious interested in the Divine Office, the pamphlet suggests the basic course and courses on Gregorian chant or early Christian prayer. Though they do not fit with the requirements suggested by the curriculum proposal, recommendations of this nature provided the Liturgy Program with a means to assist students who were attending the program for only a summer or two without seeking the M.A. degree by directing them to courses that would best address their particular needs.

Growth of the Graduate Program

The graduate component of the Liturgy Program at Notre Dame underwent significant growth, evolution, and change during the 1950s. Early in the decade, it saw both a shift in the number of credits per course, which served to reduce the number of total courses students could take, and the division of the program into a research and non-
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research degree. In 1952 the program began to recognize a specific concentration in Liturgical Music, possibly collaborating in its development with the university’s music department. By the middle of the decade the program also shifted away from an annual cycle of history courses and moved towards providing a schedule of courses introducing students to the liturgy and Gregorian chant in general as well as various liturgical rites and different Christian liturgical traditions. At the same time, the program significantly increased its elective offerings, with a number of practical and pastoral courses added to the schedule, as well as a number of language courses. Most importantly, the graduate program underwent significant growth, expanding its original three classes to twelve different courses with graduate numbers and fifteen total courses in the year of Mathis’ death, 1960.

### 3.3.4 Liturgical Services

In addition to the notable shifts in the course offerings following the program’s initial years, there were also shifts and reductions in the schedule of liturgical services. Unfortunately, Mathis does not provide a description of the liturgical schedule in each year’s annual report, but the schedule is shortened from the original plan in the years when his report does give a description of the services. This can be seen in the 1950
annual report, where the liturgical schedule no longer includes the daytime minor hours.\textsuperscript{79} The 1951 schedule is similar, with the addition of Mathis’ Vigil Service to Saturday night and the inclusion of Sunday Vespers.\textsuperscript{80} It is possible that the reduction in the minor hours served as a correction from a schedule that was too ambitious. In his 1950 report, Mathis reflects on the attendance and participation and reports that there is room for improvement.\textsuperscript{81} It is also possible that the reduction in the number of services was an attempt to encourage participation by easing the burden of the large number of services to a more realistic level. Apart from the subtraction of the daytime minor hours, the other changes reflect an increased emphasis on the importance of Sundays and feast days, with additional services setting Sundays apart from the rest of the week.

An additional shift is also evidenced by short descriptions of the liturgical services found in the university bulletin’s entry for the Liturgy Program. Prior to 1951, the entry had described the services as including Mass with a homily and the recitation of some of the canonical hours. It is likely that these included the morning celebration of Lauds and the evening Compline service with Benediction that Mathis described in his 1950 report. In 1951 the description expanded to include mention of the Vigil Service in

\textsuperscript{79} Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 6.

\textsuperscript{80} Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 20 December 1951, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 5-6.

\textsuperscript{81} Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 1.
preparation for Sunday, and Sunday Vespers was added to the description in 1953.\textsuperscript{82} The description included a significant change in 1958. That year’s university bulletin’s description of the liturgical services included daily \textit{Missa Cantata} with a homily, the daily singing of Lauds and Vespers, and the weekly Vigil Service.\textsuperscript{83} Given that the years before 1958 had singled out Sunday Vespers as part of the liturgical services, it is probable that daily Vespers was not included until 1958. This final schedule shows that the program had come to privilege Vespers over Compline. This shows a final movement from a schedule that featured heavy use of the minor hours at its beginning to an emphasis on Lauds and Vespers as the two primary hours of the day.

\textbf{3.3.5 Students}

As the program grew in number of course offerings, it also grew to include many more students. Though Mathis does not provide a total number of students in the first years of the program, giving instead the number in each class, it is possible to estimate that with no more than fifteen per class, there were likely somewhere between fifteen and twenty-five graduate credit students in the first year of the graduate program. In 1949 the number of total credit students, including undergraduates, had risen to sixty-three, with


\textsuperscript{83} Notre Dame, \textit{Summer Session}, 1958, 71.
almost as many students auditing various courses.\textsuperscript{84} By 1950 the number of students had reached seventy-five, with only two undergraduate students, but the number had dropped back to the sixties with sixty-six graduate students and two undergraduates by 1952.\textsuperscript{85}

Over the next several years, the number of students steadily increased, with eighty-seven students in 1956 and around one hundred eighteen students in 1957, before significantly increasing to over two hundred students in 1958.\textsuperscript{86}

Apart from increasing numbers, one of the most important features of the student body during the program’s growth was a continued vocational diversity among the student body. Table 2 shows a breakdown of the percentage of students represented by each vocational group. This table provides a helpful look into how the program’s demographics evolved over the years. However, it is somewhat limited by incomplete data. In some years Mathis does not provide any numbers, in some years he provides a breakdown between graduate and undergraduate or for credit or auditors, and in other years he either does not make the distinction or is unclear. As a result, this table cannot

\textsuperscript{84} Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 15 December 1949, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 2.

\textsuperscript{85} Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 2-3; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 15 December 1952, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 3.

\textsuperscript{86} Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 12 December 1953, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 5; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, Mathis, 20 December 1954, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 5; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh 15 December 1955, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1; Michel Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 19 December 1956, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 13 December 1957, UNDA, 1; Michael Mathis to Damasus Winzen, 5 July 1958, CMTH 20/29, UNDA; Mathis does not give total numbers in 1955, but provides numbers for individual courses. The largest of these had 44 students taking the course for credit and 39 taking the course as auditors. In 1958, Mathis reports that there are 208 students in the liturgy program in a letter to Winzen.
provide a completely exact profile of the student body, but it can give some insights into shifts.

In general, the table shows relative consistency in the percentage of the student body made up of priests, religious brothers, and lay students. Priest students tend to be about 15-20% of the student body each year, and the number of lay students typically hovers around 10%. Religious brothers were absent from the student body of the initial graduate offering but were a small but steady presence in the years that followed.

The most interesting aspects of the breakdown of the student body are the numbers for seminarians and religious sisters. In the first year of the program, there were roughly similar numbers of seminarians and sisters. In the two years following the graduate program’s first summer the number of seminarians spikes to 38% and 43% of the student body. Following these years, however, the number of seminarians falls, and they begin to represent about twenty percent of the students, almost half of the number of seminarians enrolled in the first year. At the same time, the number and percent of sisters began to greatly increase, accounting for almost half of the students by 1957. This high percentage highlights the involvement of women religious in the liturgical movement.87

87 Many women religious were active in the liturgical movement. Of particular note are Estelle Hacket and Jane Marie Murray, who worked with Virgil Michel to produce religious education textbooks with a liturgical focus (Pecklers, The Unread Vision, 171-175). Teresa Berger highlights another important group as part of her discussion of women in the liturgical movement in her text Women’s Ways of Worship. According to Berger, the Precious Blood Sisters of O’Fallon, Missouri, worked with their chaplain, Martin Hellriegel, to better incorporate the liturgy into their community life and served as something of a model liturgical community. Teresa Berger, Women’s Ways of Worship: Gender Analysis and Liturgical History (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 101-102.
# TABLE 2

## STUDENT BODY COMPOSITION

1949-1957\(^{88}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priests (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Seminarians (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Brothers (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Sisters (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Lay Students (Percentage of Total)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>14 (22%)</td>
<td>24 (38%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>14 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>13 (17%)</td>
<td>32 (43%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>17 (23%)</td>
<td>12 (16%)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>15 (23%)</td>
<td>11 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>31 (47%)</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>29 (48%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>9 (14%)</td>
<td>17 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>29 (46%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>24 (27%)</td>
<td>18 (21%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>31 (36%)</td>
<td>11 (13%)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>35 (23%)</td>
<td>28 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>75 (49%)</td>
<td>13 (8%)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{88}\) Numbers and student types taken from: Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 15 December 1949, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 2; Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 2-3; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 15 December 1952, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 3; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 12 December 1953, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 5; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, Mathis, 20 December 1954, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 5; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 19 December 1956, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1; Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 13 December 1957, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1.
3.3.6 The Evolution of the Liturgy Program

From 1948 to 1960, the Liturgy Program enjoyed substantial growth and underwent changes, both major and minor, in its curriculum, liturgical schedule, and even student body. The primary focus of the program quickly shifted from undergraduate courses to graduate courses, and the number of graduate courses significantly grew. The Liturgy Program added graduate courses on Gregorian chant and language skills, began to offer additional electives, and reduced the number of liturgical history courses. The program also saw major growth in the total number of students and important changes in the liturgical services. Overall, these various changes to the program demonstrate a number of shifts from the earliest description of the program and Mathis’ initial vision for the curriculum.

One of the most substantial changes to the program’s curriculum from its earliest days was the decline of the undergraduate program. Though the Liturgy Program began with only undergraduate courses, this component of the program diminished in importance within a few years. Ultimately, the lower level courses would serve only to provide a foundation for students without the necessary background, while qualified undergraduates were offered the opportunity to take graduate courses with permission. Though this shift represents a major change from the initial offerings of the program, it does not appear to depart from the program’s foundational goals. Mathis had hoped to offer graduate courses from the beginning, and as early as the first year of graduate
courses, he indicated that the undergraduate courses were intended to prepare students for
the graduate program.

There were also significant changes in the course offerings at the graduate level. The first year of the graduate program included three courses, one each on Gregorian chant, interpretation of liturgical texts, and liturgical history. These courses provided both a pastoral and scholarly focus that allowed the program to serve the liturgical movement in different ways, providing both training for scholarly and pastoral liturgical leaders. The changes in coursework brought a slight shift in emphasis towards the practical aspects of the program, while maintaining aspects of scholarly preparation.

Additions to the program during the 1950s underscored the practical aspects of the Liturgy Program. Among these changes were new courses for the study of Gregorian chant and liturgical music, including a course demonstrating methods in teaching chant and courses offering different types of music lessons. This created new opportunities for students to learn how to promote chant as a means of participation and how to lead others in its use. Additionally, particularly in the second half of the 1950s, the program featured a number of new courses with practical applications, with courses on pastoral care and catechesis highlighting the intersection of those fields with the liturgy. Finally, beginning in 1952, the program offered a non-research option for the master’s degree, creating a dedicated path to the degree for students more interested in liturgical studies for its applications to their teaching or ministerial position than for scholarly research.

Despite changes in course offerings at the graduate level, particularly the loss of the annual history course, the program also continued to possess a strong scholarly
element. In addition to the continuation of courses focusing on different liturgical texts, an important part of the program’s scholarly emphasis from the beginning, the program continued to recruit well-known European liturgical scholars to teach its growing catalogue of courses. The program also continued to work to develop student research skills, particularly by increasing course offerings in Latin and Greek. Finally, though it added a non-research degree option, the program continued to provide a research degree for interested students.

By the year of Mathis’ death, 1960, the Liturgy Program had grown from three courses to fifteen courses. These courses included both courses that were included in the original curriculum, like the chant courses, and entirely new courses touching on a wide variety of topics. The program’s expansion included new courses in languages, additional chant offerings, and classes on catechesis and pastoral care, but it also involved the subtraction of some components of the original curriculum, including the annual history course. The program’s growth, both in size and diversity of course offerings, allowed it to expand to reach additional pastoral and liturgical leaders and to explore and investigate a greater range of topics on a scholarly level. In this way, it was able to remain true to Mathis’ original scholarly and practical vision.

3.4 Evaluating the Notre Dame Liturgy Program

A necessary aspect of exploring the Notre Dame Liturgy Program is investigating how successful the program was and the extent of its influence. This can be done, first,
by looking at how the program’s founder, Mathis, and university officials viewed the program. This will necessarily be followed by consideration of more objective information, both examining how the empirical information regarding program growth reflects the program’s success and appraising evidence given by outside evaluation, primarily in the liturgical journal *Orate Fratres/Worship*. Finally, the program will be considered in light of its stated purpose in order to see how it was designed to fulfill its primary goals. All of these approaches will show that the Liturgy Program was a successful, strong, and well-regarded academic program that attracted a large number of students, providing liturgical foundations to educators, musicians, potential future scholars, and others in various pastoral positions.

### 3.4.1 Self-Evaluation

The first place to turn for evaluation of the Liturgy Program is internal assessment of the work, from Mathis, the university administration, and from the leadership of his religious order. In his annual reports, Mathis speaks of the progress of the students, at times evaluating the type of students from the past year, discusses the professors, and reflects on progress with the liturgical services. Both university presidents during Mathis’ time directing the Liturgy Program, John Cavanaugh and Theodore Hesburgh, also remarked positively on the program in their responses to Mathis’ annual reports. Finally, comments of the Congregation of Holy Cross’ superior general during Mathis’ time with the Liturgy Program also offer praise and endorsement of Mathis’ work.
Mathis’ annual reports give a generally positive appraisal of the program, though there are some exceptions where he describes areas for improvement. For example, in some cases, Mathis reports that a number of students were unprepared for graduate studies. However, at other times, he remarks on the excellence of the students, saying in 1950 that the students were performing admirably in classes and that many exceeded the requirements for admission.\(^{89}\) The 1954 report is an example of both a positive and negative assessment of the students, as Mathis claims that the students are the best they have had to date but adds that many of them still lack a basic background in liturgy and chant.\(^{90}\) Mathis’ reporting on the liturgical celebrations was similarly mixed. In 1950, he wrote that he was seeing increased participation in the liturgical functions but that he hoped for improvements, and in 1951 he claimed that he was still unsatisfied and believed that more could be done.\(^{91}\) Mathis also gave a very positive evaluation of the professors and at times looked optimistically towards future years. In the 1957 annual report, Mathis highlighted the quality of Bouyer and Mohrmann’s lectures, along with the rest of the professors, saying, “Not only were the lectures of these outstanding world scholars noteworthy, but all along the line our staff was encouraged to do perhaps the best job that we have yet succeeded in accomplishing in our Liturgy Program for the

\(^{89}\) Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 3.

\(^{90}\) Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 20 December 1954, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 8.

\(^{91}\) Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 1; Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 20 December 1951, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 6.
Summer Session.”"92 As a whole, the annual reports give a positive assessment of the program, though they also occasionally highlight areas Mathis would like to see improve.

Even more positive than Mathis’ assessments are the responses of the university presidents to the annual reports. The first sign of these positive notes comes after the 1949 annual report, where Cavanaugh responds, saying, “You must derive much satisfaction from realizing that deeper understanding of the life giving Liturgy is spreading because of your zeal.”93 Praise continued in Cavanaugh’s responses and into Hesburgh’s. Following the 1952 report, Hesburgh wrote, “Your work has brought great honor upon the University, and I do hope it can be continued and deepened as the years go on,”94 and after the 1953 report, Hesburgh wrote, “I know that at times you may be discouraged, but I do want to tell you sincerely that I think you have done a truly prodigious work for the foundation of the Liturgical Movement in the United States.”95

These letters are usually very short, often no more than a page, but they show that the program was well regarded by the university administration.

Finally, by the end of his career, Mathis’ program also saw support and praise from the leadership of his religious order. Most notably, Christopher O’Toole, C.S.C., the superior general of the Congregation of Holy Cross from 1950-1962, mentioned Mathis

92 Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 2.
93 John Cavanaugh to Michael Mathis, 27 December 1949, CMTH 6/21, UNDA.
94 Theodore Hesburgh to Michael Mathis, 20 December 1952, CMTH 10/20, UNDA.
95 Theodore Hesburgh to Michael Mathis, 21 December 1953, CMTH 10/20, UNDA.

103
and the Liturgy Program in his circular letter to the order on the liturgy in 1959.

Concerning the program, he writes,

At the same time we cannot underestimate the profound and scholarly influence exercised by the Liturgical Program at the University of Notre Dame conceived and organized by Father Michael A. Mathis. Naturally, the influence of these sessions has gone far beyond the confines of Notre Dame... I urge Provincial Superiors to allow as many religious as possible to profit by the exceptionally scholarly opportunities afforded by this program... May I take this occasion to congratulate most sincerely Father Mathis and the staff working with him at the University. Their hard work, enthusiasm, and results represent a great contribution toward the liturgical movement not only in the United States but throughout the world.\(^{96}\)

O’Toole’s recommendation shows that the leadership of his order believed the Liturgy Program had made important contributions to the liturgical movement in general and could assist in ongoing liturgical renewal within the order itself.

Overall, the internal assessment and review of the Liturgy Program is quite positive. Though Mathis certainly felt that there were some areas for improvement, both he and the university presidents concluded that the program was doing well. However, the internal estimates of success should not be completely accepted without some caution. It would be natural for those closely involved with the program to view it positively. Because of this, it is important to seek confirmation of the positive comments in other sources.

3.4.2 Empirical Evidence

One way to begin verifying the positive reports contained in the program’s self-assessments is to look to see if success is reflected in the program’s numbers. As has been shown in the chapter, the program experienced a great deal of growth during the ten years that Mathis directed it. The program began with only three undergraduate courses and expanded to over a dozen courses of different types by the time Mathis died. Large numbers of classes on a variety of topics point to the program being able to give a more comprehensive approach to its course offerings, addressing various areas of need in liturgical education. Though the number of students is not available for every year, this chapter has shown similar growth in the numbers of students, with the program growing to over 200 students in 1958. The growth in students suggests that the program was able to reach an ever-increasing number of potential liturgical leaders and scholars, spreading liturgical competencies and the message of the liturgical movement to a wider audience. Together, the growth in both courses and students point to both a general level of health in the program and a potentially large impact on the liturgical movement in the United States.

3.4.3 Outside Assessment

Some of most important evidence for evaluating the Liturgy Program, however, comes from a number of outside sources. These are found in three forms: reviews of the
program, especially from the program’s first years, annual announcements of the Liturgy Program in the *Liturgical Briefs* section of *Orate Fratres* and *Worship*, and reflections written after the death of Mathis. The first of these can be found primarily in the liturgical journal *Orate Fratres* and in *Caecilia*, a journal for liturgical music. The announcements do not say a lot about the program but typically include some word of praise for the work that was being done at Notre Dame. The memorials are found both in *Worship* and the proceedings of the National Liturgical Week and tend to simply reflect on the importance of Mathis and the Liturgy Program rather than give more detailed review of the program. These outside evaluations, though limited in number and scope, provide an independent positive assessment of the program.

The program’s success in the early years can be seen in a number of positive journal reviews. While there appear to be no major reviews of the program written after the first year of the graduate program, three reviews were written by visiting professors after the 1948 summer session. Diekmann and Reinhold discussed the program in the September 1948 *Orate Fratres*, and the chant professor, Vitry, wrote about the program in *Caecilia*.

Reinhold’s review appears in his *Timely Tracts* column in the September 1948 issue of *Orate Fratres*. Reinhold claims that the school performs an important task by offering an opportunity for seminarians, who, he reports, receive a poor liturgical education in seminaries, to learn more about the liturgy. He also praises the integration of liturgy and study, saying,
The fact that the common exercises of the Notre Dame liturgical school are all liturgical in the strict sense of the word is an added advantage: that unfortunate chasm in so many schools between theory and practice, lip service to the excellence of the Church’s liturgy concomitant with either complete neglect of its basic notions or routine performance of it without joy and heart, is avoided here.  

Finally, he suggests that the school can be helpful beyond training teachers and researchers by providing needed liturgical background for potential members of diocesan liturgical committees.  

Diekmann’s review follows Reinhold’s comments on the program in the same issue of *Orate Fratres*. While admitting that there are disadvantages to the program only offering courses during the summer, Diekmann offers even more praise of Mathis’ work, saying “Certainly it is already unique in the Western hemisphere. The American liturgical movement can look to it with high hopes of future leadership.” He also adds that he believes Notre Dame is the answer to the need for a place to educate specialists in the liturgy, claiming that for this purpose the Liturgy Program “is not equaled anywhere in Europe.” Diekmann concludes by encouraging attendance by discussing upcoming offerings and the potential benefits of participation in the program.  

Vitry also praises the program’s commitment to Gregorian chant in his editorial comments in the May-June 1948 issue of *Caecilia*. Vitry’s discussion of the program is

---

98 Ibid., 456-457.  
99 “Liturgical Briefs,” *Orate Fratres* 22:10 (September 1948), 471-472. The author’s indication that he lectured for a week in 1947 and the whole summer in 1948 makes it clear that this is Diekmann.  
100 Ibid., 472.
part of his overall discussion of summer courses in Gregorian chant. Concerning these courses in general, Vitry argues that thousands of students have taken them, but “the penetration of the Chant of the Church into Catholic life has not been achieved…. The few oases wherein very creditable and sometimes remarkable work is being done, are surrounded by an immense wilderness whereupon the Chant remains taboo in devotion and is scorned with a scandalous indifference.”\textsuperscript{101} Vitry suggests that the source of this problem is that the training in Gregorian chant is too theoretical and disconnected and that there are two major failings of Gregorian chant summer courses, a disconnect from liturgical life and a superficial approach that treats the chant course like any other and gives too much information in too short of a time.\textsuperscript{102} Vitry reports that the new summer school of liturgy at Notre Dame avoids the shortcomings of many chant courses and claims that, “It is permissible to foresee in the newborn course of Notre Dame University a new and brighter day for liturgical music.”\textsuperscript{103}

Though they are very brief, the announcements of the Liturgy Program and other notes about it in the \textit{Liturgical Briefs} section of \textit{Orate Fratres} and \textit{Worship} show the program’s high standing in the eyes of a major liturgical journal. These notices typically favored Notre Dame over other liturgy programs, often giving it first place in its notices


\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., 112-113.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 113, 128.
about such schools. In at least one such case, *Worship* referred to the Notre Dame program as most important, saying, “First in importance among the summer schools of liturgical interest this year is again unquestionably that at Notre Dame University, under the direction of Fr. Michael Mathis, C.S.C.”\(^{104}\) The journal also frequently highlighted Notre Dame for its excellent faculty and academic strength. Discussing the faculty of the 1949 summer session, *Orate Fratres* says, “Here, in literal truth, is the chance of a lifetime. And all of us in the U.S. interested in the liturgy must be grateful to Notre Dame for placing it within reach.”\(^ {105}\) A few months later, *Orate Fratres* again praised the program’s excellent faculty, particularly Josef Jungmann, saying, “We reiterate our conviction that securing Dr. Jungmann’s services constitutes a major scholastic coup and makes Fr. Mathis something of a miracle man.”\(^ {106}\) A few years later, in 1954, the journal claimed, “There is no other school in the world which offers equally concentrated instruction on the liturgy by such experts.”\(^ {107}\) The “Liturgical Briefs” section of *Worship* did not confine its praise of the program to notices about upcoming summer sessions. Reflecting on an article by Hofinger about liturgical training in seminaries, which had its origins in a lecture given at Notre Dame, the section claims that the program has “done a magnificent service to America’s liturgical apostolate by making available specialized


\(^{105}\) “Liturgical Briefs” *Orate Fratres* 23:3 (January 1949), 132.


courses in the liturgy of highest caliber…. It has been a farsighted, pioneering work, unique in its field, of which we can be justly proud.”

Finally, both Diekmann and Frederick McManus reflected on the importance of Mathis and his liturgy program at the end of his life. Prior to Mathis’ death, Diekmann wrote about Mathis in advance of the 1959 Liturgical Week at Notre Dame. Diekmann praises Mathis, saying that he “deserves Catholic America’s thanks for his wise and selfless labors in laying more scholarly foundations to popular liturgical efforts, specifically by means of the Notre Dame liturgical summer schools.” He would again discuss the importance of Mathis in a memorial to him in *Worship*. Concerning the liturgy program, Diekmann suggests that it is too early to judge specifically the importance of the program, but also argues that it is clear that the program is of “capital significance.” McManus also reflects on the importance of Mathis and the Liturgy Program in the Preface to the proceedings of the 1959 Liturgical Week at Notre Dame. McManus says,

His [Mathis’] principal and enduring achievement for the sacramental renewal is the Liturgy Program of the University of Notre Dame, established by him in 1947. With patient but enthusiastic guidance, this has become the most significant center of liturgical scholarship in the English speaking world and has guaranteed a sound basis for pastoral liturgical growth in the United States.

---

McManus also goes on to say that the influence of Mathis and the professors of the program will continue in the program’s students.\textsuperscript{112}

These outside sources confirm a positive evaluation of the Liturgy Program. Reviews from early in the program highlight the promise and potential the program shows, focusing on the educational needs that it may fulfill. As the program aged, Worship continued to praise its work, particularly highlighting the excellent professors. Finally, at the end of Mathis’ life, two different writers praised the liturgy program for its important work establishing a scholarly basis for the liturgical movement in the United States. Overall, these show that the program was well regarded and, at the least, thought of as academically successful.

3.4.4 Assessing the Program in Light of its Goals

A final means of exploring the program’s level of success is to return to its stated purpose and examine the program in light of these stated goals. The first step in this process is to clearly establish the program’s purpose, making use of its annual reports, Mathis’ 1948 special lecture, entries in the university bulletin, and promotional materials for the program. Once established, the program’s objective can be used to assess the program by first examining how the program’s structure and requirements served to

\textsuperscript{112} McManus, Preface, III.
promote its goals. Next, the program’s courses can be discussed in light of each individual goal, examining how the courses did or did not serve to serve that aspect of the program’s purpose. This can be followed by evaluation of how the program’s liturgical services served its goals and how the vocational makeup of the program’s student body can give evidence that the program achieved some of its aims. Finally, the observations expressed by outside reviews may also serve to show how or if the program successfully fulfilled its stated purpose.

_Establishing the Program’s Purpose_

The most complete and clear description of Mathis’ purpose with the Liturgy Program in its first years of existence comes from the 1948 annual report. In a description of the program’s objectives, discussed above, Mathis reports that the goal of the graduate program was to train students in research for their work as teachers and pastoral leaders and for the development of liturgical scholarship. In the same report, he claims that the objective of the undergraduate program was to provide students with a background in the liturgy in general and liturgical arts in particular and to provide training in chant for liturgical participation. Additionally, in his special lecture, delivered earlier in 1948, Mathis highlights both the promotion of research skills and the support of chant as important purposes of the program.

In addition to Mathis’ early writings about the Liturgy Program, details about its purpose may also be gleaned from the program’s entries in the university bulletin. As early as the 1950-1951 academic year, the bulletin indicated, “The purpose of this program is to introduce the student into research work in the fields of Sacred Liturgy so
as to enable the graduate to continue his studies and writings and to teach Liturgy.”

By the 1955-1956 academic year, the description of the program’s purpose had undergone some minor evolution, increasing its emphasis on teaching, and said, “The purpose of this program is to introduce the student to research work in the field of Sacred Liturgy, so as to enable the graduate to continue his studies and writings, and to teach Liturgy on the grade, high school, college and university levels.” These texts suggest that the overall purpose is the program is to produce both scholarly writers and teachers with a strong liturgical background, with the latter text emphasizing that the program prepares students to teach liturgy at all levels of schooling. Missing from these two descriptions is any mention of a desire to create further awareness of liturgical music or arts or the need to provide formation for pastoral leaders.

Finally, further declaration of the program’s purpose can be found in the promotional pamphlets sent out in various years. Addressing purpose, the program’s 1951 pamphlet claims,

THE ACADEMIC OBJECTIVE of the Graduate Program is to initiate the student into research work in this field, leading to an M.A. in the Liturgy. This degree will be given to students who have successfully completed four semesters (4 Summer Sessions) and who have written an acceptable dissertation on an approved subject. From the standpoint of practice, this education should prepare graduate students, first, for training others to participate fully in the communal action of liturgical singing, and, secondly, for explaining liturgical functions to


others, especially the priest in a homily at Mass, and the teacher in the class
room.115

In the following year, and for several years after that, the description provided similar
goals, but began to specify goals for students focusing in Gregorian chant. It says,

The training of both the research and non-research programs should qualify
students, who have majored in Gregorian Chant, to train others in the communal
action of liturgical singing, and, secondly, those who have majored in Liturgy, as
such, should be qualified to explain liturgical functions to others, as teachers in
school, and as preachers in the pulpit.116

These two promotional texts focus on providing educators and liturgical leaders who
could instruct their students and parishioners in the liturgy and preparing students to
promote Gregorian chant.

These sources show that the program’s primary goal was to introduce students to
liturgical research in order to prepare them to support and promote the liturgy in a
number of different roles. The different sources appear to favor different ways that the
program would serve to prepare students, though the 1948 annual report, the university
bulletin, and the promotional materials all agreed that one of the purposes of the liturgical
education offered by the program was to provide teachers with the liturgical training
necessary to instruct their students in the liturgy. Other tasks that the program hoped to

115 1951 Liturgy Program Promotional Pamphlet, PNDP 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY
DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, UNDA.

116 1952 Liturgy Program Promotional Pamphlet, PNDP 40-TH-02 -THEOLOGY
DEPARTMENT - LITURGY PROGRAM 1940's-1950's, UNDA.
educate its students for include the promotion of Gregorian chant, the appreciation and proper use of liturgical art and architecture, pastoral liturgical leadership, and continuing studies and writings as liturgical scholars. The successful training of students for these tasks is the criterion for determining if the program was able to accomplish its goals.

Program Structure

The structure of the program’s requirements was well suited to accomplishing at least some of these goals. From the beginning, the program’s structure, particularly its requirements for a thesis and language competencies, was suited to preparing potential scholars for further work as a researcher. With the addition of the non-research option in 1952, the program was able to better serve those who wanted to study liturgy in order to teach it at grade school or high school levels by reducing the research-oriented requirements and providing additional courses that would allow them to expand their knowledge base. This non-research option would also serve well in providing liturgical training to other pastoral leaders.

Program Courses

From a general standpoint, the courses offered by the Liturgy Program gave students the opportunity to receive a well-rounded education in the liturgy that could be put to use in any of the possible roles described by the various program materials. In its early years, the program offered students the possibility of receiving an overview of the entirety of liturgical history as well as courses in a number of liturgical texts. These courses would provide students with essential knowledge not only about the liturgy but also about the central concepts and methods in the field. Undergraduate courses in the
early years also allowed the program to provide important background in the liturgy for students who were not qualified for the graduate program. Near the end of Mathis’ time as director, the types of courses shifted, but students continued to receive a strong foundation in liturgical studies through the graduate course in basic liturgy and through course offerings on the history and theology of the Mass or Divine Office.

Beyond providing a general foundation in liturgical studies, several of the program’s courses, especially in the second half of the 1950s, served to support it in its goal of training educators in the liturgy. Specific courses on catechesis, such as “Catechetical Initiation into Liturgical Life” and “The Glad Tidings of Catechetical Instruction,” were particularly relevant for educators. Additionally, courses on Gregorian chant and liturgical arts could also be applied in the classroom, especially in a parish school, where they could be used to initiate students into active participation. In particular, the program’s “Workshop in Gregorian Integration” was well suited to providing potential teachers with the tools to teach Gregorian chant to students.

The program’s course offerings were also supportive of the other tasks for which it hoped to prepare students. For example, the goal of “deepening the liturgical foundations” of pastoral leaders was accomplished in general by the program’s thorough treatment of liturgical topics, and in particular by its courses on music, art, catechesis, and pastoral care. These courses offered pastoral leaders an opportunity to receive important formation on the relationship between the liturgy and these topics. For the program’s goal of promoting Gregorian chant, the required choir practice in some years likely familiarized students with chant, while the various course offerings in both the
theory and practice of chant and methods of teaching would help students to promote and lead others in Gregorian chant. Courses also supported the development of research scholars, as many of the courses, particularly the program’s history courses, were designed to develop research skills that would assist future scholars in their work. Finally, while the program offered a course on liturgical architecture and art in a number of years, Mathis reports that it was not very popular. The unpopularity of this course indicates that the program was less successful in introducing and promoting liturgical art and architecture among its students than it was with other important goals.

Other Considerations

In addition to the program’s degree requirements and coursework, its regular liturgical functions also served to help fulfill its stated purpose. By providing a model for a Mass with active participation, as well as communal celebration of the Divine Office, the Liturgy Program helped to form pastoral leaders, giving them the foundation the program desired through exposure to quality liturgy and, at the same time, providing an example of how to improve the liturgy in their own schools and parishes. Additionally, because the program’s regular liturgical exercises emphasized congregational singing, they worked to support the program’s goal of emphasizing chant for the sake of participation.

The number of students and the composition of the student body may also give some hint about the program’s success with its stated goals. This chapter has shown that large numbers of both seminarians and religious sisters made up the majority of students in the summer program in the years that Mathis provides a vocationally specific breakdown of students. The presence of such large numbers of seminarians and sisters suggests that the program was successful in reaching both pastoral leaders and religious educators.

Outside Assessment

While review of the program’s structure, course offerings, and liturgical services can show how it was designed to effectively fulfill its established goals and discussion of the makeup of the student body can begin to indicate areas the program was successful in, examination of outside sources helps to confirm the program’s success in achieving its purpose. Helpful sources for this task come from two periods of Mathis’ time as the program director. The first group of texts consists of reviews from the graduate program’s first year of operation, while the second includes texts reflecting on Mathis and the Notre Dame Liturgy Program’s work near the end of his life or shortly after his death. While these texts are not attempts to assess the program in light of its stated purpose or goals, their remarks address issues related to the goals.

The three reviews discussed earlier in this chapter are universally positive and each touch on a different aspect of the program’s purpose. Reinhold’s review, “Pioneering at Notre Dame,” argues that the program can be particularly helpful for seminarians and for members of diocesan liturgical commissions, while also mentioning
researchers and teachers. Reinhold’s review also touches on the formation of scholars, saying that the Liturgy Program has a “wider aim” than the formation of research scholars and adding that there is hope that the school will “develop into a permanent research center for liturgical studies…” The review in the “Liturgical Briefs” section of the same issue singles out seminary professors as a group that would greatly benefit from attendance. Finally, while Vitry’s review does not discuss the program’s advantages for a specific type of student, it does argue that the program shows promise for the promotion of chant in the United States. These comments show that, after just a year of operation, liturgical leaders in the United States saw the potential for the program to prepare pastoral liturgical leaders, in the form of seminarians and diocesan liturgical commission members, to train teachers, especially seminary instructors, and to promote Gregorian chant, three of the important goals Mathis identified in his 1948 writings.

Diekmann’s and McManus’ reflections on Mathis and the Liturgy Program near the end of his lifetime also show the program’s success in achieving its goals. Both point to the scholarship provided to the liturgical movement through the Liturgy Program, claiming that the pastoral efforts of the movement benefited from Mathis’ work. This shows that the program was perceived to be successful in providing liturgical leaders with significant academic training in the liturgy. While they do not speak to specific


types of students and liturgical leaders that the program was able to train, they provide confirmation that the program was able to accomplish its goals in a general way.

_The Success of the Notre Dame Liturgy Program_

Though not absolutely conclusive, this survey of the Liturgy Program’s requirements and course offerings and reviews of the program show that the program was likely able to train students to promote the liturgy in many of the ways it identified as important. The program’s requirements and course offerings provided the adaptability to effectively train scholars, pastoral liturgical leaders, educators, and liturgical musicians and fulfilled several of the program’s stated goals. Examination of the program’s liturgical services shows that they helped the program achieve its goals by offering liturgical models for teachers and pastoral leaders, while also encouraging the students to participate through Gregorian chant. Additionally, examination of Mathis’ breakdown of student vocations shows that the program was likely successful in training pastoral leaders and teachers. Finally, reviews and comments about the program from outside writers have also shown that the program was believed to be particularly useful for liturgical leaders and teachers on various levels and have provided evidence to suggest the program was well equipped to develop research scholars.

Of the major five tasks identified as what the program hoped to prepare students for, there is evidence to show that Mathis and the Liturgy Program were likely able to achieve four in the regular summer sessions. These included the formation of teachers and scholars, as well as providing liturgical knowledge to pastoral leaders and introducing the liturgy students to chant. The introduction of students to liturgical
architecture and art was not as clearly accomplished in the summer sessions, though several courses were offered on the subject. Overall, the evidence suggests that the Liturgy Program was very successful in achieving its stated purpose during Mathis’ lifetime, and, because of this, it was able to support the liturgical movement in multiple ways.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the Liturgy Program from its founding in 1947 until the death of its founder and director, Michael Mathis, in March of 1960. It first discussed possible inspirations for the program and elements in Mathis’ career that helped him prepare for his educational apostolate. Next, the early days of the program were considered, with particular emphasis on the courses offered and the program’s liturgical schedule. This was followed by a look at the changes that took place in the following twelve years, until the death of Mathis, again with a focus on coursework. Finally, the chapter considered how the program changed from the early years to Mathis’ death and looked at different ways to evaluate the program’s success.

From this survey, it is possible to make some summary statements and conclusions. First, Mathis designed the program from its early days to include both pastoral and scholarly concerns, offering challenging courses from top tier professors in order to train teachers, pastoral leaders, and liturgical scholars. Though there were changes in the courses over the years, the pastoral and scholarly focuses of the program
remained through his tenure. Second, the liturgy program drew a large and diverse student population. Including in its course rosters students from women’s religious orders, seminarians, diocesan priests, lay persons, and a small number of religious brothers, the Liturgy Program’s reach touched many areas of ecclesiastical life and ministry. Third, the excellent faculty that Mathis recruited was one of the most important aspects of the Liturgy Program. The strong faculty, drawn from both pastoral and academic leaders of the liturgical movement in both the United States and Europe, served to attract students and inspire praise, and it allowed the Liturgy Program to teach liturgical studies in the most scholarly fashion possible. Finally, and most importantly, Mathis’ Liturgy Program successfully established itself as a liturgical school that was able to provide well-trained scholars, teachers, musicians, and other liturgical leaders for the liturgical movement in this country.
CHAPTER 4:

LITURGY PROGRAM SECONDARY PROJECTS

In addition to the main summer session academic courses offered by the Liturgy Program, Mathis also worked to develop a number of associated programs that expanded both the pastoral and academic reach of the program. These initiatives included annual seminars for artists and architects, yearly conferences for priests and seminarians, a publishing program using lectures from the summer session courses, and a planned program for the academic year. This chapter will examine the history, content, and goals of these projects with an eye towards understanding how Mathis used these projects to widen the impact of the program. Though each of the expansions of the program includes elements of both pastoral and practical concerns and a scholarly focus, it is helpful to split the program’s additional efforts into those with a more pastoral accent and those with academic and scholarly emphases.
4.1Pastoral Conferences

During Mathis’ time as director of the Liturgy Program at Notre Dame, the program frequently put its resources to work for pastoral and practical purposes. The previous chapter has shown that the program offered a number of courses, particularly in the final years of Mathis’ life, focused on practical and pastoral concerns. Pastoral concerns can also be seen in some of the program’s associated extracurricular programs, such as in the program’s earliest efforts to expand beyond the traditional classroom courses, as well as in seminars and workshops for clergy and artists that emerged during the middle of the 1950s. This section will look at how the extracurricular programs for priests and seminarians and artists and architects developed, and it will examine how the Liturgy Program used these initiatives to spread liturgical awareness and ability among professionals who were already or about to be engaged in important ministerial work.

4.1.1Early Expansions

As early as 1947, the first year of the program’s existence, Mathis made an effort to widen the reach of the Liturgy Program beyond the regular credit students in classes. The “Aspects of the Liturgy” course included a nightly forum where both students from the program and anyone with an interest in the subject could engage with the week’s lecturer about his topic. The annual report from 1947 claims that this was very successful,
reporting that the forum at times attracted entire classes from outside the program.\textsuperscript{1}
Additionally, the previous chapter has shown that another way the program broadened its reach beyond credit students was through the inclusion of a large number of auditing students in the program’s courses. By both allowing and encouraging this outside engagement, Mathis and the Liturgy Program began a precedent of reaching beyond the small number of students who were able to attend the program as credit-seeking students.

Beyond the initial inclusion of non-credit-seeking students in courses and the forum connected with the “Aspects of the Liturgy” course, the next major extracurricular expansion came in the 1951 summer session with the introduction of a weekly evening presentation on the place of liturgy in the teaching of religion. This included lectures, taught by current and former students of the Liturgy Program and by Mathis, on how to incorporate liturgy into religious instruction at the elementary, high school, college, and graduate levels. Mathis, however, does not give any indication about how many people attended this public seminar.\textsuperscript{2} The Liturgy Program would again take up this topic in 1955, concentrating specifically on grade school and high school, with both lectures focusing on teaching students about the Mass.\textsuperscript{3}

These early attempts to extend the reach of the Liturgy Program helped set the stage for the program’s expansions in the years to come. The first Workshop for Priests
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and Seminarians would take place just one year after the first major extracurricular lectures, and the first Seminar for Artists and Architects would begin in 1954. More importantly, the topic of these lectures, the relationship between liturgy and education, would be taken up later by the Workshops for Priests and Seminarians, becoming a recurring theme of the program.

4.1.2 Workshops for Priests and Seminarians

The first major expansion of the Liturgy Program’s extracurricular activities came in 1952, when, following the recommendation of the board of directors of the National Liturgical Conference, the Liturgy Program began to offer a weeklong seminar for priests and seminarians. These workshops each ran for about a week in the summer sessions from 1952 until 1957. In addition to these workshops, Mathis also oversaw a related conference for priests on the revised rites for Holy Week in February 1956, which will be discussed in chapter eight.

Mathis does not always speak in great detail about these workshops in his annual reports. However, in addition to the annual report letters that Mathis sent to Hesburgh, further information from these workshops can be found in schedules, letters, and promotional materials found in the Mathis Papers in the Notre Dame Archives.

The first mention of the Workshop for Priests and Seminarians in Mathis’ writings is in the Liturgy Program’s final annual report sent to Cavanagh in 1951. There Mathis reports that, following the suggestion of the board of directors of the National
Liturgical Conference, the program would begin to offer a weeklong workshop for priests and seminarians in the summer of 1952. Schidel reports that the genesis of the project was a hope “to give opportunity to interested priests and seminarians to profit from the program even though they could not attend the whole summer session.” The first workshop, running from July 28 to August 1, 1952, included three major presentations, demonstrations of teaching liturgy, and opportunities to participate in the regular classes and liturgies of the summer program. Each day’s schedule began with Lauds and Mass, followed by the regular classes of the Liturgy Program. In the afternoons, the schedule included additional classes and, on most days, demonstrations on incorporating the liturgy into grade school and high school religion classes. Finally, in the evenings, the program featured Compline with benediction, and a featured speaker. The presentations for the 1952 workshop included a lecture from Louis Bouyer, who was teaching at Notre Dame at the time, on “Liturgical Piety for Priests and Seminarians,” and lectures from Frank Quinn and Aloysius Wilmes on how to integrate the liturgy into the parish and other Catholic ministries. According to Mathis, the attendance at this workshop was around thirty seminarians and twenty priests.
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6 Schedule for “Liturgy Workshop for Priests and Seminarians: July 28-August 1,” CMTH 20/33, UNDA.
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Mathis’ 1953 annual report does not indicate a topic for the second workshop, but he does report that it had forty-eight participants and was a great success, benefitting greatly from the presence of Martin Hellriegel. The schedule for this workshop shows that it followed largely the same schedule from the first year, including the demonstrations in incorporating liturgy into religion classes. The special lectures for this workshop began with presentations on the Divine Office by Boniface Luykx and on the topic of “Why is Gregorian Chant the Integrating Factor in Liturgy?” by Thomas P. Conley, an assistant pastor of a parish in Hubbard Woods, IL. In the second half of the week the special presentations turned to the question of deepening liturgical life, first looking at how it might be accomplished in the diocese, led by the staff of the Liturgical Institute of Kansas City, Missouri, and then at how it may be accomplished in the parish, with Hellriegel. In the following year, Mathis does not provide many details about the workshop in his report to Hesburgh, mentioning only that the participants’ fees covered its expenses.

Beginning in 1955, the workshops began to take a new shape. While previously the workshops had taken place over the course of most of a week and included regular participation in the Liturgy Program’s classes throughout the week, the 1955 and
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following sessions were condensed and shifted away from course attendance as a major component of the program. Program participants continued to take part in the liturgical exercises of the Liturgy Program, but the morning classroom sessions were replaced with one of the special lectures. This change was not entirely well received, and, replying to one concerned sister in March of 1955, Mathis explained the reasons for the change. In his letter, Mathis reports that the alternative approach was inspired by the program’s experience working with architects in the previous summer. On this note, he argues,

In the past we found out that just going to the regular classes, for which few of them were prepared, did not help them as well as the special lectures we gave last year to the one-day Workshop for architects. For this Workshop we had special lectures for just these architects, and it helped them very much. Of course at this Workshop and for the five-day Workshop next summer (for priests, seminarians and alumni of the Liturgy Program) there will be special sessions besides the evening sessions which we formerly had. Of course all Members of the Workshop will be free to attend any particular class they want to attend.\textsuperscript{11}

Promotional materials for this summer’s workshop also indicate that a limited participation in the program's courses was envisioned, with the final morning of the workshop set aside for anyone who wished to attend the courses.\textsuperscript{12}

This shift in structure is a logical change to the workshops. Though many participants may have taken advantage of the opportunity to attend courses during their week at Notre Dame and been disappointed when the practice was discontinued, Mathis’ arguments suggest that attending courses was not the most fruitful use of their time at
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Notre Dame. Additionally, the influx of so many underprepared students into the classes of the Liturgy Program may have been disruptive to the regular classes and taxing on the professors. The shift allowed for the workshop participants to hear scholarly lectures that did not require as much additional background, and, as a result, were better suited to their level of preparation with less disruption to the regular summer session.

The topics for the 1955 and 1956 workshops formed a brief series on “Basic Training in the Liturgy” for different age groups. The special lectures at the 1955 workshop included lectures on worship for parishes, adult education and study clubs, elementary schools, high schools and colleges, and major seminaries, as well as a lecture on Gregorian chant and participation. The presenters included Ermin Vitry, Johannes Hofinger, Gerald Ellard, Shawn Sheehan, and Hellriegel.\textsuperscript{13} The 1956 workshop served as a follow-up and addressed outlines for handbooks for basic training in liturgy. Lecture topics included designs for a handbook in teaching chant and outlines touching on liturgical training in grade school, college, high school, and seminary. Presenters in 1956 again included Vitry, Hellriegel, Hofinger, as well as John Quinn and Jane Marie Murray.\textsuperscript{14} Mathis reports that this workshop had about seventy-five attendees.\textsuperscript{15} The final session of the workshop was held in 1957 and was focused on the relationship of private
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and liturgical prayer. This session included only three major presentations, one each on liturgical and private prayer and one on the relationship between the two.16

Two related major themes stand out for their regular inclusion in these workshops. The first of these is discussing how to deepen the liturgical life of Catholics at different levels of church ministry. The first two workshops approached this question, asking how to integrate the liturgy into parish life and Catholic institutions in 1952 and how to deepen liturgical life in these locations in 1953. These questions are at the heart of the movement for liturgical renewal and show an ongoing discussion about how to apply the scholarship and principles of the liturgical movement on a basic level in the parishes, schools, and other ministries of the church. The second, and arguably more prevalent, theme that emerges from these workshops is the importance of education in liturgy and worship. Education and training in the liturgy was the major focus of two consecutive workshops, and the first workshops also included demonstrations on incorporating the liturgy into Catholic education.

In addition to these two major themes, two other important components of the workshops need to be noted. The first of these is the continued importance of Gregorian chant for the Liturgy Program. Chant played an important role in the coursework of the program throughout the 1950s, and the workshops continued to reflect this emphasis. There were presentations on chant in many of the summer workshops, including a lecture

16 Michael Mathis Promotional Form Letter, “Dear Friend,” 19 June 1957, CMTH 20/43, UNDA.
on chant’s importance for active participation in 1955. Secondly, the important role of liturgical functions for the academic program carried over into the workshops. This allowed workshop participants the opportunity to worship temporarily in a community committed to active participation and the renewal of the liturgy promoted by the liturgical movement; this may have served to provide both an example of what might be done, and encouragement that such worship was possible.

With the shift in format in 1955, the Workshop for Priests and Seminarians began to be shortened, moving from nearly a week to a span of a long weekend. In some ways, the initial reduction simply served to condense the program, with a similar number of special lectures delivered over a shorter period of time. However, by 1957, the program for the workshop was reduced to three days and three lectures. After summer of 1957, the workshop was discontinued. Schidel reflects on the discontinuation of the workshops in his memorial for Mathis, reporting that the program was not unpopular or unsuccessful, but was instead a victim of its own success. He claims that program had become so popular that it became too much of a strain on the program staff to continue.\(^\text{17}\) Since Mathis does not provide attendance figures for each year, it is difficult to confirm this. The workshop did, however, grow from around fifty participants in its first year to seventy-five by 1956. Additionally, since many of the special lectures were not delivered by Liturgy Program faculty, the extent of the burden placed by the workshops on the

program is unclear, and there may be additional, undiscovered reasons why they were discontinued.

The limited nature of Mathis’ comments in his annual reports about the workshops for priests and seminarians makes it somewhat difficult to judge its success. It is possible, however, to make three brief comments. The first is that the lectures, the liturgies, and even the courses gave priests and seminarians an experience of the liturgical movement. It allowed them to encounter liturgies that facilitated participation, meet leaders in the liturgical movement and other likeminded priests, and exposed them, sometimes briefly and without adequate preparation, to some of the leading scholars of the liturgy in the United States and, to a lesser extent, Europe. Secondly, through workshop themes focused on incorporating the liturgy into Catholic life and training Catholics of all ages in the liturgy, the workshops worked to turn the participants into promoters of the liturgical movement. Finally, based on Schidel’s comments concerning the popularity and the signs that the workshop did grow over the years between its founding and final installment in 1957, it is possible to say that the workshop program was successful at expanding the Liturgy Program’s impact beyond the summer session students in the years it was active.

4.1.3 Seminars for Artists and Architects

A second way that Mathis and the Liturgy Program expanded their offerings on a pastoral level beyond the traditional summer session program was through annual
architecture seminars. An evolutionary outgrowth of the course regularly offered on liturgical art, the annual seminar met near the end of the summer and drew on the resources of the summer Liturgy Program. These seminars sought to give artists and architects who worked on Catholic churches the liturgical understanding to build and adorn churches that would serve to facilitate both deeper reflection and more active participation from the congregation.

Architecture was an important aspect of the Liturgy Program as early as the first summer session. In the first year, the Aspects of the Liturgy course included lectures by H.A. Reinhold titled “Ecclesiastical Spaces.” The annual report for the 1947 summer session also notes that “whole classes in architecture, journalism and religion, etc., availed themselves of the opportunity not only of the liturgical forum, but also occasionally of the liturgical classes when they were pertinent to the professional work of students.” It is likely that Reinhold’s course on architecture was one of the courses that attracted the professional students. After the first summer, architecture and art courses continued to be offered in many summer sessions.

In the middle of the 1950s Mathis began to reassess the program’s approach to teaching liturgical art and architecture. He reports that, although the program had frequently offered a course on the topic, there were typically very few interested students.

Mathis says that he came to see the problem during the 1954 summer session after having a conversation with a minister taking the course. He reports,

For the summer of 1954 a non-Catholic minister enrolled for this course, and his reason for taking this course was the interest in the spiritual side of a church not on his own part, but on that of the architect and builder of his church. This experience suggested that I had not been advertising this course to the people who are really interested in it.19

In response to this realization, Mathis experimented with a trial evening Workshop for Artists and Architects at the end of that year’s summer session. The program included four lectures from the faculty of that year’s Liturgy Program, Vitry, Meinberg, Gy, and Mathis, and attracted seventeen architects from nearby cities, with a number of other architects indicating that they were interested in the project. The success of the trial led to a larger weekend workshop in July of 1955; this workshop was attended by fifty architects for its entirety and another twenty-five for selected parts of the workshop. After 1955, Mathis decided to make the workshop an annual part of the program.20

The Workshop for Architects and Artists focused on a range of different themes related to church architecture and decoration during the 1950s. The inaugural session had an introductory focus; Vitry discussed the architectural requirements for Catholic music, Mathis gave a lecture on the Mass, Gy discussed baptism, and Meinberg discussed the
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history of church design. The first full workshop also had a fairly introductory character, covering church and baptistery design, church decoration, and the requirements in space and decoration. More detail is available about the seminars from 1956-1959, as Mathis assembled and published basic proceedings of these events for the attendees. The 1956 session discussed planning a parish’s physical plant, focusing primarily on the church, but extending beyond to other parish buildings. This was followed in 1957 with a seminar focusing on symbolism and the use of symbols in church architecture and decoration. The 1958 session focused on the needs of the church and the task of the architect, while also looking at concrete examples of renovation and reconstruction. Finally, the 1959 workshop happened concurrently with the 1959 Liturgical Week on the campus of Notre Dame and took up its theme, looking at participation and liturgical architecture.

The speakers for these seminars were a mix of Liturgy Program professors, other professors from Notre Dame, and outside speakers. The trial afternoon session in 1954 was made up entirely of professors from that summer’s program. Frank Montana, an architecture professor at Notre Dame, who often worked with the Liturgy Program, and Robert Leader, an art professor at the university, were also two frequent contributors. Montana served as the moderator for the sessions from 1956-1958 and chairman in 1959.

______________
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He also gave a lecture in 1955 on church baptisteries and led a panel lecture that discussed modern styles in liturgical art and architecture and looked at concrete examples from the Little Flower Parish in South Bend, IN and the Church of Loretto at Saint Mary’s College, also in South Bend, in 1958. Leader lectured on the decoration of a parish church in 1956, the use of Old Testament symbolism in church decoration in 1957, and the use of church art to maximize participation in 1959.

One of the prominent outside speakers was Maurice Lavanoux, the editor of *Litur-gical Arts*, who lectured in 1957 about the use of Old Testament symbolism in church architecture in different parts of the world and who discussed examples of contemporary stained glass windows as part of Montana’s 1958 panel. 1958 and 1959 also saw the addition of papers delivered by members of the hierarchy. In 1958, Mathis read a paper from Cardinal Lercaro of Bologna on “The Task of the Architect,” and Bishop Robert Dwyer of Reno, Nevada, delivered a paper on “Art and Architecture for the Church in Our Age.” Lercaro attended in person in 1959 and delivered an address on designing a church for maximum participation.

A number of major themes emerge from the four years of seminars for which there are published proceedings. Among the topics that came up repeatedly are the centrality of the altar and the importance of building a church designed with a specific community in mind. A number of speakers also advocated for the use of contemporary techniques, technologies, and styles, and, along a similar line, some of the presentations called artists to be willing to innovate and try new styles, but let tradition serve as their guide. While not every presentation takes up every theme and some presentations even
suggest opposite conclusions, these themes stand out for their emergence from more than one year’s seminar and in several different authors.

A few presenters highlight the importance of the altar as the focal point of the church in their lectures to the seminar. In his 1956 presentation on the “The Spiritual Activities of the Parish,” Ernest Grieshaber argues, “The parish church must be built for the community and for the altar.” Later, he adds, “The altar must be the most important part of the church. It is the focal point of the whole interior space. Everything should converge on the altar, and the eyes of the church visitor should be at once drawn to it.”

In the 1958 seminar, Lercaro also argues that the altar should be centrally placed in such a way that “no member of the assembly will be excluded or feel himself too far removed,” and argues that the altar should not have excessive ornamentation that detracts from its centrality.

While Grieshaber and Lercaro both approve of the centrality of the altar, Dwyer argues even more forcefully for the importance of the altar in the architectural imagination, saying that it, rather than a model based on the soaring cathedrals of centuries past, should be the symbol that guides the construction of a church. He calls for the conventions of church building to be discarded, saying that replacing the cathedral
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with the altar as the central symbol guiding church architecture “means a long farewell to those trite formulas of church planning which have blighted imagination and ingenuity and have covered the country with edifices which, whatever their incidental differences of style, are as like as peas in a pod.” More positively, he says it “means making the altar of sacrifice central to the entire architectural scheme, in such a way that it is the immediate focus of the family of Christ gathered around it and participating in its divine action.” Ultimately, he claims that this shift will open up many new possibilities for church design.

A second major theme that comes up in a number of presentations on church design is the importance of the specific parish community. Grieshaber gives great importance the idea that the church is built for the community in his presentation and claims that the church should be built in such a way that it draws everyone into the community and should be located in a place that reflects its central importance for the community. Leader, in his discussion of the decoration of the church, briefly brings up the importance of the community. For Leader, each parish is different, and different parish situations call for different decorations. Lercaro also speaks strongly about the
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importance of the community when designing the church building. He says that the
architect must pay close attention to the surrounding community to understand what is
needed to serve the community. This, he says, involves careful study of the local
community and the local congregation that allows the architect to see “the face, the
expectations, the hopes, the sorrows of the community which asks of his vocation as artist
the gift of a gate opened to heaven.” 30 This will help the architect to create a church that
is easily recognizable and distinct from other buildings in the community, but at the same
time belongs to the community. 31

Presenters in three different seminars also advocated for the use of contemporary
and innovative techniques in the designing and construction of churches. These authors
argued that the church’s teaching on art called for the use of the art of the age to create a
living art instead of simply reproducing historical forms. Lercaro, for example, argues
that “the truest and most genuine sense of tradition is this: that every epoch has expressed
the divine praise in its own language and in conformity with artistic evolution and
technical resources.” 32 In his 1959 presentation on church structure in light of (then)
recent instructions from the Congregation of Rites, Edward McCarthy also rejects the
idea that tradition requires a specific architectural style. He says, “The Church canonizes

31 Ibid., 4.
32 Ibid., 7
no specific style of architecture. Good contemporary architecture is encouraged."\(^{33}\)

Another example can be found in Leader’s 1959 presentation, where he argues at length for the importance of modern architectural forms. He argues that the use of only historical forms is telling the world that the church is a relic of the past.\(^ {34}\) He also claims that the fear of modern art is preventing the church from turning to the most talented artists of the day, saying, “We insist that we want the best for the Church… and yet we stubbornly refuse to go to the recognized masters… because we are fearful that these men may not be predictable or that their work will not please everyone or even us.”\(^ {35}\) Additionally, Leader particularly advocates for the use of modern abstract art, arguing that art does not always need to be used only to communicate religious truths, but instead ought to be used to create the proper atmosphere.\(^ {36}\)

Some of the same presenters who called for the use of modern artistic styles and techniques tempered this with calls to allow tradition to serve as an important guide.

Lercaro’s discussion of tradition in his 1958 presentation touches on the first of these issues. While arguing there that tradition calls for the use of contemporary techniques, 
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Lercaro also claims tradition provides helpful boundaries, saying that “It safeguards him [the architect], moreover, from the danger of falling into the exhibitionist fashion of choosing the modern for the sake of the modern, the new for the sake of the new… It may be all the rage for a while but then collapses, just because it is detached from tradition; a shoot detached from the stock inevitable withers.”37 McCarthy’s lecture in 1959 warns against extremes in both realism and symbolism and describes tradition as providing guidelines for what features ought to be included in a new church building.38 Though he addresses rubrics and laws rather than tradition, Leader’s 1956 lecture takes up a similar position when he likens the church’s rubrics and instructions on church architecture to the string that allows a person to fly a kite without losing control.39 Ultimately, these authors present tradition and rubrics as something that allows the architect to use new styles and techniques while still building a structure that will serve well as a church; architects and artists should experiment, but they must design with the sacred character and liturgical purpose in mind.

Overall, the presentations of these seminars reflect two major characteristics of the liturgical movement. The first is advocacy for active participation in the Mass by the faithful. The entirety of the 1959 seminar was dedicated to this topic, and a number of other presentations also express this concern. For example, one finds in Vitry’s 1956

presentation the idea that the church should be built to facilitate participation of the whole congregation in the chant of the liturgy.\textsuperscript{40} Greishaber also says that people’s participation should be considered when designing the church, and Dwyer’s reconsideration of the cathedral model is partially based on the failure of this model to facilitate corporate worship.\textsuperscript{41}

A second major characteristic reflected in these seminars is the importance of historical research and a desire to understand the forms of the past in reforming the present. Historical surveys play a major role in both Vitry’s presentation on planning a parish with Gregorian chant in mind and Cornelius Bouman’s presentation on the relation of church structure and participation in church history.\textsuperscript{42} Dwyer’s presentation on the symbols governing church construction also looks to liturgical history to understand the meaning of the cathedral symbol, and turns to the biblical text for earlier models and symbols for churches.\textsuperscript{43} Additionally, there is a similar return to biblical models in

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{41} Grieshaber, “The Spiritual Activities of the Parish,” 10; Dwyer, “Art and Architecture for the Church in Our Age,” 2-5.


\textsuperscript{43} Dwyer, “Art and Architecture for the Church in Our Age,” 1-4.
\end{flushleft}
Grieshaber’s lecture in particular; when considering the parish, he looks especially to the early church as described in Acts for his inspiration.44

The major theme that holds these seminars together is the desire for renewal in church art and architecture. Though the topics varied, each of the presenters sought to find a way to help artists and architects build churches that would serve the needs of the people of God liturgically and spiritually. In various ways, the seminars tried to encourage artists and architects and help them to build and design liturgically sound buildings that would reflect the renewal taking place through the liturgical movement.

Moving from the contents of the art and architecture program to an evaluation of it, it is possible to examine the seminars from a number of angles. First, as was the case with the Liturgy Program itself, relative success can be gauged to some extent by the number of participants in the seminar sessions. Again similar to the Liturgy Program proper, a second approach is to look at both self-evaluation and outside evaluation for helpful insights into the program’s success. A third avenue for assessment, which is related to but independent of the program’s success, is the overall quality of the papers and presentations given in the seminar. Finally, the program can be appraised in a different sense by considering whether or not it accomplished anything or had any lasting impact.

44 Grieshaber, “The Spiritual Activities of the Parish,” 4-6.
Consideration of the number of participants the program attracted can help give a sense of the scope of the program’s reach and, to a limited extent, give a picture of participants’ general satisfaction. The trial program in 1954 attracted seventeen architects, with others expressing interest, and the first year of the seminar in 1955 had fifty participants registered at the Morris Inn on the campus of Notre Dame and other local hotels and twenty-five other participants attending some of the sessions.\textsuperscript{45} The 1956 seminar attracted seventy-five participants, mainly architects.\textsuperscript{46} Finally, while there are no numbers available for the 1959 seminar, its setting as part of a wider conference on participation in the Mass suggests the possibility that it reached a still wider audience.

These numbers do show that the program was able to successfully grow from its original seventeen participants to seventy-five in only three years. In this sense, the architecture seminar did allow Mathis and the Liturgy Program to reach a much wider audience than the regular courses on liturgical art, which averaged typically had very few students. It should also be noted that Mathis worked to publish the materials from the seminars as quickly and as cheaply as possible. This also helped to widen the audience, as more booklets of the proceedings were produced than the number of participants.\textsuperscript{47} The growth over three years also suggests that the program was generally well received,

\textsuperscript{45} Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 15 December 1955, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 5.

\textsuperscript{46} Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 19 December 1956, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 2.

\textsuperscript{47} See: Michael A. Mathis, “Dear Reader,” in \textit{Seminar on Art and Architecture for the Church in Our Age: A Report} (Notre Dame, IN: Michael A. Mathis, 1958), 1-2, which reports that 800 copies of the booklet were produced.
though this cannot be considered absolutely definitive evidence for that conclusion. At the very least, there can be said to have been no negative word of mouth that reduced the number of participants.

While there was extensive reflection on the Liturgy Program from sources both inside and outside the program, this does not appear to be the case for the architecture seminars. Mathis only speaks of it in any detail when he introduces the concept in his 1955 Annual Report; his 1956 report only mentions the dates of the program and the number of participants, and, though one was held, the 1957 report makes no mention of the seminar at all. The seminar also largely escaped the notice of major journals concerned with liturgy. There is no mention of this seminar in Worship, and only two brief mentions of the gathering in Liturgical Arts. The editor of the Liturgical Arts, Lavanoux, mentions attending the 1958 session in his column, “The Editor’s Diary.” Lavanoux gives a generally positive description of the event, though he does not give it wholehearted endorsement. Instead, his description of the seminar says,

> These annual meetings of architects, at the Morris Inn, are very pleasant affairs – whether they settle anything is another matter, but I think of them much as I do of the United Nations meetings. They allow everyone to blow off steam and exchange ideas, and what is more important these days?48

Lavanoux does single out one talk in particular, however; he calls Dwyer’s talk “one of the best talks I have heard for years.”49 “The Editor’s Diary” again makes mention of the


49 Ibid., 34.
seminar following its 1959 session, and says that there were several excellent talks that
the editor hoped to include in future volumes of liturgical art.\(^5^0\) The lack of extensive
reviews, along with the generally positive, but not glowing, mentions of the program in
outside journals suggest that the perception of the architecture seminars did not reach the
level of perception and regard of the Liturgy Program in general and that it likely had a
less widespread impact.

The quality of the presentations in the seminars also varies. Many of the
presentations were informed by the latest scholarship and challenged participants to use
their craft to build and decorate churches properly designed for liturgical use in light of
the principles of the liturgical movement. Some of these presentations were so well
received that they were published in outside journals like *Liturgical Arts*. Other
presentations offered helpful case studies of specific projects that reflected more modern
styles. These were likely interesting and helpful to architects in attendance, but they did
not offer any major new insights about liturgical architecture. A third type of presentation
offered little more than commentary on rubrics and requirements for the time. These were
likely helpful to some of the artists and architects present, and they show a commitment
to innovation within the boundaries of established rubrics and requirements, but, like the
second type of lecture, they did not offer anything exceptionally groundbreaking. As a
whole, the presentations served their purpose of educating artists and architects about the

relationship between their work and the liturgy, but they did not offer regular, significant contributions to the scholarly discourse on liturgical architecture.

Additionally, there is evidence even within the seminars themselves that this project did not have a widespread impact. While the program did attract as many as seventy-five participants, the lack of vocational diversity among the attendees highlights some problems. Most of the participants in the seminar were architects who welcomed instruction in liturgy. However, with only a small number of clergy present at the seminar, both the presentations and the discussion sessions often expressed concerns about implementation of the ideas presented in the seminar. Papers presented at times included advice on how to present new ideas to parishes and cushion the shock of innovation, and many of the presenters reflected on the discord between artists and the church.51 Some of the seminar discussion sessions similarly expressed difficulties in getting parishes to accept work reflecting the papers presented. With the feeling that clergy in parishes were opposed to the types of work suggested by the architecture seminars, architects in the discussion sessions at the end of some years expressed a desire to bring in more clergy and discuss the issues with them. Some even suggested that the seminar draft a document on their positions for the clergy.52 This evidence points to a


serious difficulty for architects and artists in implementing the ideas they encountered in the seminar, which would have severely limited the workshop’s impact.

Overall, the architecture seminars were a limitedly successful expansion of the Liturgy Program. The seminars did provide a tool for the education and formation of architects, as well as a forum for select members of the hierarchy, liturgically minded architects, musicians, and artists to discuss aspects of church architecture. However, while it performed this role well, it suffered from the difficulties participants experienced moving from the ideas of the seminar to their implementation. In this sense, the seminars, though they presented a forum for the advocacy of architecture in light of the liturgical movement, were likely limited in their impact and overall importance.

4.2 Academic Programs

In addition to the Liturgy Program’s practical and pastorally focused expanded offerings, the program also had more scholarly focused expansions. These included both a publishing program and an attempt to create a full year program focused on language preparation. This section will closely examine these two projects, discussing their origins and development and evaluating their success.
4.2.1 Publishing Program

One of the most enduring contributions of the Liturgy Program was its publication program. Kennedy considers this one of Mathis’ most important contributions to the liturgical movement, saying,

[T]he seminal scholarship of these distinguished professors was singlehandedly translated into book form through the efforts of Mathis; and his Liturgical Studies Series not only gave the program respectability, but also produced a unique body of liturgical resources in English that remain beneficial to students and researchers today.53

Beginning with Louis Bouyer’s *Liturgical Piety*, the *Liturgical Studies Series* published six important books from the lectures given by professors during the summer session. These publications served to provide important English language scholarly literature in the field, and greatly widened the potential audience of the courses of the Liturgy Program. The following section will examine both the origins and development of the publishing program, while also looking at the various problems the program faced and its reception and impact.

Mathis does not indicate when it was first decided that the Liturgy Program should begin to publish the class lectures from the summer courses. However, it is likely that this decision was made at a very early stage. The motivation for this project may be seen in Mathis’ discussion of the graduate program after the 1948 summer session. In his
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annual report of that year, he indicates that scholarly literature on the liturgy is badly needed for both “students and the Catholic public.” His recognition of the need for additional literature in the field is certainly at the root of the eventual development of the *Liturgical Studies Series* that emerged from the Liturgy Program.

By the end of 1948, Mathis and the Liturgy Program had a definite plan to begin to publish materials from the program’s summer courses. Writing to Gerard Carroll, trustee of the Grace Trust, Mathis describes their efforts to publish materials from the first two years, noting that only materials from Reinhold’s lectures would be suitable for publication from that year. From 1948, Mathis says he planned to publish Dirksen’s lectures on the Old Testament background of the liturgy and hoped to look at Diekmann’s lectures to see if they would be able to publish those as well. A year later, in his report for 1949, Mathis mentions the recent publication of his own Vigil Service, as well as the forthcoming publication of a book on liturgical architecture, based on Reinhold’s lectures on the topic, a book based on Jungmann’s course on the early liturgy, and a book on Dirksen’s lectures on “The Jewish Background of the Liturgy.” The first of these works, *Speaking of Liturgical Architecture*, was published in May of 1952 but was not branded as part of the *Liturgical Studies Series*. Though the publication of Reinhold’s

---

54 Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 2.
book represented a milestone for the program, it was only a short thirty-two-page booklet and did not provide the depth of later works.\textsuperscript{57}

In the years that followed, the publication program would become an important focus of Mathis and the Liturgy Program. Mathis and Hesburgh both discuss the importance of the publishing program in their correspondence concerning the annual reports. In his response to the 1952 annual report, the first report from the Liturgy Program that he received from Mathis as president, Hesburgh indicated that he wished Mathis could be freed from his duties at the hospital, partly so he could spend more time working on the books for publication. In the same year, Hesburgh further wrote that he believed that the publications would give “permanent value” to the program.\textsuperscript{58} In 1954, Hesburgh also remarked that the publication program “should give a more permanent character to your work and should diffuse its salutary influence far and wide.”\textsuperscript{59} Mathis likewise proclaimed the importance of the publication program, saying that he was addressing its status first in the 1953 report because of its importance.\textsuperscript{60}

Mathis’ annual reports also continued to name more lectures that the program was editing and translating. From 1949 until 1957, Mathis listed over a dozen books that he

\textsuperscript{57} See: Reinhold, H.A. \textit{Speaking of Liturgical Architecture}. Notre Dame, IN: Liturgical Programs University of Notre Dame, 1952.

\textsuperscript{58} Theodore Hesburgh to Michael Mathis, 20 December 1952, CMTH 10/20, UNDA.

\textsuperscript{59} Theodore Hesburgh to Michael Mathis, 30 December 1954, CMTH 10/20, UNDA.

\textsuperscript{60} Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 12 December 1953, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1.
hoped the program would be able to publish in the coming years.\textsuperscript{61} In order to facilitate publication of the lectures, Mathis was joined by a number of assistants and scholars. Beginning around May of 1953, John Julian Ryan and Mary Perkins Ryan were hired by Mathis to work on editing and translating texts for the publication series.\textsuperscript{62} Mathis also worked with the committee formed for the translation of the American Ritual at Notre Dame to determine what texts were best suited for publication. In 1956, Mathis reported to the university president that he was adding Christine Mohrmann and Bouyer to this committee, which already included existing members Mary and John Ryan and Joseph Garvin, a member of the Medieval Institute.\textsuperscript{63} The use and expansion of this group for the preparation of publications points to the importance that Mathis and the Liturgy Program placed on the publication program.

\textsuperscript{61} The list of texts to be published was regularly evolving and changing over the years, with different volumes being added or subtracted from the list and titles of planned volumes changing from list to list. A list of the planned volumes can be constructed from various annual reports, as well as lists in the front of published volumes. They include the published texts: Louis Bouyer, \textit{Liturgical Piety}; Bouyer, \textit{The Meaning of Sacred Scripture}; J.B. O’Connell, \textit{Church Building and Furnishing}; Jean Daniélou, \textit{The Bible and the Liturgy}; Johannes Hofinger, \textit{Worship: The Life of the Missions}; Josef Jungmann, \textit{The Early Liturgy}. Texts that were listed, but never published by the Liturgy Program, included: Balthasar Fischer, \textit{The Psalter as a Christian Prayer Book}; Herman Schmidt, \textit{Liturgy and Western Culture}; Bonifaas Luykx, \textit{The Prayer Life of the Church}; Eugenio Zolli, \textit{Aphikomen: The Key to the Last Supper}; Francis H. Davis, \textit{The Sacred Scripture and the Spiritual Life}; Hermann Bauer, \textit{Church Architecture for Our Time}; Martin Hellriegel, \textit{Basic Liturgy}; Hofinger, \textit{Kerygmatic Theology}. For references in the annual reports to projected publications, see: Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 15 December 1955, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 7-8; Jean Daniélou, \textit{The Bible and the Liturgy} (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956), ii; J.B. O’Connell, \textit{Church Building and Furnishing: The Church’s Way: A Study in Liturgical Law} (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1955), ii.

\textsuperscript{62} Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 9 May 1953, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 1.

\textsuperscript{63} Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 19 December 1956, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 2.
Outside of the successful development of Reinhold’s booklet on architecture, the program’s publication series would begin to hit a number of obstacles that delayed publications, despite the importance placed on bringing works to publication. These delays included problems obtaining rights, difficulties with translation, and other projects taking precedence for the authors or translators. Delays began as early as 1950, when Mathis reports that Jungmann was unsatisfied with the translation of his notes on the early liturgy and that preparation for Dirksen’s book on the Jewish background of the liturgy was delayed by his work on another book for the theology department.64 In the following year, Mathis writes that Daniélou’s book was initially delayed because he wanted the French edition to be published first. Then, further problems arose because Daniélou asked Mathis to relinquish the rights and give them to Sheed & Ward.65 Several projects were further delayed in 1953 when Mathis and his coworkers began working on a translation of the American Ritual, setting aside the publication projects.66 These types of problems plagued the publication process for the Liturgy Program and forced delays for most of the books.

Eventually, however, the delays were overcome for a number of the books, and the first volume in the Liturgical Studies Series, Bouyer’s Liturgical Piety, was published

64 Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 11 December 1950, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 3-4.
in 1955.\footnote{Louis Bouyer, Liturgical Piety (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1955).} This was followed in Mathis’ lifetime by J.B. O’Connell’s \textit{Church Building and Furnishing} (1955), Daniélou’s \textit{The Bible and the Liturgy} (1956), \textit{Worship: The Life of the Missions} (1958)\footnote{Johannes Hofinger et al., Worship: The Life of the Missions, trans. Mary Perkins Ryan (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958).} by Johannes Hofinger, Bouyer’s \textit{The Meaning of Sacred Scripture} (1958)\footnote{Louis Bouyer, The Meaning of Sacred Scripture, trans. Mary Perkins Ryan (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958).}, and \textit{The Early Liturgy} (1959) by Josef Jungmann.\footnote{Josef A. Jungmann, The Early Liturgy To the Time of Gregory the Great, trans. Francis A. Brunner (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959).} Hofinger’s \textit{The Art of Teaching Christian Doctrine} (1957) is not included as a part of the series in the list given at the beginning of each book in the series after 1958 and does not include mention of the series in its own text, but it was nevertheless based on lectures given at schools in the United States, including Notre Dame, was edited by Mary Perkins Ryan, was published by the University of Notre Dame Press, and is mentioned by Mathis as a forthcoming publication in his 1957 annual report.\footnote{Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 13 December 1957, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 4; Johannes Hofinger, The Art of Teaching Christian Doctrine: The Good News and Its Proclamation (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1957), iii.}

Unfortunately, a number of the planned volumes were never published by the Liturgy Program. These include books that the program advertised as “In Preparation” and worked on for years, such as Balthasar Fischer’s \textit{The Psalter as Christian Prayer Book} and Boniface Luykx’s \textit{The Prayer Life of the Church}. Others were texts based on
classes that Mathis had hoped would be turned into books but which never got off the
ground, including texts from many of the history courses. Additionally, three of the texts,
Daniélou’s *The Bible and the Liturgy*, O’Connell’s *Church Building and Furnishing*, and
Bouyer’s *The Meaning of Sacred Scripture* were first published elsewhere. Daniélou and
Bouyer’s works were both originally published in French in 1951, with Daniélou’s
appearing as *Bible et Liturgie: La théologie biblique des Sacrements et des fêtes d’après
les Peres de l’Église* and Bouyer’s as *La Bible et L’Évangile*. O’Connell’s text was
published in England by Burns and Oates under the same title in 1955.

Though not every course that Mathis hoped the program would turn into a book
eventually was, many of those that were published were very successful. *Liturgical Piety*
received generally favorable reviews, sold out its first printing of 4,000 books in six
months, and by the end of 1957, was on its third printing. This first entry in the Notre
Dame *Liturgical Studies Series* was reviewed favorably in a review in *Theological*
Studies, which highlights only a few issues with the text and claims,

>This inaugural volume of the Notre Dame Liturgical Studies Series under the
knowledgeable zeal of Fr. Mathis, C.S.C., is remarkable for the extraordinarily
intuitive and scholarly (in the best broad sense of the word) contribution it makes

---

72 Jean Daniélou, *Bible et Liturgie: La théologie biblique des Sacrements et des fêtes d’après les


74 Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 15 December 1955, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 7; Michael
Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 13 December 1957, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 4.
to the liturgical revival and for stimulating the largest assortment of superlatives used by liturgists in many a year.\footnote{Edward J. Murray, review of \textit{Liturgical Piety}, by Louis Bouyer, \textit{Theological Studies} 17 (1956): 127.}

Another review appears in \textit{Worship}, where Clifford Howell praises Bouyer and his work, saying, “Indeed this is a great book – scholarly profound, balanced, and quite astonishingly beautiful. It is sure to win for itself a high place among the classics of liturgical literature.”\footnote{Clifford Howell, review of \textit{Liturgical Piety}, by Louis Bouyer, \textit{Worship} 29:4 (March 1955): 189.} In the same issue, the “Liturgical Briefs” column notes the high praise given by Howell and reports that the column is in agreement. “Liturgical Briefs” goes on to claim, “The book is a landmark advance,” and comments on the other announced books in the series, saying, “We look forward to their early publication. It will give Catholic America a liturgical book shelf of note.”\footnote{“Liturgical Briefs,” \textit{Worship} 29:4 (March 1955): 223-225.}

Other texts in the series also received praise from reviews. Reviewing Daniélou’s \textit{The Bible and the Liturgy} in \textit{Worship}, Michael Marx writes, “Daniélou offers us a rich synthesis of the profound meaning of the sacramental rites and feasts… It is of high importance for pastoral liturgy and catechetical instruction.”\footnote{Michael J. Marx, review of \textit{The Bible and the Liturgy}, by Jean Daniélou, \textit{Worship} 31:3 (1957): 142.} A review of \textit{Worship: The Life of the Missions} by Frank Norris in \textit{American Ecclesiastical Review} noted the
thorough treatment given to the topic and reports that it “will be of interest to all who are genuinely alive to the needs of the twentieth-century Church.”

The Liturgy Program made an important contribution to the liturgical movement in the United States through its publication program. Kennedy is undoubtedly correct in identifying this as one of Mathis’ most important contributions. This series of publications successfully achieved Hesburgh’s hope to broaden the program’s impact by making important liturgical scholarship available to a much wider audience than were able to attend the program’s lectures. In doing so, it helped to satisfy the need for liturgical literature that was identified by Mathis’ 1948 report. It successfully published six scholarly texts, many of which were well reviewed by various journals at the time of their publication. However, its contribution would have been much more substantial, providing a scholarly library that included overviews of most of early Christian and medieval liturgical history, different investigations into the Bible and its relationship with the liturgy, two different approaches to church architecture, and introductions to the ritual and the Divine Office, had Mathis and his colleagues successfully brought to publication every book they planned or even just those advertised as forthcoming. However, this regrettable abbreviation of the catalogue does little to lessen the overall impact of the major works Mathis and his colleagues brought to publication.

4.2.2 Liturgy Program II

A second major academic extension of the Liturgy Program was a less successful program for the regular semesters known as “Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy” or “Liturgy Program II.” This program, which included extensive work in ancient languages during the fall and spring semesters as preparation for additional theological and liturgical graduate studies, was supposed to launch in 1957 but never attracted enough interest and was quickly phased out. Though the program was ultimately a failure, it is important to investigate Mathis’ plans for it to see how he tried to expand the liturgy program and respond to the academic needs of the church in the United States. In order to accomplish this, this section will look at the origins and inspiration for the program, the design and requirements for the program, and its ultimate failure.

The origins of Mathis’ Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy are traceable primarily to his dissatisfaction with the preparation level of the graduate students in the Liturgy Program and, to a lesser extent, the desire to help create a graduate school of theology at Notre Dame. As early as the first year of the graduate program, 1948, Mathis reported that he felt the students were unprepared for graduate work and particularly deficient in languages.  

\[80\] Following the 1953 session, Mathis reports to Hesburgh that weekly meetings with the program’s professors have highlighted students’

\[80\] Michael Mathis to John Cavanaugh, 19 October 1948, CMTH 6/21, UNDA, 4.
lack of preparedness. He goes on to say that he has examined the courses of preparation at some European schools and suggests a program for general preparation for graduate work in theology. This suggested program would include courses in Latin, Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew and additional introductory courses in philosophy, English, chant, and theology. The students in this program would earn a degree in liturgy in three summers and take the preparatory courses during the school year, living at Notre Dame in a dedicated building with its own chapel for Liturgical Program services. After their time in the preparatory program, Mathis hoped for the students to take two years of theology at European schools, where they could receive the best possible education. Mathis suggests that the program could begin in 1954 and says that his plan would allow Notre Dame five years to arrange to offer the type of theological education available in Europe. He also claims that this could be an important step towards establishing a graduate school of theology and liturgy at Notre Dame.81 Hesburgh, however, does not encourage Mathis on the topic in his response to the annual report, but thanks him for putting so much work and thought into the concept.82

After 1953, the idea of a year round program for preparation does not appear again in Mathis’ annual reports until his 1957 annual report describes the “Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy.” Letters to professors involved with the program, however, show that Mathis was working to build this program as early as the summer of

81 Michael Mathis to Theodore Hesburgh, 12 December 1953, CMTH 10/20, UNDA, 8-9, 12-19.
1956, with plans to bring the first students in during the summer of 1957. Among these are August and October 1956 letters from Mathis to Mohrmann, which refer back to discussions over the summer about the pre-liturgical program. The first of these letters, a response to a letter at the end of Mohrmann’s time in the United States in the summer of 1956, mentions that Mathis intended to speak about the pre-theology program with the president of the university when he returned from a trip abroad.\(^{83}\) This was followed in October with a much more detailed letter that indicates that response to the program has been positive and asks Mohrmann for more details about her understanding of the plan for the program. At this time, Mathis’ hopes for the program include beginning Latin and Greek classes in the summer of 1957, followed by a philosophy class in the period between the summer and fall and additional Latin and Greek courses over the fall and winter semesters before Mohrmann’s intensive Christian Latin course; Mathis also hoped for additional courses in Hebrew and Early Christian Literature.\(^{84}\) Beyond the correspondence with Mohrmann, a letter to Bouyer in March of 1957 shows that Mathis had consulted Bouyer about the courses in summer of 1956 as well.\(^{85}\)

Over the next several months, Mathis selected the specific courses that would be offered, and the program took shape. Promotional materials and early versions of the potential schedule for the curriculum show Latin and Greek in the first summer, followed

\(^{83}\) Michael Mathis to Christine Mohrmann, 20 August 1956, CMTH 12/44, UNDA.

\(^{84}\) Michael Mathis to Christine Mohrmann, 6 October 1956, CMTH 12/44, UNDA, 2-5.

\(^{85}\) Michael Mathis to Louis Bouyer, 18 March 1957, CMTH 12/45, UNDA, 1.
by Latin, Greek, Hebrew, “Early Christian Literary History,” and an introduction to theology in the following school year. Students would have a break during the second summer and would take Mohrmann’s intensive Latin course in August of 1958. The program would conclude with regular courses in “Early Christian Literary History,” Hebrew, and an intensive theology course.\(^{86}\) However, this would not be the final form of the program at its failed launch in autumn 1957. In a letter from July of 1957, Mathis reported to a prospective teacher of the theology course that they had not found any students for the course and would not be able to hold it.\(^{87}\) In its place, the program planned to offer a course on “Monophonic & Polyphonic Chant.”\(^{88}\)

Mathis’ plan for the Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy is given fully in a four-page program description and prospective schedule titled “Liturgy Program During the Regular Semesters: Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy.” The description claims that the goal of the program is “to provide the necessary tools for research in Christian Latinity and Liturgy.”\(^{89}\) It claims this requires courses in Classical Greek and Latin, Hebrew, and “Early Christian Literary History.” Additionally, in order to promote research skills in chant, a course on chant notation was also included. These courses would be accomplished through twenty-four credits of instruction during

\(^{86}\) Michael Mathis, Liturgy Program II Promotional Letter, 3 June 1957, CMTH 12/45, UNDA.

\(^{87}\) Michael Mathis to Boniface Luykx, 16 July 1957, CMTH 12/44, UNDA.

\(^{88}\) “Liturgy Program During the Regular Semesters: Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy,” CMTH 12/46, UNDA, 2.

\(^{89}\) Ibid., 1.
the regular session and six credits during the summer session, planned to end with an intensive course in “Christian Latinity” led by Mohrmann in the 1958 summer session.\textsuperscript{90}

Unfortunately, the Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy was unable to attract enough students and never completely launched. Though he had widely advertised the program and had received promises from several religious superiors to send students, for its first projected semester Mathis only received interest from a few full time students. However, while the entire program did not begin in 1957, there was sufficient enough interest in the chant notation course that this course was held with six students.\textsuperscript{91} After the initial failure, the program was attempted again, with courses scheduled to begin in 1958, but the lack of interest continued. Schidel reports that Mathis was only able to sign up two students and the program was cancelled at the end of the school year.\textsuperscript{92}

Though the Program for Early Christian Languages and Liturgy was never able to attract enough interest to offer the complete program, Mathis’ intention to create such a program shows his continued commitment to developing well-equipped scholars and the importance that he placed on the development of quality research for the liturgical movement in the United States. If the program had succeeded, it would have helped to provide an additional infusion of American scholars that were not only well versed in the

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 4.

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., 3.

\textsuperscript{92} Schidel, “Never Too Much,” 30.
literature and history of the early church, but also equipped with the tools to perform original research in those fields. Faced with the difficulty of inadequately prepared students, Mathis offered a direct solution in having the Notre Dame program provide the necessary preparation. While the ultimate impact of this aborted program is minimal, Mathis’ solution to his problem may have some continued validity in the present and speaks to the continued need to emphasize preparation and development in research skills in liturgical education today.

4.3 Conclusion

4.3.1 Secondary Projects and the Goals of the Liturgy Program

Each of these four programs worked towards the stated goals of the Liturgy Program. The Workshops for Priests and Seminarians provided greater liturgical background to future parish leaders, both introducing them to important liturgical scholarship and modeling quality liturgy for them to implement. Additionally, these workshops also supported the program’s goal of training teachers by frequently focusing on liturgical education as one of the primary subjects of the workshops’ lectures; the current and future parish priests in attendance could be expected to help teachers implement the ideas presented in these lectures and demonstrations at their parish schools. The seminars on art and architecture also took steps to fulfill one of the program’s early goals. Recognizing that the program’s initial approach to liturgical arts
was not reaching the proper audience, Mathis and the program shifted their approach from teaching undergraduate students about art and the liturgy to providing artists and architects with liturgical background; though it did not achieve the program’s goal as originally described, it performed an important related task. The most important of the related projects relative to the program’s stated goals was the Notre Dame *Liturgical Studies Series*. This project allowed the Liturgy Program to contribute the published liturgical works that Mathis described as “badly needed.” Finally, Mathis’ attempt to produce an academic year program to prepare students for additional graduate study reflected the importance the program placed on research and represented an attempt to help achieve the program’s goal of developing research scholars in the field of liturgy. Though Mathis’ attempts to launch this program were unsuccessful, they show his commitment to this important goal. In total, though one was unsuccessful, the related projects studied in this chapter supplemented the efforts of the Liturgy Program in Mathis’ efforts to achieve the program’s overall goals.

### 4.3.2 Impact

Overall, these programs were a successful attempt to use the resources of the Liturgy Program to spread knowledge of the liturgy and promote liturgical renewal for an audience beyond the students of the regular academic program. The Workshops for Priests and Seminarians connected ministerial professionals with the ideas of the liturgical movement and focused on how to make the liturgy an important part of
Catholic life. The Seminars for Artists and Architects put participants into contact with like-minded professionals and showed the important role art and architecture must play in liturgical renewal. The publishing program, though it was unable to publish as many texts as Mathis and his colleagues originally hoped, helped to spread the work of some of the Liturgy Program’s best professors to a much wider audience than the Liturgy Program itself. The only major expansion project that was completely unsuccessful was the attempted year-round program. This failure, however, shows Mathis’ ambitious attempts at producing more complete liturgical scholars for the church in the United States. Though these programs, with the possible exception of the publishing program, fall short of the impact and longevity of their parent program, they still represent helpful projects that made their own important contributions to liturgical renewal in the United States.
CHAPTER 5:

THE NOTRE DAME LITURGY PROGRAM AND ADVANCED LITURGICAL EDUCATION IN THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

While Michael Mathis founded a groundbreaking academic program in liturgical studies, the Notre Dame Liturgy Program was not the only effort to educate priests, seminarians, religious, and other pastoral leaders and teachers in the liturgy during the liturgical movement. Liturgical education, especially of teachers and priests, was one of the priorities of the movement, and during the first half of the twentieth century, a number of different programs were launched to educate different target groups about the church’s worship. First, this chapter will examine these various programs in order to place Mathis’ efforts at Notre Dame into context. After establishing the shape of these other programs, the second half of the chapter will compare Mathis’ work to these other enterprises in liturgical education of the time.
5.1 Liturgical Education Programs

Liturgical education programs during the early to mid-twentieth century had a variety of different emphases and intended audiences. Many were entirely focused on Gregorian chant, while others gave general introductions to the liturgy or focused on scientific study of the liturgy; still others joined liturgy to another topic or treated the liturgy as only part of a wider program of study. Some programs were targeted to specific groups, like priests and seminarians or religious women, but others were more open. The earliest program this chapter will consider began in 1917, but relevant programs were founded in each subsequent decade through the years following Vatican II. While the majority of programs offered sessions that lasted only a couple of weeks, some were given over an entire summer or were offered year round. The present study is primarily focused on the American liturgical movement, but there are also a number of important programs that existed in European liturgical centers that must also be considered. In order to examine such a diversity of programs, this discussion of education programs in this chapter will primarily be organized around a few major programs while also noting similar programs of lesser impact.

This section will examine each program to give a sense of how it focused its particular approach to liturgical education. Typically, discussion will focus on the origins and curriculum. In select cases, a more complete history will be provided, and, where possible, the chapter will also comment on professors, audience, and reception. Though some of the programs surveyed are connected with programs that continue into the
present, the scope of this study will limit discussion of these programs to the early to mid-twentieth century, and it will only survey programs up to the early 1960s. Programs will also be organized geographically, with American and European schools treated separately.

5.1.1 American Liturgical Education Programs

_Pius X School of Liturgical Music and Gregorian Chant Programs_

The promotion of Gregorian chant was frequently emphasized in attempts to encourage active participation, as some reformers saw music as one of the most readily available means to involve the congregation in the liturgy. In the United States, one of the first major liturgical education programs to be established was a program promoting Gregorian chant, the Pius X School of Liturgical Music. Featuring both summer schools and a year-round component, the Pius X School and similar projects that followed promoted Gregorian chant by instructing both teachers and musicians in its techniques and often also provided additional instruction in the liturgy. Emerging all over the country, these schools represented a significant portion of summer liturgical education programs.

A joint venture of Justine Ward and Georgia Stevens, the Pius X School of Liturgical Music began its first summer program at Manhattanville Academy, in New York, in 1917. This first program offered teachers instruction in the Ward Method, a strategy for teaching Gregorian chant developed primarily by Justine Ward with the
assistance of Thomas Shields of Catholic University and John Young of St. Francis Xavier Church in New York. The summer school was not the only project that Ward and Stephens were working on, however, as the Ward Method was taught in the local grade school and eventually at a high school set up for successful students of the method.

Ward and Stevens had a successful relationship for several years, and their work included instruction using the Ward Method at Manhattanville Academy, Annunciation Grade School, and the Justine Ward Academy, as well as a correspondence course in teaching the Ward Method. Eventually, the two collaborated with the Music Department of the college, to establish a four-year program for supervisors in the Ward Method and a two-year program for school or church music held during the school year.

The summer school in particular flourished during the 1920s. The program added a dedicated hall on the Manhattanville campus in 1924 in a response to the growing number of students involved with the program, and the summer course also began to feature well-known lecturers. Ward made use of her connections at Solesmes to bring Benedictine music scholars to the United States for the program, including Doms Mocquéreau and Désrocquettes of Solesmes in 1922 and Dom Paolo Feretti of the


2 Ibid., 13-16,21-22.

3 Ibid., 21-26, 33.
Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in 1925 and 1928. Liturgical specialists also began to give courses on the liturgy at the school during the 1920s, beginning with Virgil Michel who lectured in 1926. Years later, in the 1950s, many more liturgy professors would come to work with the school’s summer sessions, including Godfrey Diekmann, Martin Hellriegel, H.A. Reinhold, and Damasus Winzen. Like many summer liturgy programs, the Pius X School also placed an emphasis on liturgical celebration. In the 1920s this included at least one Solemn Mass per week, a weekly Missa Cantata, and at least one Vespers service each summer; in later years, the schedule included “daily Mass, the Sunday solemn Mass, Sunday Vespers and/or Compline.”

In the summer of 1931, however, the Pius X School and Ward separated over Ward’s concerns for the integrity of the Ward Method and oversight of the school. Catherine Carroll notes that the loss of Ward’s support cost the school important benefactors and connections, saying, “With Justine’s departure, some of her friends who had been benefactors of the School shifted their allegiance elsewhere, and she saw to it that no monk of Solesmes would be allowed to teach at the School for almost thirty
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Nevertheless, the school was able to persevere, continuing to offer year-round education connected with the college and a regular summer program that included other important figures in the liturgical movement.

In 1946, Stevens died and was replaced at the head of the school by Aileen Cohalan, who, according to Carroll, began to strengthen the curriculum; she was followed in 1951 by Josephine D. Morgan, who completed some of the work begun by Cohalan. In the years that followed, the entire college moved from its location in the city to newer campus in Purchase, New York, and, because it was no longer connected with a grade school and high school, the Pius X School began to focus primarily on college-level courses and its summer program. The Pius X School also partnered with the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music and began to offer a Bachelor of Sacred Music in 1954.

Following the Second Vatican Council, the program of the Pius X School shifted to adapt to the changing musical needs of the church in the United States. According to Carroll, the 1965 summer session included changes to the curriculum, including the addition of workshops on different roles in the liturgy and “The Music of the Liturgy Today.” Summer programs in the years following the council also included lectures on
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the reformed liturgy and its meaning for musicians from liturgical scholars such as Aidan Kavanagh (1965) and Frederick McManus (1967).\textsuperscript{13} Unfortunately, interest in the program declined following the council, and in 1969, following the retirement of its final director, the school merged with the Music Department of Manhattanville College, ending the Pius X School of Liturgical Music.\textsuperscript{14} Though it was unable to successfully continue in the years following the Council, the Pius X School played an important role in promoting Gregorian chant education and supported liturgical renewal with its inclusion of liturgical scholars and emphasis on liturgical celebration.

While the Pius X School was the United States’ first major liturgical music education program and the first real education program focused on the liturgy, there were a number of other programs that also combined music and liturgy in regular academic and summer program offerings. One such organization was the Gregorian Institute of America, which, in the 1940s, began to offer correspondence courses and a number of one-week workshops in Gregorian chant in cities throughout the United States.\textsuperscript{15} Additionally, in 1949, the institute began to supplement its series of week-long courses with a longer, four-week workshop held at St. John’s Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota. The initial announcement of the workshop in the January 1949 issue \textit{Orate Fratres} indicates that, in addition to chant courses, the curriculum would include lectures on the
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liturgy given by a monk from the abbey; participants were also invited to participate in the liturgical life of the monastery. These annual workshops continued for several years, lasting at least until the summer of 1954. In that year, Grailville in Loveland, Ohio, also began to offer a music course. The program boasted a number of visiting professors, including Ermin Vitry, and also featured daily liturgical celebrations.

Several other Catholic colleges and universities were also involved in promoting liturgical music. In the 1920s and early 1930s, Justine Ward worked with The Catholic University of America to have the Ward Method taught in the sisters’ college. An effort was made to expand these offerings to reach other members of the university with a school of liturgical music around 1929, but disagreements between Ward and the school led to the abandonment of this plan and the end of Ward’s relationship with the school for several years. The sisters’ college would also offer courses in liturgical music during the 1950s, though it is unclear if these were connected with Ward. Other schools that offered liturgical music programs included Pittsburgh’s Duquesne University, which announced a four-year degree in liturgical music in 1932, and Loras College in Dubuque,
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Iowa, which began a weeklong summer Institute of Liturgical Music and Liturgy in 1938.\textsuperscript{21}

The large number of courses and programs spread throughout the country shows that by the middle of the twentieth century, education in liturgical music had become a major priority for both liturgical centers and other institutes of learning in the United States. These music programs helped to instruct both musical leaders and teachers in the principles of liturgical music, and, in doing so, helped to promote improved music participation in the liturgy. In most cases, these programs also provided solid foundations in liturgy to accompany musical training. Many of the programs included lectures in the liturgy, often from established liturgical scholars; the Pius X School is perhaps most notable for this, as it featured such scholars as Virgil Michel and Martin Hellriegel. Additionally, some of these music schools made liturgical celebration, typically accompanied by the music being taught, an important component of their program. As a whole, the wide variety of liturgical music schools in the United States played an important role in educating not just about music but also about the liturgy in general and in promoting active participation. They thus met similar needs as many other liturgical education programs that lacked the primary focus on music.

This chapter has already discussed how the monks of St. John’s Abbey partnered with the Gregorian Institute of America in the 1940s to offer a four-week summer program in Gregorian chant with additional lectures dedicated specifically to the liturgy, but the monastery was also involved in major liturgical education projects many years before its collaboration with the Gregorian Institute. In the late 1920s, St. John’s hosted an annual summer program that included courses in both liturgy and music. While the program only ran for two or three years, it was one of the first major programs in the U.S. dedicated to studying the liturgy, and, because of this, it serves as a benchmark for examining similar attempts to engage the liturgy in an educational setting. Describing this program’s brief history, the types of courses offered, and other particular characteristics will provide helpful points of comparison with future programs, including the Notre Dame Liturgy Program.

The first mention of the Liturgical Summer School connected with St. John’s Abbey is in the May 1928 issue of Orate Fratres. In the “Liturgical Briefs” section of that issue, the editor reports that a summer school for liturgical music was being organized for that year and that it was intended as a first step towards summer school with programs in several aspects of the liturgy. The liturgical music summer school was held in June and July of 1928 in conjunction with the Saint Cloud Music Institute, under the direction of Ermin Vitry, who would later serve as the primary chant instructor in the
Notre Dame Liturgy Program.\textsuperscript{22} The success of this program allowed a full liturgical summer school to be organized in the following year, with the stated goal, [T]o offer courses of instruction and lectures in all the phases of the liturgy in order to bring out the many vital contacts the liturgy of the Church has in our Christian life and civilization...In a general way the summer school would include three main fields of endeavor: Religion, Christian Art, and Church Music.\textsuperscript{23}

The program for this summer, 1929, attracted over sixty students.\textsuperscript{24}

While the 1929 session was successful and a second summer of the full liturgical school was planned for 1930, there was some concern about whether the location of the abbey was suitable for it to continue serving as a liturgical education center for the United States. Paul Marx reports, “While Michel planned the summer school as a permanent affair, he kept in mind that it might be moved to a more advantageous place.”\textsuperscript{25} This concern was also reflected in \textit{Orate Fratres}, which writes,

But the problem of a summer school here at the abbey still remains unsolved, and the decision to have such a school was made for only the present year of grace. Whether the school will continue here for another year after that, as far as human intentions go, no one can at present tell. There are many reasons for not conducting such a school in a remote countryside. As other schools in more favorably situated localities grow and flourish, there may be less hesitation here about not continuing our school at Collegeville.\textsuperscript{26}
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Following a successful second summer, a plan was made to continue the program in 1931, but inadequate enrollment, which *Orate Fratres*’ editors attributed to the financial difficulties connected with the country’s economic depression, forced the program’s cancellation prior to the 1931 session.27

The summer liturgy school at St. John’s Abbey featured a mixture of liturgy, music, and art courses. In its trial year of 1928, the program was focused almost entirely on music courses, offering six music courses and one liturgy course. These included daily courses on music in the parish, Gregorian chant, harmony and accompaniment, teaching chant to children, and two different levels of organ instruction, as well as a twice weekly lecture on “The Spirit of the Liturgy.”28 The same issue of *Orate Fratres* that provides a description of the trial program also provides a projected list of topics for the full program of the next summer; these are a reliable source for the courses of the first year, as the announcement of the full summer program reports that the courses are essentially the same as had been described.29 In liturgy, the topics would include “The Liturgy and the Spiritual Life; The Liturgy and Religious Instruction; The Liturgy of the Sacraments; The Liturgical Year; The Liturgy as Rule of Faith; The Holy Sacrifice; The Liturgy of Praise; Social Mission of the Liturgy, etc.” In art, the courses would cover “The Sacramental Principle in Christian Art; Liturgical Symbolism; the Development of the

---


28 “A Summer School in Church Music,” 254.

Liturgical Arts; The Liturgy and Church Architecture; Christian Aesthetics, etc.,” and in music, courses would cover the same types of topics covered in the music summer program of 1928. It is unclear whether these lists of topics are intended as separate courses, as was the case with the 1928 music program, or if they were simply meant to be topics covered by a smaller number of courses. If the former, this represents an ambitious schedule of courses for the first year of the program.

There are not as many details available about the courses for the second year of the program, 1930. Orate Fratres simply reports that the schedule would be similar to the previous year, with the addition of some advanced music courses. Though the 1931 summer school was never held, Orate Fratres published course descriptions in its April 1931 issue. The majority of the fourteen courses announced for this summer session are related to liturgical music. They included three courses on Gregorian chant, two levels of voice lessons, two courses for organists, and courses on chant accompaniment, grade school music education, and conducting. The principal liturgy course was called “Daily Liturgy Lesson” and was described as “A course of lectures including the following topics: The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; The Sacramental Life of the Church; The Liturgical Year; The Divine Office; Catholic Action and the Liturgy.” A second liturgy course was “Catechetical Methods and the Liturgy,” which discussed the importance of
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liturgical instruction and the use of the liturgy in Christian formation. One final course was also offered in church Latin. There were no courses listed in Christian or liturgical art.  

33

The planned courses for its final year give a clearer picture of the entirety of the program. This final schedule suggests an answer to the question of whether the list of topics was intended to represent individual courses or topics in specific courses. The “Daily Liturgy Lecture” in the description of courses for 1931 covers many of the topics described for the liturgy component of the program in 1929, while many of the topics described for music are given individual courses in 1931. Because of this, it seems most likely that these topics represented a mix of individual courses and topics to be covered in a smaller number of courses. This is not certain, however, as it is also possible that the program had a more balanced, threefold focus in 1929 and 1930 but shifted back to an almost exclusively musical focus in its never-held final session. Whether or not the program ever truly expanded beyond its initial musical emphasis, it is clear that by the planned 1931 summer session, the focus of the program was liturgical music and not a more diverse look at several aspects of the liturgy.

The Liturgical Summer School at St. John’s Abbey was not limited to its coursework components, however. As was the case with many programs, the summer school at St. John’s made liturgical celebration an important part of the program.

33 Ibid., 288-290.
Discussing the reception of the liturgical school and particular approval of its location by
the students, the “With our Readers” column of Orate Fratres reports, “They realize that
for a school of this kind the monastic environment and the daily horarium of the
community provide an almost ideal atmosphere for the study of the liturgy and Church
music.”34 In addition to involvement in liturgical prayer, some of the students were also
engaged in extracurricular work in developing teaching tools that incorporate the liturgy
into catechetical materials. Led by a group of Dominican sisters attending the summer
school, this project was associated with the development of the catechetical supplement
series With Mother Church, and later, with The Christ Life Series.35 Finally, the first
National Liturgical Day in the United States was connected with the summer session of
1929, being held at Saint John’s Abbey shortly after the conclusion of the session and
including many of the students from the summer school.36

While the Liturgical Summer School was ultimately short lived, surviving for
little more than a trial session and two full summers, it offered one of the earliest
programs for the study of the liturgy in the United States. Though there is some question
about the exact makeup of different types of courses, the program provided courses on a

34 “With Our Readers,” Orate Fratres 4:11 (September 1930), 470.
35 Ibid., 470-471; For additional discussion of With Mother Church and the Christ Life Series see:
Keith F. Pecklers, The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America: 1926-
1955 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 171-175; Marx, Virgil Michel, 152-153. Both authors
indicate that work on the series began prior to the sisters’ affiliation with the summer school.
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variety of topics that served to provide a wide breadth of background on the liturgy, and its focuses on music and art allowed for practical application. Work on liturgy and catechesis looked beyond the school itself to see how the liturgy could be included in different levels of education. Opportunities to participate in the liturgical life of the monastic community also served to more fully immerse students in the liturgy that they were studying, and integrating the summer school with the first Liturgical Day served to connect the school with the wider movement for liturgical renewal. Finally, while St. John’s summer school for liturgy was not able to continue beyond a few successful summers, it succeeded in attracting fairly large numbers and showed that there was an interest in more advanced study of liturgy by priests and religious in the United States. St. John’s itself would later be involved in the summer schools connected with the Gregorian Institute, discussed above, and would eventually add its own graduate program in liturgy in 1966.37

Liturgical Summer School at Mundelein

Following the brief existence of the Liturgical Summer School at Saint John’s Abbey, the next major attempt at creating a summer school for liturgical education in the United States does not appear until the early 1940s. This program, organized in 1941 by Reynold Hillenbrand, was a three-week summer school in the liturgy for priests and religious.

seminarians at Mundelein Seminary. Important details about this program may be found in the announcement and review of the program in *Orate Fratres*.

The Liturgical Summer School at Mundelein Seminary in Illinois was organized for the period from July 14 to August 1, 1941. The program consisted of four lectures per day, five days a week for the three weeks. It is likely that there were not four separate courses, each held daily for three weeks, but rather a series of individual lectures on the liturgy with a large number of professors covering a wide range of topics. An announcement in *Orate Fratres* reports that particular topics were “doctrinal background; the sacramental liturgy; the Mass; the liturgical movement; the liturgical year; parish participation; dialog Mass and high Mass; liturgy and social action; [and] the chant.”

Professors for these courses included many notable names in the American liturgical movement, including Diekmann, Hellriegel, Ellard, Reinhold, and Hillenbrand himself. An additional feature of the program was an evening discussion led by members of the faculty, including one discussion on liturgical art from Maurice Lavanoux. Liturgical celebrations included Masses modeling the principles of active participation and Compline sung daily. During the day, the hours of Terce, Sext, and None were recited, with Terce opening each morning session, Sext concluding it, and None beginning the afternoon session.
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The summer school at Mundelein was very successful. According to *Orate Fratres*, over one hundred twenty priests attended at least one week of the program, with the majority attending all three weeks. The journal’s discussion of the school is completely laudatory, highlighting the excellence of the lectures, the evening discussion sessions, the liturgical services, and the general spirit of interest in the liturgy among the participants. The review also expresses hope that similar summer schools will be organized throughout the country in the following year.\(^{40}\) In addition to this favorable review, the program may certainly be praised for its outstanding faculty, representing some of the best that the liturgical movement in the United States had to offer, and for the breadth of its lecture topics. Unfortunately, this program was only held once, and while there were liturgical weeks and days specifically aimed at seminarians in the years to follow, a similar program dedicated to the education of priests in the liturgy never developed.

**Social Worship Program at Boston College**

One final attempt to launch a major summer school for liturgical studies in the United States during the first half of the twentieth century is the Social Worship Program at Boston College. Launched in 1948, this program offered numerous courses in liturgy and liturgical art during its four summer sessions. While the program lasted only a few years, it is the nearest contemporary to the Notre Dame Liturgy Program and, in a sense,

\(^{40}\) Diekmann, “The Liturgical Summer School for Priests,” 470-472.
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was its direct competition. Examination of its curriculum and failure will be helpful tools to establish some of the important common features of early American liturgical education programs and will allow for some of the most helpful comparisons with the Notre Dame Liturgy Program. Resources for the discussion of this program include the autobiography of its director, William Leonard, and announcements of the program in the “Liturical Briefs” section of Orate Fratres.

The Social Worship Program offered its first classes in the summer of 1948, just one year after Mathis’ Notre Dame program began. In its first summer, the program was part of Boston College’s School of Expressional Arts and hosted three courses, “1) The Church, the Mystical Body of Christ; 2) The Encyclical Mediator Dei; 3) Social Worship in Practice.” The program lasted five weeks and featured two Jesuits, Paul Curtin and Leonard, as its lecturers.41

The program was significantly expanded in its second year of operation, 1949. In addition to courses on Mediator Dei and the Mystical Body of Christ, classes were offered on the sacraments, Gregorian chant, the history of the Mass, and “the living parish.” Special lectures were also given on “Old Testament background of the Christian liturgy, the liturgy in the New Testament, the sacramental character of the universe, the history of Christian symbolism, and the function of statuary, sculpture, stained glass and

architecture as servants of worship.’’ Additional components of the program included a workshop in effective teaching of the liturgy and daily singing of the Mass and Divine Office. The faculty associated with the program was also significantly expanded to include Thomas Carroll and Shawn Sheehan, both of whom served in leadership roles with the Liturgical Conference, Francis Moran, editor of the *Boston Pilot*, James Coleran of Weston College, Sister M. Rachel, conductor John Bonn, sculptor Robert Amendola, and Thomas Stark of St. Thomas’ Seminary, Bloomfield, Connecticut.

The Social Worship Program continued in 1950 with a similar curriculum and a few additions. A partnership with both the Gregorian Institute and the Catholic Art Association brought a number of art courses to the curriculum, including “Staging the School Play,” “Calligraphy and Calligraphic Drawing,” “Painting,” and “The Teaching of Art.” These additions brought a similar number of art instructors to the program. This was followed, in 1951, with the continued mix of liturgy and art courses and the addition of the well-known liturgist Gerald Ellard to the staff.

Despite its favorable location in a major eastern city and its wide variety of courses, the Social Worship Program struggled to attract students from its very...
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beginning. In his autobiography, Leonard attributes this difficulty to the college’s refusal to grant credit for the program’s courses. He writes,

> Although it had an excellent faculty (Father Ellard, Father C.J. McNaspy), the graduate school refused to grant credit for its courses, so enrollments were few. Even the Sisters, who because they read seriously and attended conferences were in their thinking far ahead of the priests (who too often did neither) - even the Sisters regretfully stayed away.\(^{46}\)

*Orate Fratres*’ discussion of the program in 1950 also shows a concern with enrollment numbers, saying,

> All the school now needs for undoubted success is a large number of students. Priests, seminarians, religious and lay people will be welcomed; no specialization in liturgical study is pre-required. Again we ask *O.F.* readers to direct interested persons Boston-wards. It is a project too important for American Catholic life to be allowed to risk failure.\(^{47}\)

Pleas for more students, including a recruiting tour of eighty-six motherhouses by Leonard, were unsuccessful, and only four students registered in 1952, which, because of such low enrollment, would be the final year.\(^{48}\)
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While there were a limited number of dedicated summer schools and other programs for the study of the liturgy in the United States, there were also several places that included liturgical elements in their curriculum. This included a number of colleges, like The Catholic University of America, that began to include a selection of liturgical courses as part of their summer sessions. Outside of higher education, other programs for the formation of the laity also began to incorporate the liturgy into their curriculums. While these are not dedicated liturgical education programs and are therefore less significant to the purposes of this study, they do give examples of other ways that the liturgy was incorporated into educational and formational programs in the United States.

Though only a few colleges would create full academic programs dedicated to study of the liturgy, several schools introduced one or more courses on the liturgy, especially in their summer sessions, during the early to mid-twentieth century. As early as 1931, Catholic University began offering summer courses in liturgy covering a variety of topics. The 1931 summer session included three courses, one called “The Liturgy in the Christian Life” and two covering aspects of the history of the liturgy. The school continued to offer regular courses on the liturgy in the decades that followed. Among the better-known professors who led liturgy courses at Catholic University were Ellard, who

49 “Liturgical Briefs,” Orate Fratres 5:5 (March 1931), 244.
lectured on *Mediator Dei* in 1948, and Diekmann, who taught courses on the Eucharist and the sacraments in both 1950 and 1953.\(^{50}\)

Smaller institutions also included study of the liturgy in their summer sessions. The December 1944 issue of *Orate Fratres* gives a snapshot of some aspects of liturgical education in Catholic colleges in the United States in its overview of summer schools. In addition to a liturgical week at Vancouver, a special school in liturgy for the Sisters of St. Joseph in Wichita Kansas, and a number of summer schools for other apostolates that included liturgical components, it lists courses at the College of Great Falls in Montana, Incarnate Word College in San Antonio, and The Catholic Teacher’s College of New Mexico.\(^{51}\) Keith Pecklers also notes that there were a large number of liturgical study clubs on the campuses of Catholic colleges, including St. Mary’s College in Notre Dame, Indiana.\(^{52}\) While these were not specifically academic programs, they show the growth of interest in the liturgy in diverse academic settings in the United States.

Various schools and formation programs for mostly lay apostolates were not primarily focused on the liturgy but also included it as one of the components of their curriculum, again particularly in the case of summer schools. Pecklers’ discussion of adult liturgical education highlights summer schools held by the Grail and the
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Campionites in the 1930s and 1940s. He describes a 1937 Campionite summer school, saying

[it] consisted of five two-week sessions between 20 June and 29 August. Subjects treated included liturgy and sociology, liturgy and life, and the Mystical Body of Christ. There was one hour of lecture and discussion on each subject daily, along with the full participation of all students in the singing of the liturgical hours and the celebration of the Eucharist. 53

Another program which placed an emphasis on the liturgy was Grailville’s workshops for young women; Orate Fratres reports that these workshops make “liturgical living… the integrating factor of instruction.” 54

Two programs focused on social action that also incorporated the liturgy in their curriculum on at least one occasion are the Sheil School and the Friendship House. Connected with the St. Benet’s Library in Chicago, the Sheil School included a number of courses on the liturgy in its curriculum. Reporting on its 1945 offerings, Orate Fratres writes

The current fall term of the School, for instance, has regular classes on the Mass and the sacraments, on Gregorian chant as community prayer, and on the songs of the Church. The summer term had courses in liturgy, the Mass, the Mystical Body, the psalms, and another entitled “The Social Thought of Dom Virgil Michel.” 55

The liturgy was also an important part of study at the Friendship House, which promoted interracial harmony and focused on the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. Worship

53 Ibid., 208.


writes of the Friendship House’s liturgical interests, saying, “These F.H. schools always emphasize the encyclicals on the Mystical Body and the Liturgy, and offer the experience of community worship.”

While none of these programs or courses treated the liturgy in the same depth as a dedicated liturgy program, each made an important contribution to liturgical education in the United States. They are particularly relevant to this study because they show a growing increase in interest in liturgical education on multiple levels and highlight the variety of ways in which the liturgy was be taught. Additionally, these programs also reflect the emphasis placed by many on the importance of liturgical celebration in teaching the liturgy.

Common Features of American Programs

While there was a great deal of diversity among programs of for liturgical education in the United States, there were also a number of features common to many of these programs. In particular, with regards to curriculum, all of these programs included course work on Gregorian chant, while most also included some consideration of liturgical arts. Many of the programs, especially those focused primarily on Gregorian chant, also offered some form of introductory course in liturgy. Programs at Boston College, St. John’s Abbey, and the Pius X School of Liturgical Music also provided courses or extracurricular offerings that focused on equipping students with the tools to

teach liturgy or liturgical music. Finally, the majority of the programs surveyed above featured a union of academic study and liturgical prayer, often including the option to participate in Mass and a portion of the Divine Office as part of the program.

5.1.2 Major European Liturgical Education Programs

While the present study is primarily concerned with Michael Mathis’ contributions to the liturgical movement in the United States, the roots of the liturgical movement and many of its leading figures and centers of scholarship were European. Because the scope of the movement in Europe is so large, however, this section will only focus on clearly academic programs, leaving to the side the other liturgical works of these centers, including liturgical weeks, publishing programs, research projects, liturgical experimentation and reform, and other liturgical promotions. Most important among European liturgical education programs are those associated with Mont César, Maria Laach, the Institut Supérieur de Liturgie in Paris, and the Liturgical Institute in Trier.

Liturgical Education at the Abbey of Mont César

One of the most important centers for the liturgical movement was the Abbey of Mont César. This monastery, which was home for a time to Lambert Beauduin and later Bernard Capelle and Bernard Botte, made a number of important contributions to liturgical education during the twentieth century. The abbey’s educational efforts included liturgy courses for the students at Louvain and eventually a summer liturgical school intended for seminary professors.
Capelle and Botte were both involved in liturgical education projects at the abbey. First, seeking to provide liturgical education for the Benedictine seminarians at Louvain, Capelle and Botte began to offer a course on the topic at Mont César beginning in 1920. Botte provides some basic description of the course in his memoir, *From Silence to Participation*, saying that in the first year the lectures covered the history of the Mass, while in the second they studied certain aspects of the liturgical year, particularly the Christmas and Paschal cycles. Capelle and Botte’s course, which was held until the Second World War and continued after the war’s conclusion, provided seminary students with a level of liturgical education unusual among seminary curriculums.57

The abbey made a more significant contribution to liturgical education in the 1950s, when it began to offer short summer courses in liturgy for seminary professors. This program sought to alleviate one of the major obstacles to the progress of liturgical renewal, the lack of seminary professors with sufficient liturgical training to adequately prepare the next generation of priests. In his memoir, Botte discusses a survey of seminary liturgy professors that effectively summarizes this situation:

> Just the same, almost all agreed on two points. The first was the limited attention paid by study programs to the liturgy; the second was the professors’ lack of training. Most of them complained they were made liturgy professors without warning, without having had the time or the opportunity to gain some degree of competence. Besides, specializing in liturgy was difficult since there was no institute organized for its study. The only way was to do a thesis in theology on a liturgical topic; but most theology schools did not have a chair in liturgy and,

consequently, did not have specialized professors. Furthermore, it seemed that superiors didn’t dream of giving special preparation to liturgy professors. This was a subject that anyone could teach.\textsuperscript{58}

Together with the Sulpicians and the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, the Abbey of Mont César decided to offer a one-week intensive liturgy course at the abbey, beginning in the summer of 1953. The week would feature sixteen lectures taught by a team primarily composed of Capelle, Botte, Jounel, Chavasse, Martimort, and Gy. Over a four year period the lectures were to cover liturgical books and the liturgical year, providing a basic introduction to both the sources and methodology for the study of liturgical topics. These study weeks continued annually at Mont César until 1967.\textsuperscript{59} Though each session was only about a week in length, the program’s goal of educating seminary professors in the methods of liturgical study set it apart from other liturgical weeks or conferences and make it more of a liturgical education program.

The work of Capelle and Botte provided an important educational service to the liturgical movement. In particular, their work with the summer liturgical school helped to provide essential formation to professors of liturgy and likely significantly improved the quality of liturgical formation of many seminarians. While the above summarizes the work done at the abbey, Botte would also be involved in other liturgical education programs that will be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 85-86.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 86-88.
**Liturgical Academy at Maria Laach**

Another of the major centers of the liturgical movement in Europe and the first to successfully launch a program for liturgical education was the Abbey of Maria Laach in Germany. This monastery was a major center of liturgical scholarship prior to World War II, serving as the home to a number of respected scholars and the source of a number of important liturgical publications. Under the leadership of Abbot Ildefons Herwegen, Maria Laach created the Benedictine Academy, also known as the Liturgical Academy, in 1931 as a two-year program in the liturgy. Announcements of the program in *Orate Fratres* provide details about the course offerings and faculty, as well as information about the type of students the program enrolled.

The coursework for this program was a mix of liturgy, art, music, and studies in monasticism. The first year of the program featured courses on the Rule of Benedict, the liturgical year, history of Gregorian chant, and the history of the liturgy.\(^{60}\) The second year featured courses on liturgy and art, liturgies for the dying and dead, the canon of the Mass, Gregorian chant, and a second course on the liturgical year.\(^{61}\) In its third year, the program added seminars on various monastic rules and included more lectures on art and the liturgy, with a focus on the ninth to fourteenth centuries, “The Chief Principles of the
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Liturgical Cult,” eastern monasticism, history of the liturgy, the Divine Office, and hagiography.\textsuperscript{62}

The following academic year, 1934-1935, saw an expansion in courses and seminars, with seminars on the Divine Office in the early church, the structure of missal orations, and the origins of the Christmas cycle. The courses included the typical courses on the liturgical year and liturgy and art, this time with a focus on the early period until the Middle Ages, along with a studies of monastic history, focusing on early monasticism, and Gregorian chant; a course on church history was also included, and it, too, was taught through a monastic lens.\textsuperscript{63} Orate Fratres does not appear to provide information about the academy’s fifth year in 1935-1936, but the program’s sixth year, 1936-1937, featured a schedule that included courses on “liturgical art, the history of the divine office, musical paleography, the sacraments, the scriptural lessons occurring in the liturgy of Lent, the Holy Rule of St. Benedict, the Apostolic Fathers, early Christian inscriptions and selected questions of liturgical history.”\textsuperscript{64} The 1938-1939 academic year, the last for which Orate Fratres gives information, included the typical music, art, and liturgical history courses, as well as courses on eastern liturgies and Scripture readings in the liturgy.\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{62} “Liturgical Briefs,” Orate Fratres 7:10 (September 1933), 471.

\textsuperscript{63} “Liturgical Briefs,” Orate Fratres 8:11 (October 1934), 522.

\textsuperscript{64} “Liturgical Briefs,” Orate Fratres 11:1 (November 1936), 39.

\textsuperscript{65} “Liturgical Briefs,” Orate Fratres 12:10 (September 1938), 474.
The Liturgical Academy’s faculty typically consisted of Benedictines; among them were Abbot Herwegen, Damasus Winzen, Jerome Frank, and Albert Hammenstede.66 The program drew students from throughout the world, including some from the United States. In its first year, *Orate Fratres* reports, the academy had students from England, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, and the United States.67 In 1935, Michael Ducey also notes that the school had enrolled around twenty students, mostly from other Benedictine abbeys, but with a few secular priests also attending. He adds that the students included at least one student from the United States each year and that there were also students from England, Belgium, Switzerland, and Spain.68 Additional American students also had the opportunity to attend a dedicated summer session in 1934, which allowed seminary students studying in Europe an opportunity to take liturgy classes in English in August and September.69 One of the American students attending Maria Laach’s Liturgical Academy was Godfrey Diekmann, who came to the school for additional liturgical education in the summer of 1931 and again in the fall of 1932.70
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Unfortunately, the unrest in Europe and the Second World War forced the Liturgical Academy to close in the late 1930s. Signs of difficulty created by the unrest leading up to the war can be seen as early as 1935, when Ducey notes in an article about the monastery that “recent economic and political conditions have seriously hampered the progress of the infant academy.” It is likely that this closure came somewhere around 1939, as the 1938-1939 school year is the final year that *Orate Fratres* provides information about the program. The monastery did return to its liturgical work after the war, however, with the Abbot Herwegen Institute opening in the late 1940s to offer courses in liturgy once again.

*Institut Supérieur de Liturgie*

In the mid-1950s, many of the scholars who had been teaching at the Mont César liturgical weeks began to work on a new program for the education of seminary professors of liturgy at the *Institut Catholique* in Paris. With the backing of the Center for Pastoral Liturgy, this program, which would be known as the *Institut Supérieur de Liturgie*, was founded in 1956. This program, with its focus on advanced studies to prepare liturgy professors for seminaries, represents the most scholarly academic program established up to this point in the liturgical movement. A relative abundance of material, found in personal account of Bernard Botte and other writings contemporary
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with the school’s establishment, allows for a detailed discussion of this school’s founding, goals, and early years.

In his book, *From Silence to Participation*, Botte traces the origins of the *Institut Supérieur* to the same need to provide well-trained seminary liturgy professors that produced the summer session liturgical week at Mont César. Referring to the success of the study weeks and the need for something more permanent, Botte says

> These study weeks responded to a temporary situation. We had to provide liturgy professors with an opportunity of acquiring the training no one ever dreamed of giving them. But it was necessary to foresee a changing of the guard in a few years, and we didn’t want to turn an improvised solution into a system. We had to find a way of training professors before their appointment. A student wanting to do this was very much at a loss. No institute provided special preparation for liturgists. As a result, we had to create something entirely new.\(^{73}\)

Botte reports that he received permission from Capelle to negotiate with the Center for Pastoral Liturgy regarding the establishment of the school. Botte composed a draft proposal of the potential course of studies and discussed the program with Gy and Bouyer. The project was then presented to the rector of the *Institut Catholique*, Monsignor Blanchet, and Botte’s draft was approved. Botte reports that the core staff of the program was then selected, with Botte himself appointed to be the first director, Gy serving as assistant director, and Jounel as secretary.\(^{74}\)

\(^{73}\) Botte, *From Silence to Participation*, 91.

\(^{74}\) Ibid., 93-95.
At an early stage in its development, it was decided that the *Institut Supérieur* should focus only on training seminary professors and should not attempt to accommodate a wider audience. Here Botte says, “One could have imagined a liturgical institute open to a very wide public, just like the Institut Catéchétique attended by many teaching sisters. But if we wanted to prepare seminary professors of liturgy, then the level had to be different.” This outlook was reflected in the program’s demanding curriculum, designed to provide seminary professors with the tools to design and teach their own courses in the liturgy. To do this, Botte says the program needed to be designed to give the students “a knowledge of liturgical sources and a critical work method.”

Four types of courses were planned, namely “general courses, special courses, some electives, and seminars.” There were three general courses, with a general introduction given in the first semester and two courses spread out over the next two years, one giving a general history of the liturgy and another focusing specifically on the Roman liturgy. Special courses were intended not just to provide students with information about the topic, but also to show the students the professor’s methodology. Describing how the courses worked at the institute, Botte says, “There were five series of special courses each semester. Each professor gave six lectures spread over two weeks. This was enough time to treat a specific problem in-depth and to give the students an

---

75 Ibid., 94.

76 Ibid., 95.

77 Ibid., 95.
example of methodology.” Elective courses were simply chosen from among the various offerings of the Institut Catholique, and students were expected to choose two per semester. Finally, the weekly seminar for the students to apply their methodological and theoretical learning in a project for a class focused on a special topic completed the initial course offerings. To these, Botte eventually added a course in Latin for liturgical texts.79

This schedule of courses can be seen in an announcement of the institute’s first-year offerings in Worship. Among the general courses and seminar were “General introduction and method in liturgical science” with Gy, “Origins of the liturgy,” with Jounel, and “Seminar and introduction to work on primary sources,” with Gy. The special courses were, “the Roman Mass (Abbot Capelle); baptismal rites (Dom Botte); the ancient Gelasian Sacramentary (Rev. A. Chavasse); word and rite (Rev. Bouyer); pastoral and history of the rubrics (Canon Martimort); oriental liturgies (Rev. A. Raes, S.J.); [and] liturgical music (Rev. J. Gelineau, S.J.).”80 These courses closely follow the plan described by Botte and show the academic strength of the program. The faculty listed in this announcement is very strong, with many well-known liturgical scholars and professors who had served in other successful liturgical education projects teaching courses.

78 Ibid., 95-96.
79 Ibid., 96-97.
While individual courses and detailed liturgical programs had begun to emerge throughout the world, none offered an advanced degree intended specifically for seminary liturgy professors prior to the Institut Supérieur. This program’s two-year course of studies was connected with the theological faculty at the Institut Catholique and presumed the possession of a licentiate in theology by its students. Additionally, a few years following the institute’s opening, Botte sought, and eventually gained, approval of the institute from Roman authorities. As a result of these factors, the Institut Supérieur de Liturgie stands out as preeminent among academic programs in liturgical studies.

The Liturgical Institute of Trier

Another program of interest among European liturgical studies programs was at the Liturgical Institute of Trier, founded in 1947 by Johannes Wagner. The institute took part in scholarly work for the renewal of the liturgy but did not initially feature an academic degree program. Botte compares it to the Paris Center for Pastoral Liturgy, saying, “In spite of its title, the latter [the Liturgical Institute] was not a teaching institute, but a study and organizational body of the liturgical movement similar to the C.P.L. of Paris.” The Liturgical Institute in Trier would not offer an academic program for

81 Ibid., 478.
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liturgical studies until 1965, when it founded its “scientific study section” in response to the call of Vatican II for more liturgical education in seminaries.\textsuperscript{85}

The “scientific study section” of the Liturgical Institute began to offer a one-year diploma program beginning in November of 1965. The program was focused on the needs of “those destined for parish work, diocesan liturgical commissions, and teaching,” as well as seminary professors.\textsuperscript{86} The coursework included a mix of lectures and seminars, conducted in German, concluding with exams and the composition of an article suitable for publication, in any language. In addition to the German requirement, students were also expected to have already completed their four-year course in theology prior to beginning the program. Announcements of the program in various publications do not list the specific courses offered during the year but do indicate that there would be a mix of history, theology, and pastoral courses. Professors for the first year included Johannes Wagner, Balthasar Fischer, Josef Jungmann, and Joseph Pascher.\textsuperscript{87}

*Common Features of European Programs*

While the European programs surveyed above offered diverse approaches to liturgical studies, there are some common features worth noting. Most importantly, a significant feature of the majority of the programs discussed above was an interest in
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liturgical history, either in dedicated liturgical history courses or in the study of specific historically significant liturgical texts. A second common element of the curriculum was the inclusion of courses dedicated to the different liturgical texts or specific aspects of different rites. Finally, looking beyond the curriculum, most of the European programs discussed focused on educating clergy, with the programs at Mont César and at the *Institut Supérieur de Liturgie* focusing specifically on seminary professors.

5.2 Comparing the Liturgical Education Programs

The first half of this chapter worked to establish the features of a diverse set of liturgy programs, describing the timeline of their histories, their focuses, the types of courses they offered, and other important details about how they approached liturgical education. In its second part, this chapter will take a more critical look at the programs and attempt to compare them to Mathis’ work. Comparison between Mathis’ programs and other contemporary liturgical studies programs will begin with programs in the United States before turning to programs in Europe.

Programs in the United States

Having examined a number of liturgy programs that either preceded Mathis’ program or were contemporary with it, it is now possible to explore what Mathis’ program holds in common with similar programs and what features of his Liturgy Program were unique. Looking first at areas of commonality, this section will emphasize the similarities in coursework among the programs. This will be followed by a discussion
of extracurriculars, especially of the incorporation of liturgical practice with liturgical study. Finally, it will be possible to judge which of its features ultimately set Mathis’ liturgy program apart from its American predecessors and contemporaries.

Since all the programs considered here were providing instruction related to the liturgy, the curriculum of Mathis’ program at Notre Dame overlaps a great deal with those of other programs. A number of these programs featured some form of introductory course, many of which were similar to the “Aspects of the Liturgy” course offered by the Liturgy Program in 1947; like the 1947 course, these classes offered a series of lectures on different topics in the liturgy. Mathis’ program also offered introductory courses, but, unlike many of the American programs studied above, the Notre Dame Liturgy Program went beyond the basic introduction or survey, offering a complete curriculum in liturgical study.

Next, like its contemporary programs, Mathis’ Liturgy Program at Notre Dame offered a number of courses concerned with liturgical arts. It is clear that most of the American programs place some emphasis on Gregorian chant. In many cases, these programs included several different courses on aspects of liturgical music, often incorporating chant accompaniment or how to teach chant in addition to a general Gregorian chant course. Mathis’ program featured a similar number of chant courses, covering chant itself, chant accompaniment, chant pedagogy, and even mandatory choir practice in some years. A number of American programs, including Mathis’ program, also offered courses on the visual arts and their relationship to the liturgy, with Mathis’
program expanding its offerings to include a weeklong workshop for artists and architects in the late 1950s.

Many of the American programs were also concerned to provide students with the tools to incorporate liturgical education into all levels of catechesis and religious instruction. One of the major goals of Mathis’ Notre Dame Liturgy Program was to instruct teachers in liturgical research. Additionally, Mathis’ program included extracurricular workshops in liturgical education in 1955 and 1956 and courses that examined the liturgy and catechesis in the late 1950s. This emphasis on teaching the liturgy allowed many of these programs to facilitate a wider propagation of the principles of the liturgical movement, providing a foundation in the liturgy from the early levels of religious instruction.

Beyond the curriculum, another point of common ground between other programs and Mathis’ is in the inclusion of liturgical services in the school’s schedule. Most of the American programs surveyed above included liturgical celebration as an essential part of their schedule. Mathis’ program also joined worship and coursework, creating an atmosphere of both prayer and learning for the study of the liturgy. It is difficult to provide a complete comparison of the different celebrations offered, because Mathis’ program shifted its liturgical schedule over time, and not all of the details are available for the liturgical functions of the other American programs. However, in at least some years, Mathis’ program offered at least as complete a liturgical schedule as any of the other American liturgy programs with the possible exception of the program at Collegeville, which provided the opportunity to participate in the regular monastic
schedule. It is clear from the extensive liturgy schedules of these programs that the actual celebration of the liturgy was one of the defining characteristics of the American liturgical schools, including Mathis’ Notre Dame program, in the early to mid-twentieth century.

A final commonality between a number of American programs and Mathis’ Liturgy Program is the composition of the student body. While exact numbers of enrollment for most programs are not available, many of the liturgy programs in the United States seem to reflect some diversity of vocations, though they were primarily attended by religious women, with seminarians, priests, and lay persons forming a minority. The earlier chapter on the Liturgy Program has shown that the Notre Dame program attracted large numbers of women religious, along with a smaller number of seminarians and priests and even a few lay persons.

Other programs appear to have similar enrollments. The program at St. John’s Abbey in the late 1920s reportedly attracted around sixty students in its first summer session. Many of these were likely sisters, as comments in Orate Fratres often refer to sisters in particular. The Pius X School also had a diverse student body, with a description of the summer sessions in the 1950s claiming, “The summer sessions were attended by religious men and women, priests, seminarians and lay musicians interested

88 See, for example: “With Our Readers” Orate Fratres 4:11 (September 1930), 470-471.
in either church or school music.”"89 Finally, the Social Worship Program at Boston College was also open to people in diverse vocations, as illustrated by the announcement of the program in the May 1950 issue of *Worship* that claims, “Priests, seminarians, religious and lay people will be welcomed; no specialization in liturgical study is pre-required.”"90 The particular importance of women religious to the liturgy programs in the United States may also be seen in a discussion of the difficulties faced by the Boston College program, where its founder remarks that “even the Sisters regretfully stayed away,” hinting at an expectation that religious women could be relied upon to compose the bulk of the student body.91 One exception to this pattern of diversity was the summer program at Mundelein seminary, which was reserved for priests. The vocational diversity that the American programs display suggests a commitment to developing pastoral leaders in a variety of different roles in the church, including teachers, lay leaders, religious, and pastors, so that all might promote the liturgical movement in their particular state of life and ministry.

In sum, Mathis’ program shares a number of important features with many of the American liturgical education programs that preceded or existed simultaneously with his. Similarities included common elements found in the curriculums of several programs, as well as an emphasis on participation in liturgies and the general shape of the student
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body. Though it does not appear that there are any universal elements beyond the general purpose of studying the liturgy, this comparison shows that Mathis’ Liturgy Program was in some ways very similar to other programs dedicated to the same topic.

Nevertheless, while Mathis’ program does not stand out as exceptionally different from his contemporaries with regards to the general shape of course offerings and the overall importance of liturgical participation, there remain some differences between Mathis’ program and other liturgical schools that merit additional attention. These distinctive characteristics of the Notre Dame Liturgy Program include the program’s longevity, its diversity of courses related to the liturgy, and the strong academic quality of the program with its particular emphasis on the development of research skills.

One of the defining characteristics of the Notre Dame Liturgy Program against other American programs is its endurance. The Notre Dame Liturgy Program began in 1947, with its first undergraduate summer courses, and lasted through the 1950s and into the 1960s. The legacy of liturgical study at Notre Dame continues with a doctoral program in liturgy that began in 1965.\(^\text{92}\) Notre Dame has continuously offered a degree program with a concentration in liturgy from 1948 to the present day. By contrast, with the exception of the Pius X School, the liturgy programs preceding Mathis or contemporary with him lasted for only a few years before being discontinued. The Liturgical Summer School at St. John’s Abbey only ran for two years, 1929 and 1930.

Though the abbey would later be involved in summer programs connected with the Gregorian Institute of America and would launch its own graduate program in the mid-1960s, it lacks the continuous presence and continuity offered by the Notre Dame program. Similarly, the program at Boston College only lasted for five years before being discontinued due to lack of enrollment, and the program at Mundelein was only offered in one summer. It is fair to say, then, that Mathis’ Liturgy Program is the only American program focused entirely on the liturgy that was able to continuously operate for more than a handful of years.

While there are a number of similarities between the curriculums of Mathis’ program and the other American programs, Mathis’ program stands out for offering more courses on aspects of the liturgy beyond general surveys and courses connected with the arts. The Notre Dame program offered introductory courses, as well as courses in chant and art, but its interest in developing skills in liturgical research for students led to a wider array of courses in diverse fields. Among these were regular course offerings in liturgical history and the history and theology of different liturgical texts and rites, as well as courses in special areas of interest, such as pastoral care, catechesis, and the relationship between the liturgy and the missions. The diversity and depth of courses in the Notre Dame program is evidenced by the course offerings in the final year of Mathis’ life, which included three courses on chant, five language courses, two courses on the liturgy and catechism, an introductory course, a course on liturgy and the eastern rites, and courses on the history and theology of baptism, the “Liturgy of the Day,” and
“Liturgy in the Light of the History of Religions and Psychology.” In this way, the program brought more focus to aspects of the liturgy beyond liturgical music and offered a greater diversity of liturgy courses.

Finally, a number of factors suggest that Mathis’ Liturgy Program was stronger academically than its American peers. This can first be seen in the diversity of liturgy courses, noted above. Mathis’ program covered the liturgy in a more comprehensive fashion than most of its American contemporaries; it not only treated the liturgy in general and the different liturgical arts but also went into great depth examining the different liturgical books and different eras in liturgical history, looking at the liturgy from perspectives that the other programs did not cover. Beyond the diverse and comprehensive liturgical curriculum, Mathis program stands out as the first graduate degree program in the liturgy in the United States. Though it was preceded by a number of programs and workshops, Mathis’ work broke new ground by offering a graduate degree and offered a level of academic work unmatched by the program’s predecessors.

Additional evidence for the relative academic strength of the Notre Dame program may be seen in its faculty. His program featured well-known American and European liturgical scholars in addition to local faculty drawn from Notre Dame. Many of the best-known American scholars that worked with the other American programs taught at least one course at Notre Dame, and several of them were involved for more
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than one summer session. Mathis’ program also stands apart because of the strong European faculty he recruited. Almost every summer session planned by Mathis featured at least one well-known and excellent European liturgical scholar.

The Notre Dame Liturgy Program’s emphasis on research also highlights the program’s high level of academic excellence. While other programs provided instruction in the liturgy, its history and theology, its meaning, or its relationship with the visual arts and music, they do not appear to have had a significant emphasis on the development of research skills. Mathis, however, clearly stated from the first year of the graduate program that the goal of the program was to introduce students to and prepare them to perform liturgical research. Many of its courses worked to develop these skills and, while the program would add a non-research option, it maintained this emphasis on research throughout Mathis’ life.

Finally, the relative academic strength of Mathis’ Liturgy Program may be seen in the related publishing program. As was shown in the previous chapter, a number of the courses taught during the summer sessions of the Notre Dame Liturgy Program were later converted into books published as part of the Liturgical Studies Series by the University of Notre Dame Press. The popularity of a number of these texts, especially the first, Liturgical Piety, demonstrates the academic force of the Notre Dame program.

Though Mathis’ program shared several features in common with American liturgy programs from around the same time, it is also unique for its sustained academic excellence. Each of the programs surveyed offered a number of similar courses in its curriculum, appealed heavily to religious women, and featured a sizable portion of the
church’s daily liturgy as part of their schedules. While Mathis’ program shared all of these characteristics, it offered them within the framework of an academically rigorous degree program that regularly featured some of the best liturgical scholars in the world. This allowed Mathis’ project to stand apart from its peers as the preeminent liturgy program in the United States.

Mathis and Major European Programs

While the Notre Dame Liturgy Program’s main peers were in the United States, it is also helpful to compare the program to European predecessors and contemporaries. In particular, points of contact between the curriculums and differences in types of students should be examined. Additionally, some comments may be offered by way of comparison of the quality of staff.

With regard to course offerings, Mathis’ program included a number of courses that were common in American programs but which were largely absent from the main curriculums of the European programs. This included courses on the relationship of art and the liturgy and introductory courses in the liturgy. Maria Laach was the sole European program in this survey that offered art courses and an introductory course in liturgy as part of its curriculum. Additionally, the curriculum of Mathis’ program also featured a number of practical courses that were not a focus of the European programs.

One area in which the Notre Dame program shared a lot in common with European liturgy programs is the role of history courses in the curriculum. The survey of common features of liturgy programs above has shown that many of the European programs included at least one liturgical history course in their regular curriculum, with
some offering more than one or including elements of liturgical history in courses on special topics. Mathis’ program initially included a four-year cycle of liturgical history courses addressing different eras in church history, though it eventually moved away from this plan in favor of more occasional history courses and incorporated history components into a number of additional classes, such as the 1958 course on the Divine Office and the 1959 courses on the development of the structure of the Mass and the early Christian prayer life. A second common type of course offering was courses dedicated to liturgical texts and rites. Both Mathis and his European counterparts featured courses discussing the different liturgical books and their associated rites as a major part of their program.

The differences in curriculum may likely be traced to the asymmetry in overall purpose and intended audience between Mathis’ program and the European programs. For the most part, the European programs discussed in this chapter were focused on educating current or future seminary professors and catered to priests and seminarians, while Mathis’ program involved significant vocational diversity and sought to educate students to serve not just as seminary professors but also in educational and pastoral roles. Mathis included introductory courses, practical courses, and art courses, while many of the European programs did not, because his program was attempting to educate those involved in ministries where such courses would be helpful. At the same time, because Mathis believed in the importance of a research-based liturgical education, he also included many courses similar to the strong academic offerings of the European programs.
While this chapter has only briefly examined the professors associated with the European liturgy schools, these schools tended to have a stronger faculty than Mathis’ program. The summer school at Mont César, the first year of the *Institut Supérieur*, and the first year of the academic program at the University of Trier all exemplify the high quality of faculty typical of the European liturgy programs. The summer program at Mont César featured Botte, Capelle, Chavasse, Martimort, and Gy, while the first year’s courses at the *Institut Supérieur* were led by well-known liturgists such as Jounel, Gy, Botte, Capelle, Chavasse, Martimort, and Bouyer. At Trier, the faculty included Johannes Wagner and Balthasar Fischer, with Josef Jungmann and Joseph Pascher serving as guest lecturers covering a short series on special topics. Though a number of these professors served at one point or another as part of Mathis’ program, they were not permanent members of the faculty, and there tended to be only one or two well-known European professors teaching at Notre Dame at a time.

While Mathis’ Liturgy Program stands out among American programs for its strong academic character, it does not compare as favorably to similar European programs. In Mathis’ favor, his program included a number of similarities with some of the leading European programs; these include emphases on both liturgical history and liturgical texts. However, Mathis’ program falls short of many of the European programs with regard to faculty. Mathis did recruit a number of excellent European faculty members, but the Notre Dame program was unable to feature as many high-quality faculty as European programs were. Additionally, Notre Dame also falls short of some of the European programs in length of term, as the Notre Dame program only occurred
during summer sessions and the programs at Maria Laach, Paris, and Trier were held during the school year.

5.3 Conclusion

This chapter has surveyed early to mid-twentieth century liturgical education programs in order to place Michael Mathis’ contributions with the Notre Dame Liturgy Program into context. To do so, it has first provided a close examination of a number of American and European predecessors and contemporaries of Mathis’ program, focusing on academic features with occasional consideration of extracurricular projects. Following the introduction to each of these programs, the chapter then highlighted key features present in a number of programs, particularly noting aspects of the curriculum that were common to a majority.

Next followed a comparison between Mathis’ program and both the American and European programs. This comparison showed that, while Mathis’s program was similar to many of the American programs on a number of fronts, it provided a stronger academic program than the majority of its American contemporaries. At the same time, while similarities were also found between Mathis’ Notre Dame program and the European programs, the European programs tended towards stronger academic offerings than Mathis’ program.

Most importantly, this comparisons of this chapter have shown why Mathis’ program played such an important role in the liturgical movement in the United States.
While it was possible to learn about the liturgy in a general way at a number of schools and to study specific aspects of the liturgy, especially chant, at a number of dedicated programs, Notre Dame provided the most comprehensive and academically rigorous program in the liturgy in the U.S., and it also provided the only opportunity to receive an advanced academic credential on the topic. Though one might receive this standard or better of liturgical training in Europe, Mathis’ program made high-level liturgical education, even including many leading European professors, available to American liturgical leaders and scholars. Providing this level of education allowed for the training of American liturgical leaders and scholars, giving them the tools with which to teach others about the riches of the liturgy and to guide liturgical renewal and reform. Ultimately, then, Mathis’ contribution through this program was to provide liturgically well-educated leaders for the liturgical movement in the United States.
PART 3:

LITURGICAL PROJECTS
CHAPTER 6:

THE VIGIL SERVICE AND RELATED PROJECTS

Michael Mathis’ liturgical interests were not confined only to his work with liturgical education. A major part of his work as a liturgist involved the creation of prayer services based on the Office of Matins and the composition of commentary addressing Matins and the Mass for each Sunday and major feast of the year. This project, which Mathis worked on for most of his career as a liturgist, represents an important aspect of his work. Though the Vigil Service has a smaller overall impact than the liturgy program, it shows how Mathis put his liturgical convictions into action.

This chapter will focus on the development and the contents of the Vigil Service and, to a lesser extent, on Mathis’ failed attempt to publish a text for daily Lauds and Vespers with commentary. It will first investigate the origins of the Vigil Service, how the service developed and changed, and how it related to the official text for Matins in the Roman Breviary. It will then consider the second important part of the service, namely, the commentary for each Sunday and feast, examining the shape of Mathis’ commentary and closely studying Mathis’ comments for the Sundays in a single season. This will be
followed by a brief consideration of the failed attempt to expand into Lauds and Vespers. The chapter will conclude with an evaluation of the Vigil Service.

6.1 The Vigil Service

Mathis’ Vigil Service was a modified version of the Office of Matins for Sundays and select feasts from the Roman Breviary intended to help prepare participants for the celebration of the Sunday or feast by means of a communal prayer service featuring psalms, scripture reading, and commentary. The service went through a number of variations over the years, developing from a local service held weekly, to self-printed sets of texts published on a regular basis with extensive commentary, to a final, streamlined edition published by the University of Notre Dame Press. In its final form, the service provided services for every Sunday of the year, each Sunday beginning with a two-to-three-page commentary and offering a version of Matins with modifications to the psalter and designated lessons.

This section will explore the Vigil Service in its different forms by first tracking the origins of Mathis’ Vigil Service, investigating Mathis’ goals for the service and his understanding of its meaning, and describing the basic structure and contents of the different forms the published prayer service took. It will then examine the service’s relationship to the breviary of its time and will conclude by providing a close study of Mathis’ Vigil Service commentaries, looking at examples from the major variations of the services.
6.1.1 Origins

Going through a number of stages of development, the Vigil Service grew from the early days of Father Mathis’ liturgical “conversion” until the publication of the final editions in 1956 and 1957. Investigating the seeds of this project will help to establish both the original goals of Mathis’ services and the starting point of development for the services. This requires a search for possible precursors of the project and other signs of an interest in the Vigil Service in Mathis’ earlier work.

Early History and Precedents

Both George Schidel and Robert Kennedy have hypothesized about potential origins for Mathis’ Vigil Service. Schidel suggests that the service “developed out of his practice of meditation on the Mass of the day with the sisters while chaplain of the Medical Missionaries.”¹ He also points to Mathis’ later work with the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade at Notre Dame, during which time he published a pamphlet called Preparation for Mass. Schidel points to the preface of the first issue, which discusses the need for preparation for Mass and reports that the early Christians spent the whole night before Sundays and feasts in vigil. He also highlights the text for the feast of St. Agnes, several months later, as the first example of Mathis turning to the texts of the Office for

the meaning of the feast. Kennedy likewise suggests that Mathis’ work with the Medical Mission Sisters and his *Preparation for Mass* booklets were early influences on the Vigil Service; additionally, he points to the importance of Mathis’ “conversion” through Parsch’s study of the liturgical texts throughout the liturgical year for his interest in the sources of the texts.

Schidel and Kennedy appear to be correct in their theories on the origins of the service. Discussion of Mathis’ work with the Medical Mission Sisters in the second chapter has shown that Anna Dengel recalled that Mathis meditated with the Medical Mission Sisters on the Mass for the day, and it is likely that this meditation could have been an early seed of the Vigil Service. Further, the connection between Mathis’ work with the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade and the *Preparation for Mass* booklets and the eventual development of the Vigil Service is strong. In addition to the introduction that both Schidel and Kennedy refer to, which establishes the connection in Mathis’ mind between the preparation he led with the Mission Crusade and the practices of the early Christians, Mathis’ introduction to the Feast of St. Luke promotes the idea that there is a lesson to be found in every Mass; this idea is central to the commentaries of Mathis’

---

2 Ibid., 16-17.


Vigil Service. In the same text, Mathis claims that the liturgy not only has a lesson to teach, but is also able to give the grace to bring the lesson to fruition. Mathis would later make this point when promoting the Vigil Service, but he makes it first here, saying, “the Mass does what no other teacher can do: it gives the grace to put the lesson into practice throughout the day.”

More importantly, the similarities between the Vigil Service and the Preparation for Mass can be seen in the structure and content of the pamphlets. The Preparation for Mass texts typically opened with a general introduction to the day, or, in the case of the earliest texts, to the series, and then discussed the history of the feasts, the lesson of the day, and how the day’s liturgy and its message might be applied to the reader’s life. After the introductory material, Mathis then analyzed each text of the Mass, including the chants, readings, and prayers. He usually summarized its meaning, connected it to the lesson of the day, or, where possible, tried to give an application for each text. By the end of the 1940s and into the 1950s, Mathis’ Vigil Service would provide commentary that followed a similar procedure, though these would be more focused on the texts of the Divine Office.

6 Ibid., 1.
7 See, for example: Mathis, “Preparation for Mass: Feast of Saint Luke, October 18th,” CMTH 13/38, UNDA.
Dating the Start of the Vigil Service

The exact timing of Mathis’ move from the *Preparation for Mass* texts to the Vigil Service is unclear, though it would seem that Mathis must have begun the Vigil Service sometime during or after 1941. Advertisements for the Mass study group for the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade began in the fall of 1939, and *Scholastic*, a school newspaper at Notre Dame, featured an article on Mathis’ group in the fall of 1940. Additionally, *Preparation for Mass* booklet publications continued into at least Lent of 1941, with a commentary on a weekday in the Second Week of Lent dated 12 March 1941, indicating that Mathis was still working with this project and not the Vigil Service at the beginning of that year. The latest year that Mathis began the Vigil Services must be 1943, as Mathis indicates in a letter to Gerard Carroll that there were one hundred copies of the service produced beginning in 1943.

Pinning down the exact date of the shift from the *Preparation for Mass* to the Vigil Service poses more difficulty. While Mathis’ letter to Carroll indicates a starting date of 1943 for the distributed copies, it does not provide a start date for Mathis’ practice of the service itself. Mathis’ move from Notre Dame to St. Joseph’s Hospital after the 1941 school year might have presented an opportunity for the shift, though there is no
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specific evidence that this was the case. Schidel suggests 1942, pointing to a letter, “Dear Friend of the Liturgy,” from January of 1954 that says Mathis had been working on the Vigil Service for twelve years.\textsuperscript{11} Additionally, in a form letter promoting the Vigil Service from November of 1956, Mathis claims to have been working on the Vigil Service for fifteen years.\textsuperscript{12} This suggests a start date late in 1941, but might allow for a start early in 1942; one possible hypothesis is that he began with Advent in 1941. However, in a comment from the floor in the 1950 Liturgical Week, Mathis claims he had begun working on the Divine Office about ten years before.\textsuperscript{13} Since Mathis was still working with the Catholic Students’ Mission Crusade ten years before, it is likely that this is more of an estimate than an exact figure. This calls into question the precision of Mathis’ other comments about the time when he began working with the Vigil Service. Yet, the evidence is strong enough to at least suggest that Schidel is reasonably correct in claiming that 1942 was the start date for the service, as it likely began either in late 1941 or early 1942.

\textsuperscript{11} Schidel, “Never Too Much,” 15.

\textsuperscript{12} Michael Mathis to Reverend and dear Father Superior, 27 November 1956, CMTH 25/12, UNDA.

6.1.2 Purpose of the Vigil Service

A number of sources help to describe Mathis’ goals for these services. These sources include, firstly, introductions to the published services themselves; though short, these state exactly what purpose Mathis intends the services to fulfill. Additionally, Mathis provides descriptions of these services during the National Liturgical Weeks, both in short comments from the floor during discussions and in a dedicated paper on the Vigil Service. Some of Mathis’ letters and promotional materials also speak to the advantages Mathis sees in the Vigil Service. Finally, Willis Nutting also describes the service in a paper delivered in the 1949 week; since he was a participant in the Vigil Service that Mathis celebrated in South Bend, his description reflects Mathis’ own understanding of the service.14

The first place to turn for an understanding of the Vigil Services are the words of Mathis himself in the introductions to the service; two volumes in particular speak to Mathis’ understanding of the purpose for the service. The foreword to the first volume of the final version of the Vigil Service begins by describing the service as “a public prayer through which God’s plan of salvation for mankind is revealed in His own words, as recorded both in the canonical Scriptures and in the oral tradition of the Church, and as
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interpreted by her.”¹⁵ This suggests an educational or revelatory purpose for the service; the service is meant to reveal salvation history through the readings and prayers of Matins. Elsewhere, in his introduction to *A Vigil Preparation for the Masses of Six Feasts With a Brief Commentary*, Mathis lists three major goals for the Vigil Service. The first of these is threefold, namely “to make available to a greater number of the faithful the rich and varied prayer-forms... to deepen our understanding and appreciation of divine revelation, and to seek, especially in the Mass of Faithful, special graces whereby we may be helped to translate into action the lessons taught.”¹⁶ Next, Mathis hopes to show how the church selects lessons to impart the message of the feast. Finally, he wants to show how the liturgical lessons of Matins are connected with the Mass.¹⁷ These goals show that Mathis wants to use additional aspects of the Sunday Liturgy, namely Matins, to deepen the understanding and experience of the Sunday Mass and generally strengthen Catholic knowledge of Sacred Scripture.

Mathis’ discussion of the Vigil Service in the National Liturgical Weeks also brings out a number of purposes for the Vigil Service. One of the first examples of this is Mathis’ comments from the floor in reply to a paper on the Divine Office in the 1950 Liturgical Week. Here, Mathis gives three purposes for the service. These include
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popularizing the Divine Office, promoting the psalms as prayer, and giving people a greater understanding of the Bible in a liturgical setting, complete with some interpretation. Schidel singles out this third purpose of the service as particularly important for Mathis’ understanding of the Vigil Service, saying, “More and more as the years went by Father Mathis came to stress another point – the propriety and advantage of reading the word of God, not just in any old way, but in a liturgical context so that it became worship and inspired worship.” Kennedy also highlights the importance of “bringing the scriptures to the faithful…” as one of Mathis’ “key concerns” in his work with the Vigil Service.

In the discussion of his paper on “The Mass, The Source and Center of Christian Piety,” for the 1951 Liturgical Week, Mathis answers a question about preparation for Mass by pointing to his service; here he says, “…it is designed precisely to help us understand the Mass of the following day.” Additionally, in a paper for the 1957 week, Mathis describes the Vigil Service as “the old prayer which the Church used to educate

18 Mathis, Discussion Comment (1950), 152-153.


20 Kennedy, Michael Mathis, 8.

its clergy and its people.” In the same paper, he says that together with Lauds and Vespers, the Sunday Vigil was the main education for Christians.

Mathis also provides a lengthy description of the Vigil Service, particularly highlighting its relationship to early Christian prayer and its educational value in a letter promoting the local celebration of the service in South Bend in 1947. Here, he connects the Vigil Service with Christian gatherings on Saturday evenings and Sunday mornings, saying that it was the public prayer of Christians for the first three centuries. Discussing his Vigil Service, Mathis focuses on the educational benefits, quoting Pius XI on the importance of the liturgy for teaching the faith and adding

…the liturgy of any Sunday or feast has a special lesson for us not only in doctrine but also in practice. Moreover, the liturgy does not merely point out a lesson to our minds, nor does it merely exhort us to follow it, as other teachers do in their fields, but it also is a sacramental action whereby the graces necessary to see the lesson effectively and to translate it into fruitful action, are obtained by Christ, our eternal high Priest, working through His invisible ministers.

In this text, Mathis again expresses an affirmation of the educational value of the service, and, as was the case with the Preparation for the Mass, he also indicates a belief that the liturgy itself helps its participants understand and implement the lesson it teaches.
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24 Michael Mathis, Description of Vigil Service enclosed in Michael Mathis to Dear Friend of the Liturgy, 10 December 1947, CMTH 25/09, UNDA, 3.
Finally, Nutting also describes the Vigil Service in light of Christian education and preparation for Mass. Concerning this, he says,

The Vigil is a scheme for bringing to modern Catholics the opportunity to pray and to learn as the ancient Christians prayed and learned - through the medium of the Sacred Scripture. It is also a scheme for bringing that praying and learning to its proper setting in the bosom of the liturgy, as a preparation for the culmination of liturgical worship, the Eucharist. It is a plan for reviving the full teaching work of the liturgy and putting that work within the reach of the ordinary layman.25

Nutting reiterates the idea that the liturgy was the primary means of Christian education and the hope that it might be revived as such. In addition to these two commonly cited purposes for the Vigil Service, Nutting also suggests that the service can serve as an alternative to the more typical secular Saturday evening celebrations outside of church.26

These sources present a number of important goals for the Vigil Service. In the first place, the service is intended to promote the Divine Office and expose Catholics to a greater depth of the traditional prayers of the church; Mathis also expressed hope that the service would help prepare participants for Mass. Most importantly, however, the service is intended to carry out an educational function. Mathis and Nutting both present the service as something that will strive to deepen Catholic understandings of both Scripture and the texts of the liturgy. Mathis would return to this theme repeatedly when discussing the goals of the Vigil Service, mentioning it in almost every case when he explained its purpose.

25 Nutting, “Preparation on Saturday Evening for the Lord’s Day,” 168.

26 Ibid., 163-164.
Mathis’ explanations of the purpose of the Vigil Service in these texts also demonstrates his understanding of the formational purpose of the liturgy. In particular, Mathis’ promotion of the educational function of the Vigil Service echoes his earlier statements that each Mass offers an important lesson and the grace to put it into practice. In general, the idea that the liturgy teaches Christians comes out more clearly in these examples, but the idea that the liturgy provides the grace to incorporate the lesson into one’s life is also present, particularly in his promotion of the local celebration of the service and in his description of the service in the preface to *A Vigil Preparation for the Masses of Six Feasts With a Brief Commentary*. As a whole, Mathis’ explanations of the Vigil Service underscore the importance of the liturgy as a central source of Christian formation.

### 6.1.3 Structure and Contents of the Vigil Service

There were two major variations of the Vigil Service during the years that Mathis produced the texts. Though these two structures were not the only shape the Vigil took, the majority of published texts followed one of these two patterns. The first major pattern for the Vigil Service made use of a modified form of the Office of Matins, as well as the complete Office of Lauds for the Sundays and feasts it gave texts for. It included commentary spread throughout the text and ended in a summary commentary, “Immediate Preparation for Mass.” The second major pattern used only the modification
of Matins and featured the majority of its commentary in a two to three page introduction for the Sunday or feast in question.

In its early stages, prior to attempts at publication, the service itself was mimeographed for the entire group, with a special “Master Copy” for the leader with comments. These texts made use of a reduced psalmody, tending to use psalms from the Mass for the day rather than psalms from the breviary for the day. Comments were given throughout the prayer service, with a parenthetical indication for where the leader should add the comments. By 1945, Mathis had begun printing the service in a more streamlined form, with commentary spread throughout the text, rather than in a separate leader text. These printed editions took two forms; one continued to use a smaller amount of psalmody, usually from the psalms from the Mass of the selected day, while a second provided a side-by-side Latin-English translation of the entirety of Matins. The two forms existed concurrently for a while, with some 1946 service publications using the psalms from Mass and some using the full text of Matins. However, the form using the psalms from the Missal would eventually come to be used in the final editions of the text.

The second approach to the Vigil Service began in the fall of 1949, with the Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost. This text again used the Office of Matins as its major
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27 Michael Mathis, “Night Prayer for the Feast of St. James, Apostle, July 25,” CMTH 24/136, UNDA.

28 Michael A. Mathis, A Vigil Preparation for the Masses of Six Feasts With a Brief Commentary (Michael A. Mathis, 1946); Michael A. Mathis, A Brief Commentary on the Text of Matins and Lauds of the Roman Breviary Arranged in Latin and English for the Four Sundays of Lent (Michael Mathis, 1946).

29 Michael Mathis, “Vigil For the Sixteenth Sunday After Pentecost,” CMTH 24/111, UNDA.
source, but Lauds was no longer included, and Mathis both departs from some of the characteristics of his early volumes and significantly modifies the source text. This version used English exclusively and featured the psalms of the Missal, rather than the assigned breviary psalms for Matins. Additionally, these texts changed the approach to the commentary, offering the bulk of the commentary in two to three introductory pages given before the text of the Sunday or feast.\footnote{Prior to 1953, there were brief introductions and footnotes with brief comments for some psalms, but in the final edition all commentary was confined to the pages preceding the prayer text. An example of the transitional version, with a commentary preceding the text and footnotes in the psalms is Michael Mathis, “Four Sundays of Advent and Sunday Within the Octave of Christmas,” CMTH 24/03, UNDA.}

These later texts also saw the addition of musical notation to facilitate singing parts of the service. The first appearance of musical notation in the Vigil Service texts was notation for the psalms around Lent of 1950; however, this was limited to only the psalms and did not include any other sections that might be chanted.\footnote{Michael Mathis, “The Four Sundays of Lent,” CMTH 24/21-24, UNDA.} Additional music was added in the middle of the 1950s, including music for the hymn, responds and versicles, and invitatory. Schidel claims that this began in 1954.\footnote{Schidel, “Never Too Much,” 20.} Kennedy argues that, by providing music for the Vigil Service, Mathis aimed “to make the church’s liturgy pastorally effective through song.”\footnote{Kennedy, Michael Mathis, 8.} The incorporation of chant in the Vigil Service recalls the importance Mathis place on Gregorian chant in the Liturgy Program.
6.1.4 The Vigil Service and the Breviary

Though Mathis was inspired by the text of Matins in the Roman Breviary, and in some editions followed it exactly, in time his text came to feature significant departures. These departures, including changes in the lessons and the psalms, helped turn the Vigil Service into something distinct from the Office of Matins found in the Breviary. It will be necessary to look closely at these changes to understand how the service moved away from the source text.\(^\text{34}\)

The Psalter

The most significant change from the breviary to the Vigil Service is found in the psalter. Though at times in the early stages of the project he used the psalms indicated by the complete breviary, in most cases Mathis replaced the more traditional nine psalms or psalm units given by the breviary for Matins for Sundays and feasts in his texts with a smaller selection of psalms taken from the psalms used in the Sunday or feast’s Mass. In the 1946 text, A Vigil-Preparation for the Masses of Six Feasts With a Brief Commentary, Mathis claims that the reason for the use of the psalms from the Roman Missal was “to give those who are not familiar with the psalms a sufficient background to get more out

\(^{\text{34}}\) Comparisons in this section will use Breviarium Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini: Summorum Pontificum Cura Recognitum Cum Nova Psalterii Versione Pii Papae XII Jussu Edita. 27th ed., 4 vols. (Turin: Sumptibus et Typis Mame, 1952) and Joseph A. Nelson, ed., Roman Breviary In English: Restored by the Sacred Council of Trent; Published by Order of the Supreme Pontiff St. Pius V, and Carefully Revised by Other Popes. Reformed By Order of Pope Pius X. According to the Vatican Typical Edition, with New Psalter of Pope Pius XII; Compiled from Approved Sources, 4 vols. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1950).
of the Psalm-Propers of the Mass.” In addition, Mathis elsewhere cites a desire to increase the variety of psalmody beyond the nine psalms or units of psalms that would be used every Sunday in the breviary as part of his reasoning for the change. Finally, in promotional letters, Mathis also reported that he used psalms from the Missal both to provide additional context to the psalms used in the Mass and in order to abbreviate the service for the laity.

This change leads to a number of characteristics of the service that deserve comment. First, since not every Sunday Mass draws from the same number of psalms for its propers, this change creates a variation in the number of psalms used each week and in each nocturn. For example, in the Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany volume of his final text, the First Sunday of Advent uses Psalm 24 in the First Nocturn and Psalm 84 in the Third Nocturn, but since these were the only psalms that the propers for the Mass drew from, there was no third psalm for the Second Nocturn. This might be compared to the service for Christmas, which has one psalm for each nocturn, or to the service for the Second Sunday of Advent, which has one psalm each for the first two nocturns, but has

35 Mathis, *Six Feasts*, 2. Schidel identifies this as the beginning of the change to using psalms from the Roman Missal (“Never too Much,” 20), but there are earlier texts and references to using the psalms from missal dating back to at least 1945. See, for example: Michael Mathis to Reverend and Dear Father, 18 October 1945, CMTH 25/10, UNDA.


37 Michael Mathis to Reverend and Dear Father, 18 October 1945, CMTH 25/10, UNDA.

38 Mathis, *Vigil Service for Advent, Christmastide, and Epiphany*, 4-12.
two psalms in the Third Nocturn.\textsuperscript{39} It is also interesting to note that Mathis uses the complete Office for the Triduum, not replacing the psalms given in the breviary.\textsuperscript{40}

The shift to using psalms from the Mass instead of the breviary psalms also introduces at least two additional Old Testament texts and one Gospel passage into the psalter for this service, as some of the proper chants used biblical texts other than psalms. For example, Isaiah 35 serves as the psalm text for the Second Nocturn in the Third Sunday of Advent; this text comes from the communion chant for the Sunday.\textsuperscript{41} Additionally, the Canticle of the Three Children, which was typically used at Sunday Lauds, is taken from the Gradual of the Mass for Trinity Sunday and serves as the psalm text for the Third Nocturn on that Sunday.\textsuperscript{42} Finally, Mathis makes use of the Magnificat in the Third Nocturn for the Assumption.\textsuperscript{43} However, additional texts are not always used when they are available. For example, the Vigil Service for Epiphany only uses one psalm, Psalm 71, even though additional, non-psalm texts might have been taken from the Missal.\textsuperscript{44} The selective usage of non-psalm texts is most easily explained by noting that most Sundays used verses from enough different psalms to provide at least one psalm
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\item[39] Ibid., 16-24, 52-59.
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per nocturn without turning to other texts. Additionally, it is possible that only select non-
psalm texts were used because Mathis may have thought that those selected texts were
more suitable to the psalter while other texts were not; both the Canticle of the Three
Children and the Magnificat were regularly part of other hours of the Office, though no
such explanation may be given for Isaiah 35. Ultimately, the number of uses of non-
psalms was limited to a few Sundays, yet their addition represents a notable shift from the
official text.

Lessons

The lessons included in Mathis’ revised services present a problem. Mathis
clearly believed in the educational benefits of the Vigil Service and felt that the lessons
played an important role in this task. It has already been discussed above that Mathis held
that the Vigil Service was the principal site of religious education in the early church.
However, Mathis believed that the breviary as it existed in his day provided lessons of an
insufficient length, especially in the Third Nocturn. Reflecting in 1950 on how the whole
liturgy of a feast can teach a lesson, Mathis says, “An even greater canon of interpretation
is in the third nocturn with its commenting on the Gospel. Now unfortunately we have
only a page out of a great sermon. Sometimes these lessons form only an introduction to
the sermon itself.”45 Later, in 1955, he remarks, “Today, if you get one word explained of
the gospel of the third nocturn, you’re lucky.”46

45 Mathis, Discussion Comment (1950), 114.
46 Mathis, Discussion Comment (1955), 69.
The commentary in the Vigil Service serves to solve some of the problems with the shorter readings, as Mathis uses his commentary to expand on the readings, especially the Third Nocturn. Describing the purpose of his commentary in the introduction to his 1956 Advent, Christmas, and Epiphany volume, Mathis claims,

This commentary also takes into account the text of Matins, as it was before its major abbreviation in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It will, therefore, be found more useful for a more complete interpretation of the Scripture read, because the abbreviation of the interpretation of God’s words in our Breviary at present is reduced to three paragraphs, which hardly suffice to explain even the abbreviated scripture texts.47

In his 1957 paper on the service for the National Liturgical Week, Mathis also reports that the Vigil Service’s commentary, “... tries to bring back the meat of the text that was in the original commentaries.”48 These commentaries will be discussed in greater detail below.

Given his willingness to change the existing Office when he thought it was called for, it would seem that Mathis could have expanded the patristic lessons instead of simply accounting for them in his commentaries. In fact, both Nutting and Mathis claim that he did just this. Nutting’s description of the service claims that it is different from the Office the clergy recite both because it is in English and because “the abbreviatedness of the Breviary is to a great extent removed by the lengthening of the readings from Scripture


and from the Fathers…” In 1950, Mathis also reports that his service increases the Scripture readings and says, “...when I feel it necessary, I use more of the homily than is given in our Breviaries. This is especially necessary for lessons of the third nocturn, because they form the principal commentary on the liturgy of the day.” However, Schidel’s account of Mathis’ life suggests he did not extensively expand the lessons, if he did it at all. He says, “if people would have stood for it, he would have put into the Vigil Service, not just the few paragraphs found in the pre-1960 second and third nocturns of Sunday Matins but would have used the whole homily from which these selections were made.”

Detailed investigation into the lessons provided in the Vigil Services has produced mixed results with regards to evidence of expansion. There is a great deal of evidence to show that Mathis regularly expanded the Scripture readings for the First Nocturn. Almost every Sunday in the final editions of the Vigil Service features several chapters of readings. Two examples may be found in the Fourth and Fifth Sundays of November in the 1957 Vigil Service for the Sundays and Major Feasts After Pentecost, where Mathis significantly adds to the selections from the Minor Prophets. The breviary gives Hosea 1:1-3, 1:4-7, and 1:8-11 as the readings for the Fourth Sunday and Micah 1:1-3, 1:4-6, and 1:7-9 for the Fifth Sunday. Mathis not only expands the selections from

49 Nutting, “Preparation on Saturday Evening,” 165.
50 Mathis, Discussion Comment (1950), 153
51 Schidel, “Never Too Much,” 17.
these books, but adds chapters from other Minor Prophets. For the Fourth Sunday he gives Hosea 1 and 3, Amos 2, Jonah 2, Joel 2, and Obadiah 1, and he selects Micah 6, Zephaniah 1, Habakkuk 2, Nahum 2, and Zechariah 14 for the Fifth Sunday. In doing so, he provides selected chapters from ten of the twelve Minor Prophets. The exceptions to the expansion of the biblical texts are few; in these final editions, the only Sundays that match their source texts in the First Nocturn are the feasts, such as Easter, Pentecost, Trinity Sunday, Corpus Christi, Peter and Paul, Assumption, and Christmas.

The extent to which Mathis made changes to the patristic lessons of the Second and Third Nocturns is less clear. Examination of all of the lessons offered in these nocturns in the final editions of the Vigil Service has revealed only limited expansions. Mathis appears to add a sentence at the end of the sixth lesson for the Second Sunday of Lent. In addition to this expansion, however, there are two significant contractions. For the Feasts of Trinity Sunday and Christ the King in the 1957 text, Mathis splits the second reading of the Third Nocturn into two separate readings and omits the final reading from the breviary. It is likely that he takes this step in the case of Trinity Sunday because the first homily ends with the eighth lesson and a new homily begins in the ninth. It is possible that similar reasoning was involved in the shortening of the Christ the King lessons, where the ninth was typically taken from the Sunday the feast fell on.

---
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Since this would only be one third of the already shortened homily assigned for that Sunday, it is possible that Mathis simply decided it was better to omit it altogether.

*Mathis’ Vigil Service and the Official Text*

Mathis’ willingness to change the existing Office in both the psalter and the lessons and his quotes lamenting the short lessons in the existing breviary show the level of dissatisfaction he had with the Divine Office as it existed in his day. This calls into question Kennedy’s assertion that Mathis had an “inclination toward the liturgical status quo” and was “clearly not a rebel or radical innovator,” but “a ‘Pius X liturgist’ who wanted to demonstrate that the liturgy as it then existed could be celebrated correctly and well.”

Though Kennedy lists the use of fuller texts at Matins as evidence of conservatism in Mathis’ liturgical celebrations, the fact that he alters the Office by changing both the readings and the psalms shows that Mathis was willing to innovate where he felt it was merited. Further, Kennedy claims that Mathis’ “initial resistance to the use of the vernacular,” further demonstrates that he wanted to celebrate the existing liturgy correctly and well rather than innovate. Mathis’ use of the vernacular in the Vigil Services at this relatively early stage in his liturgical career shows that the opposite is true and that Mathis recognized the value of the vernacular from an early moment in his work. At the same time, however, Mathis did not suggest that his modified rites

---


56 Ibid. Further discussion of Mathis and the vernacular can be found in Chapter 8’s discussion of the American Ritual.
should replace the official texts, and he tended to promote the texts with groups that were not obligated to pray the full Office. Mathis does introduce changes into the liturgical text, however, and, because of this, cannot, in this instance, be said to favor the status quo over change absolutely.

6.1.5 Commentary

The commentary for the Vigil Service is Mathis’ major contribution to these liturgical adaptations. These commentaries are where Mathis speaks most directly about the Sunday or feast being celebrated, and they represent one of the largest bodies of Mathis’ writing on the liturgy. Because of this, it is important to look at these texts, both in their characteristics and in their content, very closely. This section will therefore include a general discussion of the different ways Mathis comments on the texts, especially in the versions of the text prior to 1949, and a detailed examination of how Mathis presents the Sundays of a single season, Advent, focusing on the final edition of the Vigil Service in 1956/1957.

Early Versions To 1949

The early versions of the Vigil Service typically included commentary for many of the individual parts of the service, including the psalms, antiphons, and lessons. The published volumes opened with common texts for all of the Sundays contained within the volume, including the psalter, and Mathis’ commentary generally began with these common texts. This may be seen in the 1945 service for the Sundays of Advent, where
Mathis says of the invitatory antiphon for the Third and Fourth Sunday, “The new invitatory for the last two Sundays… shows a greater proximity of the advent of the Messias over that of the two previous Sundays.”\textsuperscript{57} The Psalter receives closer attention, with each psalm receiving commentary first at the beginning, and often throughout. These comments provide a summary of the text and usually provide a typological interpretation of the psalm, often focused on their Christological meaning. For example, in the interpretation of Psalm 3, part of the First Nocturn, Mathis first gives the context of the psalm, before claiming that David, here praying for protection from his enemies, is a figure of Christ. He then compares David and Jesus in commentary spaced every few verses of the psalm; for example, before verse six, Mathis says that David trusted in God and slept soundly and refreshed, while Jesus “accepted the sleep of death, and rose again, rescued from his enemies…”\textsuperscript{58} At the conclusion of the psalm, Mathis also interprets the antiphon as a typological comparison between David and Jesus, highlighting how David prayed for deliverance from enemies in the psalm and how Christ prayed for protection at the crucifixion, and noting that both prayers were answered.\textsuperscript{59}

After the psalter, the propers for Matins and Lauds of the selected Sundays follow; these typically begin with an introductory comment from Mathis about the theme

\textsuperscript{57} Michael A. Mathis, \textit{A Brief Commentary on The Text of Matins and Lauds of the Roman Breviary Arranged in Latin and English for the Sundays of Advent}, (Michael Mathis, 1945), 2.

\textsuperscript{58} Michael A. Mathis, \textit{A Brief Commentary on the Text of Matins and Lauds of the Roman Breviary Arranged in Latin and English for the Four Sundays of Lent} (Michael Mathis, 1946), 13.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 14.
or lesson that he is highlighting in the Sunday’s liturgical texts. In addition to pointing out dominant themes in the text, these comments will, at times, also give background about the origins and purpose of the texts for the day. Occasionally, this section will also include additional summary comments about the readings that follow, serving as an introduction to the lessons of the First Nocturn.

The commentary on the nine lessons can be somewhat inconsistent and uneven. On some Sundays, the lessons of the First Nocturn are given an introduction in the general introduction to the Sunday, on other Sundays, there are direct comments preceding the nocturn, and in select other Sundays, there are no comments with these readings at all. All three of these can be seen in the Second to Fourth Sundays of Lent, 1946. The Second Sunday includes extensive commentary on the readings from Genesis 27:1-29, including a summary of the text, an allegorical interpretation of the text wherein Jacob and Esau are compared to the Gentiles and the Jewish people and a quotation from Augustine on the question, and a discussion of how the biblical text is connected with the remainder of the Office for the Sunday. By contrast, the Third Sunday of Lent includes very little commentary on the reading, apart from a brief mention of Joseph, the subject of the first three lessons, as a figure who will appear in the Office for the day. Finally, the Fourth Sunday of Lent discusses the lessons of the First Nocturn in the general

60 Ibid., 88-89.
61 Ibid., 124.
introduction; here Mathis provides a lengthy quotation from Pius Parsch that summarizes the reading and compares Moses in the Exodus with Jesus at Easter. 62.

The Second Nocturn also receives intermittent commentary, sometimes featuring a lengthy text, sometimes just a brief summary, and sometimes no comment at all. Again looking to Lent of 1946, there is no commentary at all offered for the readings from St. Ambrose in the Second Nocturn of the Third Sunday of Lent and only a brief summary of St. Basil’s texts for the Fourth Sunday of Lent, but there is an extensive discussion of Augustine’s sermon in the Second Sunday of Lent. This commentary not only summarizes Augustine’s consideration of Jacob deceiving Isaac in obtaining his blessing but also looks to Augustine’s other writings to add additional clarity to the lessons contained in the service. 63

Mathis’ commentary on the Third Nocturn receives the most attention in his discussion of the Vigil Services at the National Liturgical Weeks. Mathis reports that he uses the commentary to fill in materials that might be left out by the abbreviation of the Third Nocturn homily. An example of this practice may be seen in the Fourth Sunday after Pentecost in 1947. He reports that the homily from St. Ambrose on the fifth chapter of Luke given in the breviary is less than a quarter of the actual text, and he summarizes

62 Ibid., 156-157.
63 Ibid., 97-98, 163.
the missing content. 64 Another, lengthy example can be found in his text for the Eighth Sunday after Pentecost for the same year. Here, Mathis gives a summary of the parts of Jerome’s commentary on Luke 16 that preceded the selections from the breviary, and he follows these selections with a few concluding comments on the end of Jerome’s homily, adding a practical illustration from Theophilius of Antioch. 65 While it is possible that these texts received extended treatments because they were in a volume meant for use during the first year of the Notre Dame Liturgy Program, commentary in other volumes also provides missing information from the Third Nocturn. One example can be found in the Second Sunday of Lent, 1946; here, Mathis highlights two ideas from St. Leo’s Transfiguration sermon that are omitted by the Office for this day. 66 Not every homily in the Third Nocturn was significantly shortened, however, and in these cases, Mathis summarizes the text and connects it with the theme of the day.

In some cases, Mathis provides individual commentaries before most of the nine lessons. In the collection of A Vigil Preparation for the Masses of Six Feasts, the commentaries tend to provide a basic summary of each of the readings, but longer commentaries that discuss the same details as the commentaries described above are sometimes provided at the start of the lessons for the nocturns. One example of this

64 Michael A. Mathis, A Brief Commentary on the Text of the Roman Breviary Arranged in Latin and English for the Fourth to the Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost (Michael A. Mathis, 1947), 94.

65 Ibid, 148-151.

practice is found in the commentary for the Feast of the Transfiguration, where Mathis provides a lengthy commentary about the homily of St. Leo on the Transfiguration and notes the omitted sections, one of which has been mentioned above for the Second Sunday of Lent, before the fourth lesson. Mathis also includes a brief summary sentence at the beginning of each of the nocturn’s readings for this feast.  

Additionally, Mathis’ earlier texts also include highly detailed commentaries on the responsories to each of the readings. These include comments that provide a basic explanation, as well as texts that give background about the text’s sources. For example, for the second responsory of the First Sunday of Advent, Mathis points out how the text reflects Daniel’s vision of the Son of Man in Daniel 7:13-14. Other responsories provide far more detail, discussing how the texts fit in with the theme of the day and the other texts of the same Office. Mathis’ commentaries on the Sundays of Lent offer a helpful illustration of the depth typical of the commentary on the responsories. Mathis’ comments on the second responsory for the First Sunday of Lent, for example, connect the responsory, “In all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God in much patience, that our ministry may be not be blamed,” to the second reading, 2 Corinthians 6:11-16, claiming that it “echoes some of the chief thoughts of the reading, especially in

67 Mathis, *Six Feasts*, 118-123.

their application to Lent.” At times, these texts also add additional insight through references to the church fathers. The commentaries on the responsories for the Second Sunday of Lent are filled with patristic references, including lengthy quotes from Augustine (Responds II and III), and additional quotes attributed to Tertullian (Respond IV), Hippolytus (Respond I), Clement of Alexandria (Respond VIII), and an unnamed Syrian writer (Respond V).

Mathis discusses the importance of the responsories in comments during the 1950 Liturgical Week, when he remarks that “the responses are the canons of interpretation,” for the message of the Sunday. This is reflected in the importance given to the commentaries in these sections, as Mathis comments on these texts more consistently than any other part of the Office other than the lessons of the Third Nocturn.

The final section of the commentaries is titled “Immediate Preparation for Mass.” This text is similar to the commentary preceding the Sundays and feasts in the final versions of the Vigil Service, and it sums up Mathis’ entire commentary on the feast. Mathis generally uses this section to promote a general message for the Sunday or feast and to argue for how the various texts of the liturgy support the theme. In this effort, Mathis not only draws on the texts for the Vigil Service itself, but also frequently refers

---
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to the texts of Mass, including the proper presidential prayers and the materials taken from the psalms. Additionally, this section often makes use of earlier commentary from specific components of the Sunday or feast in question.72

1949-1956 Editions

The commentary in the editions of the Vigil Service after 1949 are generally condensed and updated versions of the commentaries given in the “Immediate Preparation for Mass” section. The final versions of the Vigil Service continue this pattern and represent Mathis’ most refined and final comments on the Sundays of the liturgical year. It will be helpful to examine Mathis’ commentary from the final edition for all of the Sundays in a single season, Advent, in order to see how he develops his commentary over a single season and connects the material to the message and themes of the season.

Mathis’ opening commentary on the First Sunday of Advent begins by claiming, “The dominant note of the First Sunday of Advent is the expectation of the glorious coming of Christ at the end of the world.”73 He follows this by drawing connections between Christ's first coming in the Nativity and his final coming, quoting the collect for the Vigil of Christmas, to show the need to prepare for Christ’s final coming even when

72 See, for example, the “Immediate Preparation for Mass” section for the First Sunday of Advent, where Mathis focuses on the theme of the coming of Christ and discusses how this theme is brought out by the homily of the Third Nocturn, as well as the epistle of the Mass and Psalms 24 and 84, which provide the texts for the chants of the Mass. Mathis, The Sundays of Advent, 73-77.

73 Mathis, Vigil Service for Advent, Christmastide, and Epiphany, 1.
remembering his first. Mathis also quotes Damasus Winzen’s *Pathways to Holy Scripture* here for a similar purpose.\(^{74}\)

The remainder of the commentary connects the texts of the day’s liturgy with the theme of Christ’s final coming. Mathis argues that the lessons, drawn from Isaiah, are primarily concerned with the salvation of mankind, and summarizes the lessons from St. Leo in the Second Nocturn as showing how we should prepare for Christ’s judgment. For the Third Nocturn, Mathis summarizes Gregory the Great’s message about the Gospel, pointing out that Gregory argues that Jesus vividly described the end of the world in order to cause people to fear the judgment; he also notes that Gregory believes his hearers should be prepared for the judgment because he sees some of the prophecy of the day’s gospel already fulfilled. Mathis next turns to texts specifically from the Mass for the day, highlighting Paul’s exhortation to “put on Christ,” in preparation for the final judgment. For the psalms used in the chants of the Mass, Mathis says that Psalm 24 represents the church “expressing her longing for Christ Himself to come and save His elect from sin and from all the spiritual enemies…” and Psalm 84 serves as a song of gratitude for salvation from sin and a request for strength against spiritual enemies.\(^{75}\)

Mathis concludes his treatment of the Sunday by discussing how the collect and secret fit with the message for the day. Concerning the collect, Mathis simply notes that it

\(^{74}\) Ibid., 1.

\(^{75}\) Ibid., 2-3.
“sums up our response to the message God has given us.” Since the prayer asks God to come to rescue us and save us from sin, it seems that Mathis is saying the human response to the message is one of belief in the power of God, along with hope and expectation for the coming of Christ. He provides more detail about the secret, however, saying how the lessons of the Mass can be “translated into deeds.” Finally, he claims that the bread and wine offered in the offertory represent the people, “insofar as they had offered themselves to God as victims,” and says that the prayer, “May these holy Mysteries, O Lord, cleanse us by their powerful efficacy, and enable us to come with greater purity to Him who is their cause,” calls for those offering to become more like Christ, the victim, through the purification requested.

In his commentary on the Second Sunday of Advent, Mathis focuses on a twofold establishment of the kingdom of God, the first begun on earth through the incarnation and the second with Christ’s return at the end of the world. He begins his consideration of this Sunday not with the lessons of the First Nocturn, as he did for the First Sunday of Advent, but with the antiphon for the Magnificat: “Come, O Lord, visit us in peace, so that we may rejoice before thee with hearts made perfect.” Mathis claims that the text prays that the Lord will come to bring his kingdom. Turning next to the lessons of the First Nocturn, Mathis reports that Isaiah presents both comings of the Savior. Mathis’

________________________
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commentary on this is confined primarily to the first sixteen verses of Isaiah 11, saying that these describe both Christ’s kingdom on earth and in heaven; by limiting his commentary to these verses, Mathis’ discussion does not touch on his expanded lessons. For the Second Nocturn, Mathis simply summarizes Jerome’s teaching on the Isaiah lessons of the First Nocturn. For the Gospel and Third Nocturn, on the other hand, Mathis says that the miracles show the beginning of the kingdom and discusses omitted sections of Gregory’s sermon on the Gospel. He summarizes these omitted sections by describing Gregory’s explanation of the messages between Jesus and John, pointing out how John is praised as a messenger for Christ who points out the need for conversion to enter the kingdom.79

For the texts of the Mass, Mathis begins by arguing that the epistle shows that conversion should manifest itself “in union of minds and hearts in communal prayer, and in works of mercy.”80 He also adds that Gentiles should be particularly merciful because they have access to the kingdom through mercy. Mathis again picks up the idea that the prayers of the Mass suggest how to put the message of the liturgy into action, saying that they call for preparation for Christ’s coming. This Sunday’s commentary concludes with a consideration of the psalms that make up the chants of the Mass. Mathis argues that Psalm 79, the introit, picks up the theme of kingdom, describing it as a vineyard cared for by God. Finally, he concludes the commentary for this Sunday with the Alleluia Psalm,

79 Ibid., 13-14.
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Psalm 111, and its description of the kingdom as “Jerusalem.” He reports that this is also the name for the stational church for the day’s liturgy and connects this to his understanding of the theme of the feast, “Therefore, just as the Jewish pilgrims once greeted Jerusalem with awe and joy… so we today, when we enter our churches, should greet Christ’s Kingdom of grace on earth.”

The theme of the Third Sunday of Advent, according to the commentary, is joy at the nearness of the Lord’s coming. Mathis turns again to Damasus Winzen, who notes that there are two major signs in Isaiah, the Virgin and Child, and the Suffering Servant of the Babylonian Exile, and says that the readings for the Third and Fourth Sundays of Advent turn to the Suffering Servant. Mathis then points to the presence of joy in the first two lessons of the Sunday, both of which give thanks for Israel’s deliverance from an enemy. Moving from the lessons of the First Nocturn, he then identifies the epistle and the introit as the texts for the theme of joy, and investigates modestia as the type of joy Christians should have, turning to the work of Ambrose for his definition.

Mathis also highlights four comings of the Lord, the first at Bethlehem, the second to the soul, the third at an individual's death, and the fourth at the end of the world. He argues that Christians should rejoice at every coming of the Lord, claiming this was the attitude of the early Christians, while today’s Christians fear Christ’s final coming. He exhorts his readers to “become accustomed now to rejoice in Christ’s coming

81 Ibid., 15.
in the Sacred Liturgy, so that we shall be ready to welcome His coming judgment.”

He follows this by describing the Sunday’s texts that speak about the Lord’s coming. First, Mathis says that the idea of Christ’s coming appears in the responsories of the Divine Office, which, he reports, describe both his first coming and the final coming of Christ as Savior. He also notes the importance of the advent of Jesus in the chants and proper prayers of the Mass, all of which ask for Christ to come. Finally, he concludes by pointing to the hope of the Lord’s nearness in the communion chant, which says, “Say to the faint-hearted, take courage and fear not: behold Our God will come and will save us.”

In the case of the Fourth Sunday of Advent, Mathis begins his commentary by claiming that there is no single theme for the Sunday, and he says that it is instead a summary of the lessons of the preceding Sundays of Advent and the Advent Ember Days. After providing a history of the Mass texts for the Sunday, Mathis analyzes the texts under five chief topics. These are the cause, timing, manner, and purpose of his comings, and the preparation required for the comings. Mathis draws attention to texts from this Sunday for each of these topics.

The cause of Christ’s coming appears only in the fifth respond and is the idea that God loved humanity and wished to redeem it. Mathis has more textual examples for the
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timing of Christ’s coming, however, and he highlights the lessons of the First Nocturn, the second responsory, and the Gospel reading as pointing to Christ’s incarnation in time; this final reading indicates the timing relative to the reign of Tiberius Caesar. That the Gospel tells the timing of Christ’s coming seems clear, though other gospel texts speak more specifically about the timing of Christ’s birth. However, Mathis does not offer much detail about how the prophecies from Isaiah and from Jacob’s blessing in the second respond point to the timing of Christ’s advent. For Christ’s final advent, Mathis points to an excerpt from Haggai, “The Desired of nations shall come,” that serves as the second antiphon of Lauds. Taking up this text, he draws on Augustine to say that this requires Jesus to be preached to all nations before he will come again.86

When addressing the manner of Christ’s coming, Mathis again splits the topic into his first and final advents. For Christ’s coming at the incarnation, Mathis points to the fourth respond and communion chant, both of which are taken from Isaiah 9:6, “Behold a Virgin shall conceive...” With regards to his final coming, the commentary points to Paul’s words in the epistle for the Mass. However, Mathis again does not provide sufficient detail here to explain how the passage relates to the manner of Christ’s coming; the text cited here, “until the Lord comes, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of hearts,” seems more to detail what the Lord will do when he comes than to describe how he will come. Mathis is clearer when
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he discusses the purpose of Christ’s comings, which he identifies as “the glorification of 
God by the salvation of mankind.”\textsuperscript{87} He points in particular here to the lessons from St. 
Leo in the Second Nocturn, highlighting sections about humans being created in the 
image of God and being restored by grace. He also adds that the ninth respond shows that 
Christ redeems us by “entering into the sanctuary not made by human hands.”\textsuperscript{88}

Finally, Mathis calls preparation for the final coming of Christ “the most constant 
theme in this Sunday’s liturgy.”\textsuperscript{89} He says that John the Baptist tells us how we should 
preserve by his words and life in the Gospel, and Gregory the Great explains the means of 
preparing in the Third Nocturn, highlighting humility, trust in Christ, and penance for 
sins. However, our own preparation is not the only preparation, and Mathis, citing the 
offertory chant with the words of the Angel and Elizabeth to Mary from the Hail Mary as 
an example, argues that sanctifying grace is “the essential and best preparation for the 
coming and indwelling of Christ in our souls.”\textsuperscript{90}

In his commentary on the Sundays of Advent, Mathis effectively presents the 
major themes of Advent, giving a particular focus to the different comings of Christ. In 
the text, Mathis not only connects the lessons of the Mass and the Office to the message 
he is promoting, but he is also able to bring in the proper prayers and chants of the Mass

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 37.
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and responsories of the Office. However, in his commentaries, Mathis does not force a theme onto a Sunday that lacks any clear theme; for example, in the case of the Fourth Sunday of Advent, he is clear that there is no dominant theme among the texts for the day. Nevertheless, he occasionally stretches his interpretation of select texts to bring them into line with his interpretation of the theme or leaves out important details that would better explain the connection.

While Mathis’ commentary does have its shortcomings, it serves its purpose of preparing its audience for the Mass of the following day. The commentary introduces readers to the texts for the Sunday or feast and encourages them to think about the connections between the texts and an overarching theme for the day’s liturgy. In this way, it served as an effective pastoral tool to increase participation in the Divine Office and to facilitate better understanding of the Mass. Finally, the commentary also served to introduce participants to the meaning of different feasts and seasons, providing them with a better understanding of the liturgical year.

6.1.6 The Vigil Service and Participation

Mathis’ work with the Vigil Service has also demonstrated more of his approach to liturgical participation. As was the case with Mathis’ work with the Catholic Students Mission Crusade, his work here highlights both exterior and interior participation. The chant notation provided in Mathis’ published editions of the Vigil Service indicates that he intended for the prayer service to be sung, reflecting the importance he placed on
Gregorian chant in the Liturgy Program and showing that Mathis sought to emphasize chant as a means of liturgical participation. On this note, Kennedy claims that “For Mathis, the fully-participative liturgy was one in which the whole congregation sang, an ideal proposed by Pius X in *Tra le sollicitudini* (1903).”\(^9\) Further, Mathis’ commentaries serve to help prepare readers intellectually for participation in Mass by focusing on the meaning of the readings, psalms, and prayers. This again echoes Kennedy’s sentiments that one of the cornerstones of Mathis’ approach to the liturgy was to promote participation through understanding.\(^9\)

### 6.2 Daily Lauds and Vespers

As he was coming to a conclusion of more than a decade of work publishing the Vigil Service, Mathis began to look toward expanding his Divine Office publications to include daily Lauds and Vespers as a text for religious groups that prayed together regularly but were not yet using the Divine Office. Because the project never came to fruition, and only a single sample day was completed, it can be treated briefly, first looking at how Mathis presented it and then at the contents of the sample text.

Mathis began promoting the Lauds and Vespers series with promotional mailings in the summer and fall of 1957, largely focusing on its connection with the Vigil Service.

---


\(^9\) Ibid., 22.
Many of the letters promoting the series included samples of both the Vigil Service and Lauds and Vespers, and his letters to those who had previously subscribed to the Vigil Service presented it as a continuation of that project.\(^93\) The idea that Lauds and Vespers complete the work begun with the Vigil Service is also found in his historical remarks that these hours together with the Sunday Vigil were the primary public prayer for the early Christians; Mathis implies here that, with the texts of these three hours, communities might be able to follow the example of the early Christians in prayer.\(^94\)

The only completed example of the daily Lauds and Vespers service is Mathis’ sample for the First Sunday of Advent. This text is produced along lines similar to the Vigil Service. It opens with a brief two-page commentary on the lesson of the day, drawing, in this case, from the texts for Lauds and Vespers, including antiphons for the psalms and the hymn. Like Mathis’ commentary on the First Sunday of Advent for the Vigil Service, this particular commentary focuses on Christ’s coming at the end of the world, but instead of commenting on the readings and the Mass, it uses the texts of Lauds and Vespers for support.\(^95\) Similarities remain, however, as Mathis quotes the same passage of Damasus Winzen’s *Pathways in Holy Scripture* in the introduction.\(^96\) The two

---

93 Michael Mathis to Dear Friend, 10 November 1957, CMTH 26/26, UNDA.

94 Michael Mathis to Dear Friend, 25 July 1957, CMTH 26/27, UNDA.


96 Ibid., 1; Mathis, *Vigil Service for Advent, Christmastide, and Epiphany*, 1.
hours then follow, using the breviary texts, but with musical notation provided so that they may be sung.

Unfortunately, Mathis only completed the sample text, though some preparatory work for the larger project was accomplished. Correspondence from 1957 shows that Father Rogusz, C.S.C., who Mathis had asked to help with the musical components, had completed his work for the project. Mathis reports in the same letter, however, that he had been unable to complete the commentaries and did not expect to be able to accomplish the work until the following year. Ultimately, Schidel reports, illness and a full work schedule prevented Mathis from ever finishing the project.

6.3 Evaluation

It is possible to evaluate Mathis’ work on the Divine Office from four perspectives. In the first place, it is important to look at the impact of the Vigil Service by considering, where possible, the extent to which it was spread to parts of the church in the United States. Second, it is also important to judge the quality of the texts, examining how they serve as prayer services and commentaries. Third, while the Lauds and Vespers service was limited to only a sample, it is possible to offer a few brief comments about it.

97 Michael Mathis to Joseph Rogusz, 1 October 1957, CMTH 26/28, UNDA.

Fourth and finally, Mathis’ historical claims and the relationship of his liturgical projects to the history of the Divine Office may be considered critically.

6.3.1 Dissemination

A few sources provide information about numbers of subscribers and participants at different points in the life of the Vigil Service. These can help to determine the impact and scope of the Vigil Service. These sources include comments by Mathis in letters about the service, as well as comments from both Mathis and Willis Nutting during talks at the National Liturgical Weeks. In a letter to Gerard Carroll in 1945, Mathis reports that he is sending the latest copy of the service for the feast of the Sacred Heart and notes that he produced and shipped three hundred copies of the Vigil Service in 1944 and over five hundred copies in the first half of 1945. To this, he also adds that the number of users is likely larger, as some religious orders only receive one copy, though many within the order use it.\(^99\) Nutting sounds something of a contradictory note in his paper on the Vigil Service in the 1949 Liturgical Week, claiming that the crowds at the South Bend Vigil Service are not very large, though he does not provide any specific numbers.\(^100\) Only a year later, however, Mathis claims that they produce over a thousand copies for every

\(^{99}\) Michael Mathis to Gerard Carroll, 28 July 1945, CMTH 10/15, UNDA.

\(^{100}\) Nutting, “Preparation on Saturday Evening,” 165.
Sunday and that the service is used by a variety of groups, including lay groups, priests who use it as part of their preparation for the Sunday sermon, and a dedicated group at Grailville; he also reports that the service is popular with Notre Dame students and that they even are able to attract some football fans when the service is held on the same Saturday as a Notre Dame football game at home. Mathis’ report to the Liturgical Week is more in line with his earlier report to Carroll and likely a more accurate representation of the spread of the service. These numbers reveal that the Vigil Service enjoyed some level of popularity and even directly reached more people than the Liturgy Program did in any single year.

6.3.2 Structure and Contents

Looking at the structure and contents of the prayer services, it is possible to say that Mathis produced a text that was successful on some levels, but less successful on others. As commentary on the texts of the Mass and the Office for Sundays and feasts, Mathis’ Vigil Service provides helpful introductions to the Sundays and feasts, as well as the liturgical year. The commentary does not offer any groundbreaking insights, but this was not its goal, as Mathis claimed from an early stage that his commentary was “based on our venerable Catholic tradition, particularly the interpretation of the Fathers and the

101 Mathis, Discussion Comment (1950), 153.
Doctors of the Church…”102 Instead, Mathis’ commentary gives a textually based interpretation that could serve to enrich the Sunday Mass for participants and to give a helpful primer on the background of specific seasons and individual feasts.

As a prayer service, the results are more mixed. In the earliest versions of the service, the flow of the prayer is interrupted by the frequent snippets of commentary, coming in between psalms, before readings, and after responses. This is improved somewhat by moving the commentary to the beginning of the text. Mathis’ use of the psalms from the Roman Missal instead of the breviary psalter presents additional problems, however. As noted above, the differences in the number of psalms used from Sunday to Sunday creates an unevenness in the text; even within the same Sunday, varying lengths in the psalms for different nocturns could potentially damage the natural flow of the service. Expansions to the lessons of only one nocturn of three may cause similar disruption and unevenness. The use of the vernacular in these texts, however, is likely to have some impact on making the service more intelligible and appealing to participants who would not know Latin and, because of this, may improve the depth of participation in the service. Finally, though it departs from the breviary’s psalter, the service retains the general shape of an hour of the Divine Office and can therefore serve as a helpful, and even somewhat simplified, introduction to this form of prayer.

102 Mathis, Six Feasts, 2.
6.3.3 Lauds and Vespers

For the planned, but never completed, daily Lauds and Vespers service, Mathis can be praised for encouraging sung recitation of these two primary hours of prayer by groups that were not obligated to pray the Office. Schidel claims that it would have been one of Mathis’ most important achievements.\(^\text{103}\) Were he able to interest a fraction of his Vigil Service subscribers or former students in the project, he could have provided a means to pray or sing Lauds and Vespers in English to large numbers, and his commentary could have provided those who used his texts with an introduction to the liturgy of the day. However, there is little definite that can be said about Mathis’ work with these services. Since he intended to use the structure and content as it appeared in the Roman Breviary, there are no changes to the prayer structure, apart from encouraging signing, that may be commented on. More importantly, because Mathis never finished this project, there is no way to judge the quality of the finished product or its reception and popularity. Finally, while this was an ambitious project that highlights Mathis’ concern for promoting Lauds and Vespers, his inability to complete it means that it had no significant impact on the liturgical movement or the promotion of the Divine Office.

\(^{103}\) Schidel, “Never Too Much,” 28.
6.3.4 History

In promoting and introducing his commentary texts, Mathis makes a number of historical claims about the Vigil and, to a lesser extent, about Lauds and Vespers. This provides one helpful way of evaluating these liturgical texts, as his claims can be judged in light of more recent scholarship on the Divine Office. In order to do this, Mathis’ claims must first be established primarily by referring to his promotional writings, the introductions to his texts, and his comments about them during the National Liturgical Weeks. After his claims have been established, they may be compared to what is known about the historical evidence for the Divine Office by attempting to identify a type of liturgical service that corresponds to Mathis’ descriptions of his own service, considering Mathis’ work in light of the distinction between cathedral and monastic forms of the Divine Office, and, finally, evaluating Mathis’ claims about Christian prayer in the first five centuries of Christianity. 104

Mathis often appealed to history in his promotion of the Vigil Service and his never-completed project for Lauds and Vespers. Characteristic of this appeal was a form letter promoting the Vigil Service and Daily Lauds and Vespers that claims as one of the chief reasons for the text that "...this selection of parts of the Office also restores much of this public prayer that was considered adequate for clergy and people generally for at

least the first five centuries of Christian history."\textsuperscript{105} In a similar letter to religious superiors, Mathis claims that the Vigil along with daily Lauds and Vespers “…also restores much of this public prayer that was considered adequate for clergy and people generally before the monastic elaboration of the Office."\textsuperscript{106} These two letters promote both the Sunday Vigil and daily Lauds and Vespers as part of the prayer life of ordinary Christians in the first several centuries of Christianity.

Mathis’ most significant exploration of the history of the Office, however, was in his discussion of the Vigil Service in the 1957 National Liturgical Week. Here, he claims that the early prayer life of the Christian people was a vigil on Saturday nights, into Sunday morning, as well as daily Lauds and Vespers. Mathis adds that in the first centuries of Christianity, ascetics also practiced private prayers at selected times, typically taking the form of meditation. Eventually ascetic communities formed, adding Terce, Sext, None, daily Matins, and eventually Prime and Compline to the schedule of daily prayer. While the people were unable to attend such a full schedule, priests were eventually obligated to pray all of these hours of prayer.\textsuperscript{107}

In this 1957 presentation on the Vigil Service, Mathis also makes a couple of important comments about the nature and contents of these prayer services. He claims, for example, that the prayer was primarily educational, saying that the vigil “is the old

\textsuperscript{105} Michael Mathis to Dear Friend, 25 July 1957, CMTH 26/27, UNDA.

\textsuperscript{106} Michael Mathis to Reverend and Dear Brother Superior, 25 July 1957, CMTH 26/14, UNDA.

\textsuperscript{107} Mathis, “The Vigil Service,” 186.
prayer which the Church used to educate its clergy and its people." He adds that Scripture played a significant role and that, while the precise details of what was read are unknown, “it is a marvelous arrangement of the whole plan of salvation, with all its great heroes.” He also adds that the morning and evening prayers of the early Christians were longer than the corresponding prayers in his own day and that “There was always a sermon, an explanation of Sacred Scripture.”

Beyond Mathis’ comments in the 1957 presentation, three additional comments concerning the nature and content of the vigil are worth noting. First, like Mathis, Nutting also spoke about the perceived instructional nature of the early Christian vigil in his larger discussion of Mathis’ Vigil Service, saying,

\[\text{And the method of the ancient Church was essentially the method of the Vigil.}\]
That is, the layman, both the catechumen and the baptized Christian, received his instruction in prayer, in worship, in morality, and in Christian belief, through the public services of the Church where, in preparation for the celebration of the Eucharist, psalms were sung, and scripture was read and explained.

Mathis also spoke about the contents of these services, saying that “a minimum of chanted psalms and canticles were used and a maximum of readings from and

\[\text{---------------------}\]

108 Ibid., 186.
109 Ibid., 186
110 Ibid., 186.
111 Nutting, “Preparation on Saturday Evening for the Lord’s Day,” 166.
Finally, Mathis claimed at times that the ancient Sunday vigil was similar in contents to the Easter Vigil.113

A number of Mathis’ claims may be highlighted by way of summary. The first is that he believed that, apart from the Mass, the core of early Christian prayer was in daily Lauds and Vespers and a Sunday vigil. Though he admitted that the exact arrangement of the prayer was unknown, he argued that it was primarily made of readings from Scripture, rather than psalms or canticles, and that it was one of the chief means of education for the Christian people. He also suggested that the contents of this service were likely similar to the Easter Vigil. Mathis also argued that this prayer shifted beginning around the fifth century, with the introduction of the daytime prayers of monks, as well as the eventual introduction of Prime and Compline. This would eventually become a mandatory prayer for priests, with the laity taking part in the office only on occasion.

The first step in judging Mathis’ historical assertions about his Vigil Service is to attempt to identify a type of vigil service similar to what he described. A vigil service in the history of early Christian worship may refer to a number of different types of services, with different structures and contents. Robert Taft summarizes many of these possible different services in his chapter on the cathedral vigils in *The Liturgy of the*

112 Mathis, *Vigil Service for Advent, Christmastide, and Epiphany*, v.

113 Michael Mathis, Description of Vigil Service enclosed in Michael Mathis to Dear Friend of the Liturgy, 10 December 1947, CMTH 25/09, UNDA, 1.
*Hours in East and West.* In the conclusion to this chapter, Taft describes nine different varieties of vigils. Though the list is lengthy, it will be helpful to summarize it. The list includes a number of private or devotional vigils which seem unlikely to apply to Mathis’ understanding of the early vigil, including prayer at night at home, vigils at tombs of the martyrs, wakes, and “private watches of virgins and ascetics.” The more public vigils include a resurrection vigil, with psalms and a resurrection gospel, monastic nocturns, with continuous psalms and reading, cathedral use of monastic nocturns, a baptismal vigil, such as the Easter Vigil, and an extension of vespers, which featured psalms, prayers, readings, and preaching, and often culminated in the celebration of the Eucharist. Taft describes this final type of vigil as “occasional,” and says it becomes the preferred type of vigil in the West.

While Mathis claims that the ancient vigil as he describes it was similar to the Easter Vigil, vigils of this sort were not held with the regularity that Mathis suggests. While they were primarily composed of readings, they were not weekly events. A regular weekly vigil attended by the people did exist in some traditions, but this resurrection vigil was primarily composed of psalms and the reading of the resurrection Gospel; it did not feature extensive Scripture lessons and preaching. Mathis’ descriptions appear to most closely match the occasional vigils that Taft says would become the preferred type in

---

114 Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours,* 188.

115 Ibid., 189-190.

116 Ibid., 189.
cathedral prayer in the West. In his discussion of four basic types, Taft describes this vigil, calling it “an occasional vigil of antiphons, responsories, Scripture readings, prostrations, prayers, and preaching, found usually as an extension of vespers and culminating in Eucharist on the morrow. Of special importance was the proclamation of the Word in the lections and homily.” Taft also reports that this type of vigil was frequently used on Saturday nights. This fits with Mathis’ belief that the early Christian vigil placed an emphasis on readings and preaching and prepared participants for the coming Eucharist.

While the general description of these types of vigils does appear to correspond with Mathis’ understanding, Mathis’ work also needs to be examined in light of the distinction between cathedral and monastic types of prayer. Cathedral prayer was the popular prayer of the clergy and people, which took place at morning and evening, with weekly and occasional vigils. Its contents included selected, unchanging psalms chosen for the time of day, singing, and symbolic ceremony. According to Taft, the monastic office was primarily composed of psalms, “followed by a prostration for private prayer and concluded with a collect,” with Scripture reading at the end of the service.

In his discussion of the cathedral and monastic types of prayer, William Storey argued that Mathis, as well as his fellow reformers who worked with the Office, were

---

117 Ibid., 190.
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119 Ibid., 31-32, 211-212.
unsuccessful because they were unaware of the distinction between these types of prayer and because they were using the fundamentally monastic Roman Breviary as their starting point. It is true that Mathis makes Matins of the breviary the core of his Vigil Service. Mathis’ comments on the Vigil Service and early Christian prayer may also be at odds with the nature of the cathedral office. Mathis’ claim that the vigil featured significantly more readings than psalms conflicts with the importance of psalmody in the cathedral office and with the description of the vigil that may be most closely compared to Mathis’ understanding. The occasional vigil, as described by Taft, included psalmody and lessons, as well as other elements. Further, another regular vigil described by many cathedral sources was a resurrection vigil, which featured both psalms and a resurrection gospel, but no additional readings. In many cases, cathedral morning and evening prayer also did not include readings from Scripture but were composed primarily of psalms and prayers. Finally, Storey’s description of the cathedral hours challenges Mathis’ claim that it was the primary education of early Christians. In his list of characteristics, Storey claims “the office was not conceived of primarily as instructive or edifying. Often it had no scripture lessons or preaching. It was almost exclusively worship... for its own sake: praise, thanksgiving, adoration, petition.”


121 Taft, Liturgy of the Hours in East and West, 166-167, 189-190.

122 Ibid., 55-56.

possible that Christians were formed through their participation in this prayer, its structure and contents were not well suited for catechetical purposes.

In some ways, however, Mathis reflects the spirit of cathedral prayer. This is seen, in particular, in his emphasis on the public celebration of the Office. Mathis’ prayer books are intended to be prayed by a group, rather than alone. This was particularly evident in the earliest versions of the Vigil Service, which featured separate texts for the leader and congregation members. Mathis’ emphasis on providing musical texts also highlights the intended communal nature of his Vigil Service. Beyond the intended communal nature of his prayer texts, Mathis’ emphasis on Lauds, Vespers, and a weekly vigil reflect the essential prayer times of the cathedral office. Though he uses the Roman Breviary for these services, he recognizes their central importance for the prayer of all Christians. It is likely that Mathis did not work with an understanding of the distinction between cathedral and monastic prayer, but his work was not completely divorced from cathedral prayer.

Beyond the problem of cathedral and monastic prayer, there is also a question of the historical accuracy of Mathis’ claims that the vigil, Lauds, and Vespers were the primary public prayer of Christians for the first five centuries of Christianity. While it is clear that these hours played an important role in the fourth century and beyond, the evidence is less clear, especially in the case of vigils, prior to the fourth century. In particular, there is little evidence a regular weekly public vigil, featuring lessons and preaching, beginning on Saturday evening and continuing into Sunday morning as preparation for the Eucharist during this period. In his discussion of vigils, Taft argues
that the early evidence for vigils before the fourth century included “daily private prayer at night, testified to by most early writers; the yearly paschal vigil; occasional vigils at the martyrs’ tombs.”\textsuperscript{124} Additionally, evidence for daily prayer in this period reflects a diversity of practices, with different sources suggesting a variety of different times for prayer.\textsuperscript{125} Both the lack of evidence for the Sunday vigil as Mathis describes it and the diversity of practice with regards to daily prayer in the earliest centuries of Christianity show that Mathis’ blanket statements about the regular prayers of the early Christians are not completely accurate.

Mathis’ claims about the historical roots of his Vigil Service have some merit, but are also not without problems. There did exist a type of vigil that emphasized both reading and preaching, and this type of service did serve to prepare participants for the Eucharistic celebration, which often followed. However, discussion of Mathis’ work in light of the distinction between cathedral and monastic types of prayer and consideration of some of his stronger historical claims highlight difficulties with his understanding of the history of the Office. Overall, Mathis’ claims are not entirely accurate but nevertheless do reflect some elements that are found within the history of the vigil.

\textsuperscript{124} Taft, \textit{Liturgy of the Hours}, 166.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., 27.
6.3.5 Evaluating the Vigil Service

In sum, there are several praiseworthy aspects of Father Mathis’ liturgical productions. These services provided helpful introductions to the Divine Office and worked for promoting its usage amongst groups and people that were not required to pray it. Through its commentary, it also provided helpful introductions to the specific Masses that may have helped prepare those who used the services to better participate in the Mass. Additionally, by expanding the scripture selections in the First Nocturn, the service also exposed participants to an increased amount of Scripture. At the same time, however, the services had a number of shortcomings, especially with regards to problems with the structure of the services. Ultimately, Mathis provided a slightly flawed service that was useful in its time, exposing a number of Catholics to a greater depth of Scripture and Tradition in the context of a traditional prayer form and helping them prepare for Mass.

6.4 Conclusion

Mathis’ work on liturgical texts for the Vigil Service and his attempt to produce a daily Lauds and Vespers with commentary were a major part of his work in the liturgical portion of his career. He spent years developing and perfecting these texts in order to help people to come to a better understanding of the texts of the Mass through prayerful preparation. The results, though not as enduring as the Liturgy Program itself, were a
series of prayer services that successfully served to introduce the different prayers and readings of the Mass and prepare for the following day’s Mass, while also introducing participants to part of the Divine Office. Overall, Mathis made a contribution with his liturgical projects that went beyond the educational contributions of his Liturgy Program and helped numerous Catholics come to a better understanding and appreciation of the Divine Office, the texts of the Mass, and the liturgical year.
CHAPTER 7:

PROMOTING THE DIVINE OFFICE IN THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

The preceding chapters on both Mathis’ liturgy program and his work with the Vigil Service have shown that he had a strong interest in the Divine Office. From a very early stage in his liturgical ministry, Mathis began using the Office to shape a weekly prayer service that he came to call his Vigil Service. Taking Sunday Matins as his starting point, Mathis provided a service focusing on lengthy lessons, together with a commentary, in an attempt to help better prepare people for Mass. Beyond the Vigil Service, consideration of the Notre Dame Liturgy Program has illustrated that Mathis made aspects of the Divine Office a daily part of the prayer life of his liturgy summer school. Finally, late in his life, Mathis began to work on composing a prayer text for sung Lauds and Vespers, offered together with a commentary, that he hoped would promote greater participation in these two hinges of the canonical hours.

Promotion of the Divine Office was common in the liturgical movement, and there were many other attempts to promote participation in this form of prayer. This chapter will look at how Mathis’ work relates to similar projects to promote participation
in the canonical hours in two main sections. The first section will investigate how
different authors promoted the Divine Office and the arguments they made in favor of its
use. The second section will follow this with discussion of implementation and will
specifically look at different modifications of the Divine Office for lay use and
recommendations for beginning to pray this type of prayer.

7.1 Promotion

This section will look at how church officials and liturgical leaders promoted
participation in the Divine Office in their various writings. It will begin with an
introduction to some of the major authors available in English who were promoting the
Divine Office, before examining common arguments made to encourage participation in
the Divine Office in the second subsection. Once these first two steps have been
accomplished, it will be possible to compare these common approaches to Mathis’ on
writings on the Divine Office.

7.1.1 Important Writers and Texts

Promotion of the Divine Office did not have the same importance in the liturgical
movement as promotion of the missal. Writing in 1927, William Busch claimed,
“Undoubtedly the chief concern of the liturgical apostolate is with the Mass and the
Missal,” and that the “liturgical apostolate should naturally encourage a more general use
of the Breviary. Yet to do so is not its first and foremost aim…”\(^1\) Keith Pecklers also reports,

> The pioneers were convinced the day would come when the laity would be praying the Liturgy of the Hours…But they were also convinced that Church members would first need to get acquainted with the Missal before familiarizing themselves with the Breviary.\(^2\)

Still, many authors, including Busch, promoted the breviary and spoke of its great importance in their writings, and these texts may be examined to understand how these liturgical leaders promoted the Divine Office.

A study of promoters of the Divine Office needs to begin with official encouragement for greater use of the Office. Here, Pope Pius XII, who briefly considers the Office in his reflection on the liturgy and the liturgical movement in the encyclical *Mediator Dei*, is most relevant. Outside of official discussion of the Office, one of the most important early texts is Rodolphe Hoornaert’s *The Breviary and the Laity*, which was translated into English and published by The Liturgical Press in 1936.\(^3\) This text attempts to show how the breviary can be used in four stages of prayer by responding to objections to its use and presenting both historical considerations and advantages of the breviary for that type of prayer. A second important translated text, Pius Parsch’s *The

---

\(^1\) William Busch, “The Hour Prayers of the Breviary,” *Orate Fratres* 1:8 (June 1927), 231.


Breviary Explained, was published in English in 1952. This text explains the different parts of the breviary, gives arguments for why someone would pray the breviary, and argues in favor of the use of the breviary by the laity.\(^4\)

In addition to these translations, a number of other authors wrote about the Divine Office in English-language publications in the United States. Among these articles are a number published in the first volume of Orate Fratres, including an article from Ellen Gates Starr on “The Delights of the Breviary,” and Busch on “The Hour Prayers of the Breviary.”\(^5\) Other articles promoting the breviary in Orate Fratres included Busch’s “The Divine Office For All” and “The Breviary for the Laity,” which both appeared in 1936, and a four-part series on the Office from Lancelot Sheppard, published in the following year.\(^6\) Elsewhere, Gerard Donnelly published in America in 1936, “Let Us Glorify Him With Psalms,” listing reasons why the laity should participate in the Divine Office.\(^7\) Finally, Gerald Ellard discussed both the increased interest in the Divine Office and


\(^7\) Gerard Donnelly, “Let Us Glorify Him With Psalms,” America 56 (December 1936), 268-269.
reasons behind the resurgence in a chapter of his *Men at Work at Worship: America Joins the Liturgical Movement*.\(^8\)

### 7.1.2 Common Arguments for the Divine Office

In discussions of the Divine Office and appeals for greater participation in it, one of the most common ideas is that the Office is the official prayer of the church and the prayer of the Mystical Body of Christ. In *Mediator Dei*, Pope Pius XII discusses the Divine Office, claiming that it is “the prayer of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, offered to God in the name and on behalf of all Christians, when recited by priests and other ministers of the Church and by religious who are deputed by the Church for this.”\(^9\) Many other authors, some writing earlier than Pius, similarly describe the Divine Office as the prayer of the Mystical Body. For example, Donnelly’s first argument in favor of praying the Divine Office is that it is the prayer of the Mystical Body.\(^10\) Parsch says that the breviary is the “prayer of the Church” as “the mystical body of Christ, the sacred spouse of the God-man, the vine whose root is Christ.”\(^11\) Additionally, Ellard points out that the

---


nature of the Divine Office as the prayer of the Mystical Body is frequently the first reason that many lay persons cite when asked why they pray the breviary.12

Related to claims about the breviary as the prayer of the Mystical Body are claims about the importance of its communal nature against the more private nature of other prayers. Building off of his description of the breviary as the prayer of the Mystical Body, Donnelly claims,

As a member of the Body, each Catholic ought to take a vocal part in its prayer. When he does this, he prays, not solo, with a puny and lonely voice, but in the Church’s great chorus, united with all the faithful, the clergy, the hierarchy, the Pope as well as the suffering and triumphant Church, and its Divine Head in heaven.13

In addition to Donnelly’s claim, in a list of three advantages of the Divine Office, Busch claims that the prayer of the breviary is “a return to a true sense of community prayer and to a consciousness of the social character of our Christian religion.”14

Discussion of the Divine Office also commonly included arguments that sought to show that the breviary was not just a book for priests and monks and that the laity were justified in their use of the text. The most common of these was a historical appeal, which argued that in the early church, the Divine Office was open to all Christians, with many participating, and that it became reserved almost entirely to clergy only over time. Parsch, for example, boldly claims, “For the fact that the laity is justified in joining in the

12 Ellard, Men at Work at Worship, 261.
14 Busch, “The Divine Office For All, 529.
Office there is no further need of proof. A cursory glance at the early Church makes this clear.\textsuperscript{15} Other arguments also point to how the texts of the breviary seem to assume a congregation. Sheppard, in particular, highlights how the texts suggest a communal celebration. He points out that the lessons of Matins are not just addressed to priests, but to the whole community, and even argues that the presence of the \textit{Dominus Vobiscum} and \textit{Et cum spiritu tuo} in the texts of the breviary point to community usage.\textsuperscript{16}

Another common type of argument claimed that the breviary was superior to the various manuals of prayer available. In some cases, this appeal focused on its sources, highlighting the importance of the Fathers and the Scriptures as the main components of the prayers of the Divine Office. Donnelly, for example, compares the authorship of manuals to that of the breviary, claiming, “But the Psalms, the backbone of the Breviary, have God Himself as their chief author.”\textsuperscript{17} Similarly, Hoornaert notes that the manuals of prayer “are open to this objection that they are inclined to neglect the dogmatic sources of the Church’s prayer (the psalms, hymns, lessons and orations of the Missal and breviary)...”\textsuperscript{18} Ellard’s survey of common arguments in favor of the Office also cites a

\begin{footnotesize}
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belief that the psalms offer “sobriety, restraint, lack of ‘pale sentimentality’” in a way that common manuals of prayer and other private prayers cannot.19

A further related argument is that the breviary provides for the needs of a Christian’s daily prayer and better expresses all of the types of prayers and intentions than the manuals. Hoornaert claims, “You will discover that the Breviary provides the usual forms of prayer to which you are attached. You will find that your own sentiments and your own intentions are not overlooked,” and, “The Breviary includes our chief customary prayers, such as morning and evening prayers and prayers of thanksgiving after Communion.”20 Sheppard also claims, “We may find in the breviary all intentions, all our hopes, fears and aspirations, expressed, and better expressed, than in any manual of prayers.”21 Parsch also claims that the breviary serves to provide the necessary prayers for the morning and evening of each day, as well as some spiritual reading, saying, “Matins supplies, for the most part, an excellent spiritual reading. Lauds and Vespers are the proper morning and night prayers.”22 Finally, Starr, in her consideration of “The Delights of the Breviary,” highlights beautiful texts in the breviary, pointing out how it can be a source of inspiration and consolation and can provide material for meditation, and says “I cannot conceive how any intelligent and literate Catholic should not prefer

19 Ellard, Men at Work at Worship, 263-264.
22 Parsch, The Breviary Explained, 446.
the breviary to the many somewhat flabby popular books of devotion (if one may say so) in common use.”

Many authors promoting the Divine Office also speak of the relationship between the Office and the Mass. Hoornaert refers to the Divine Office as the “official preparation for Mass,” saying,

If therefore the Missal has taught you to understand the Mass as the Church does, why not also make use of the Church’s official preparation for Mass (First Vespers, Matins and Lauds), and why not continue throughout the day to dwell with the Church upon the theme of the morning Mass (in the Minor Hours, Second Vespers and Compline)?

Sheppard also argues that the breviary helps prepare for the Mass, claiming that it provides the important background for the variable parts of the Mass and suggesting that readers should look at the missal and breviary for an important feast like Easter and see how the breviary aids in interpretation of the missal texts. Parsch, too, claims that the breviary prepares for the Mass, but he also adds that it reinforces the Mass. He says that First Vespers, Matins, Lauds, Prime, and Terce, “are a remote preparatory part of the Mass,” while Sext, None, and Second Vespers, “echo and hark back to the morning’s Mass.” Donnelly sees a complementarity between the two types of prayer, saying, “The Missal and Breviary are twin books. The latter enshrines the day’s Sacrifice, echoes its

23 Starr, The Delights of the Breviary, 263.
prayers, extends and continues Mass.”²⁷ Finally, Busch presents the relationship between the breviary and the Mass in a similar way, saying, “The Breviary prayers encircle those of the Missal; they carry the radiance of the Mass throughout all the hours of the day…”²⁸

A final topic that appears in articles and chapters encouraging participation in the Divine Office is the idea that the breviary exposes Christians to the sources of doctrine and helps educate them in the faith. This can be seen, for example, in Sheppard’s article on the advantages of the breviary, where he says, “Recitation of the breviary deepens our understanding of the dogmatic truths of the faith; it is a deepening therefore of our life of faith.”²⁹ Ellard also notes that people claim the office serves similarly, saying that it “broadens and deepens our hold on Catholic culture in the knowledge it affords of Sacred Scripture, the writings of the great Fathers, the short lives of all the saints…”³⁰ Finally, Parsch argues that the breviary can help with Christian growth through its close contact with the liturgical year. Here, he compares the breviary to “the ladder on which the soul mounts to heaven,” and claims, “Through contact and “exposure” to the Church year, our soul matures for heaven; no book offers more contact with the life of the Church’s liturgical year than does the breviary.”³¹

---

³⁰ Ellard, Men at Work at Worship, 264.
³¹ Parsch, The Breviary Explained, 8.
While this survey has not covered every argument in favor of the breviary in detail, several important themes have been highlighted. Among these are the importance of the idea that the Divine Office is the prayer of the Mystical Body and historical arguments in favor of lay participation in the Office. Other common appeals included comparing the breviary to different forms of private prayer, particularly manuals of prayer, and highlighting the breviary’s potential to help prepare Christians for the day’s Mass as well as to form Christians in their faith and introduce them to the liturgical year. These important themes can therefore now be compared to Michael Mathis’ writings on the Divine Office, which show both some similarities and some differences from the common themes and appeals discussed above.

### 7.1.3 Mathis on the Office

Mathis’ writings on the Divine Office display a number of themes and ideas that can be commonly found in the writings of his contemporaries on the topic. The first of these is his belief that, together with the Mass, the Divine Office served an important role in educating Christians. We have seen in the previous chapter that Mathis described the Vigil Service, together with the Mass, as “the old prayer which the Church used to
educate its clergy and its people.”\textsuperscript{32} Similarly, Willis Nutting’s description of the Vigil Service, claims that the Vigil Service “is a plan for reviving the full teaching work of the liturgy and putting that work within the reach of the ordinary layman.”\textsuperscript{33} Related to this idea is the second belief that an important aspect of the breviary is that it is composed using Scripture and the writings of the Fathers. In his introduction to the final version of the Vigil Service, Mathis describes it saying it is “a public prayer through which God’s plan of salvation for mankind is revealed in His own words, as recorded both in the canonical Scriptures and in the oral tradition of the Church, and as interpreted by her.”\textsuperscript{34} In an introduction to an earlier version of the service, he also claims that one of the goals of the service is “to deepen our understanding and appreciation of divine revelation.”\textsuperscript{35} A third argument that Mathis holds in common with many liturgical writers is the appeal to the practice of the early church when promoting the Divine Office. Mathis argues that the Divine Office was one of the primary means of education for the early Christians and that Matins, Lauds, and Vespers were the regular prayers of early Christians.\textsuperscript{36}


\textsuperscript{34} Michael A. Mathis, \textit{Vigil Service for Advent, Christmastide, and Epiphany Season} (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956), v.

\textsuperscript{35} Michael A. Mathis, \textit{A Vigil Preparation for the Masses of Six Feasts With a Brief Commentary} (Michael A. Mathis, 1946), 3.

\textsuperscript{36} Mathis, “The Vigil Service,” 186.
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A more significant point of common ground is on the topic of preparation for Mass. Mathis’ description and promotion of his Vigil Service suggests that one of the main reasons to participate in the vigil is to prepare for the Sunday or feast it corresponds with. On this topic, Mathis describes the purpose of the commentary in his Vigil Service, saying that he hopes “to show how the Church has selected from Sacred Scripture and tradition and hagiography appropriate passages to illustrate the lessons she teaches on each of these feasts…” and “...through the summary of the lesson of the feast, as it reveals itself in the Divine Office, to bring out how intimately the lesson is connected with the Mass the central liturgical act of the whole day.”37 His commentary texts also reflect this emphasis, as the commentary constantly refers to how the prayers and lessons emphasize the lesson or message for the day. Further, Mathis’ commentary texts also provide helpful introductions to liturgical seasons, reflecting Parsch’s belief that the breviary offers particularly important exposure to the liturgical year.

Finally, Mathis shares an understanding of the Divine Office as the communal and public prayer of the church with many of his contemporaries. In a 1956 paper about daily prayers for religious, which will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter, Mathis recommends Lauds and Vespers prayed in common as “the ideal morning and night prayers, which are both designed for public prayer and which are at

37 Mathis, A Vigil Preparation for the Masses of Six Feasts With a Brief Commentary, 3.
the same time the public worship of the Church.” Additionally, his use of the Vigil Service in communal celebration and embrace of common recitation of much of the Divine Office during the Liturgy Program’s sessions also point to an emphasis on the communal nature of the prayer.

While Mathis shares some things in common with his contemporaries when discussing the Divine Office, there are some common themes used to present the breviary that Mathis tends not to discuss. In particular, while his contemporaries frequently appeal to the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, Mathis does not appear to mention it in any of his discussions about the Divine Office. This doctrine is important to writings of many of his peers, and it is unclear why Mathis makes no appeal to it. Another topic that Mathis does not appear to address directly is the difference between manuals of prayer and the breviary. However, while he does not discuss manuals of prayer specifically, in two different papers on prayer for religious communities, he does argue for the superiority and use of Lauds and Vespers over the prayers many religious communities used for their morning and evening prayers that were more private in their nature.

---


While this does not specifically reference manuals of prayer, it argues similarly that the prayers of the church are superior to privately composed prayers.

Overall, Mathis echoed many of the important themes that liturgical writers highlighted in their promotion of the Divine Office. He emphasized its public character, noted its use of biblical materials, appealed to its historical usage, and underscored the relationship between the Mass and the breviary. While his writings did not address all of the topics discussed in the survey above, they are generally in agreement with other writings promoting the Divine Office.

7.2 Facilitating Participation

Liturgical leaders in the twentieth century did not limit themselves to writing about why lay Catholics could and should participate in the Divine Office; they also took steps to help facilitate such participation. One of the most important steps was the publication of a number of translated, shortened, or simplified breviaries, designed with lay use in mind, by a number of publishers throughout the world. Further, many of the authors who wrote in favor of lay participation in the Office included practical suggestions for how to cope with difficulties presented by the breviary and where to begin. Finally, different groups were formed to both encourage and assist lay persons in regularly praying the Divine Office. This section will first look at different ways these three methods were approached and then address how Mathis’ project compares.
7.2.1 Modified Breviaries

Breviaries produced as part of an effort to encourage and assist those not obligated to pray the Divine Office to participate in at least part of the church’s official prayer took many different forms. All of them featured the vernacular, though in some cases the vernacular was provided side-by-side with the official Latin. Many included abbreviations of the hours of prayer themselves, often reducing the number of psalms or lessons in order to shorten individual hours, or reductions in the number of feasts included to shorten the book and decrease added complications. Other texts provided prayers for only select hours, such as Prime or Compline, or gave all of the hours except for Matins, which would require the most space in a liturgical book. Because these represent a significant aspect of efforts to promote the Divine Office and they provide the clearest points of comparison with Mathis’ efforts with the Vigil Service, it is important to review examples of different breviaries in detail.40

A Short Breviary

The most significant shortened or lay breviary to appear in the United States during the liturgical movement was A Short Breviary for Religious and the Laity.41

40 As this study is primarily concerned with Mathis’ contribution to the liturgical movement in the United States, only texts available in English will be considered here. For discussion of other modified breviaries, see: Stanislaus Campbell, From Breviary to Liturgy of the Hours: The Structural Reform of the Roman Office, 1964-1971 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995), 20-22; additional discussion of adapted breviaries may be found in William G. Storey, “Vernacular Psalters and Breviaries,” Amen 1 (June 1961): 19-21.

41 The editions referred to in this chapter are Monks of St. John’s Abbey, ed., A Short Breviary for Religious and the Laity, 3rd ed. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1944), and William G. Heidt, ed.,
Compiled by the monks of St. John’s Abbey, this text aimed to provide a shortened form of the breviary for religious and laity to replace translations of the whole or part of the breviary, which *Orate Fratres* describes as “either not available or have been found too long and complicated for popular use.” This text itself claims that its modifications leave all of the essentials in place, allowing it to remain “in close harmony with the Roman breviary” and reports that its main changes are “the reduction of the number of feasts, psalms and lessons.” This prayer book was extremely popular, and it went through multiple editions and over one hundred thousand copies by 1959.

Each of the hours contained in *A Short Breviary* has a reduced number of psalms or psalm parts, and, in total, *A Short Breviary* uses nearly one hundred of the one hundred fifty psalms. In the regular psalter of the 1954 edition, this includes eighty-seven psalms.

---


43 *A Short Breviary* (1944), 754.


45 For a table of the psalms, see: *A Short Breviary* (1954), 755 and *A Short Breviary* (1944), 764. Each text also includes an index, which includes the psalms not in the regular cycle, on 765-766 (1944) and 756-757 (1954). Interestingly, there is a one psalm difference between the 1944 and later 1954 editions. While the 1954 edition give two parts each of Psalms 144 (143) and 145 (144) for Saturday Vespers, the
in the weekly psalter, seven psalms that appear in the common only, and the invitatory
psalm, Psalm 95 (94). Four additional psalms, namely 4, 74 (73), 140 (139), and 143
(142), appear only in Holy Week. The only differences in psalters between this and the
1944 edition is the use of Psalm 144 (143) in the weekly psalter and the use of Psalm 4 in
both Holy Week and Monastic Compline, which is not included in the later editions.\textsuperscript{46}
Beyond the reduction in the total number of psalms, a number of the psalms that are
included are shortened from their appearance in the breviary. Psalm 119 (118), in
particular, has been significantly abbreviated. Only fifty-six of the one hundred seventy-
six verses appear in \textit{A Short Breviary}, with twenty-four of those verses only appearing in
the common.\textsuperscript{47} The supplement included in the complete edition adds three additional
weeks of three psalms per day for Matins, providing the psalms omitted and shortened by
the regular psalter and allowing for the use of the complete psalter over a four week
period.\textsuperscript{48}

In the new distribution of psalms, Matins is reduced by six from nine to only three
psalms or psalm units, Lauds is reduced by one to three psalms and a canticle, Vespers is
reduced by one psalm to a total of four, and the minor hours, Prime, Terce, Sext, None,

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{A Short Breviary} (1954), 755,384-385, 400-401, 404-405, 413-414; \textit{A Short Breviary} (1944),
764, 49-50,410, 423, 435.

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{A Short Breviary} (1954), 20, 24-26, 28,269, 271, 272-273, 755-757.

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{A Short Breviary} (Complete Edition), 742-839.
and Compline, are all reduced by two and each have only one psalm. Within these changes, *A Short Breviary* notes, the psalms used remain on the same day they are used in the Roman Breviary, though sixteen psalms and psalm units are indicated as placed in different hours of prayer than where they appear in the breviary.49

The lessons for the office of Matins are reduced to a single reading for each day. In the case of the regular text of *A Short Breviary*, Sunday, the day which would typically have the most readings, receives a proper reading for each week, while Monday through Saturday receive a shorter lesson in the psalter or the seasonal proper. The limited sanctoral also provides propers for the feasts of the included saints. The lessons provided in the psalter for the weekdays all come from epistles, while other short biblical readings are given for seasonal weekdays and during certain octaves.50 The Sunday and feast day lessons are often longer and possess greater variety. While the majority of these lessons come from Scripture, including the Gospels, patristic lessons are also included for some days.51 The lessons in the sanctoral are again a mix of biblical and non-biblical lessons, with the non-biblical lessons coming from patristic homilies, the acts of various popes, and accounts of the life of the saint or martyr. It is unclear, particularly in the case of

49 *A Short Breviary* (1954), 755.

50 Lessons for the weekdays in the psalter include Col 3:12-13, Romans 15:5-7, 1 John 3:23-24, 1 Peter 2:4-5, 2 Corinthians 4:10-11, and 2 Peter 2:11-12 – *A Short Breviary*, 49, 79, 110, 139, 168, 200. For seasonal weekdays, a single lesson is provided for all weekdays during the period covered. An example of the seasonal lessons can be seen in the biblical text provided for the weekdays of Advent, Isaiah 11:1-3 – *A Short Breviary* (1954), 278.

51 For example, for the first four Sundays of Lent, the lessons include a homily of St. Leo, Hebrews 12:1-6, Mark 8:31-38, and Luke 12:32-38, *A Short Breviary* (1954), 365-367.
Sundays and seasonal feasts, what criteria were used in determining the type of lesson chosen (Gospel, patristic homily, other Scripture), and the text does not provide an explanation. In the supplement of the complete edition, each day has a biblical lesson.\textsuperscript{52}

Outside of the supplement, the length of the selected lessons generally matches a single lesson from the breviary, though, especially in the case of feasts, they can at times combine all or part of more than one lesson to give a longer overall reading. For example, in the lesson for Christmas, a combination of the fourth and sixth lessons from the breviary text for the day is used, and, on the feast of St. Stephen, all three lessons are from the sermon of St. Fulgentius used for that day in the breviary.\textsuperscript{53} For the supplement of the complete edition, the lessons are approximately the length of three lessons in the breviary.\textsuperscript{54} The longer length of some Sunday and feast day lessons, as well as the longer lessons of the supplement, does mitigate the reduction in lessons somewhat, though the overall number of lessons remains reduced.

Like the psalter and the lessons, the calendar is also truncated, with a significant reduction in feast days. The number of texts provided for the feasts of saints in this breviary is forty-three in the 1944 edition and thirty-eight in 1954. These feast days include feasts of the apostles and evangelists, as well as St. Joseph, a number of feasts of Mary, St. Ann and St. Joachim, All Saints, and All Souls. Additionally, the early editions

\textsuperscript{52} A Short Breviary (Complete Edition), 840-1179.

\textsuperscript{53} A Short Breviary (1944), 295-296, 302-303.

\textsuperscript{54} A Short Breviary (Complete Edition), 840-1179.
included a number of Benedictine feasts, such as St. Maurus, St. Gertrude, the feast of All Saints of the Benedictine Order, St. Scholastica, and two feasts for St. Benedict. Later editions omitted these Benedictine saints but added other saints relevant to American Catholics of the day, including the feasts of St. Frances Xavier Cabrini and the North American Martyrs; the more recently created feast of St. Joseph the Worker was also added to later editions. While there is a reduction in the sanctoral cycle, the feasts of the temporal cycle, such as Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter, are largely left in place. These changes helped to fulfill one of the goals of the text, namely, “to give more prominence to the proper of the seasons.”

In its end matter, A Short Breviary also accounts for the possibility of praying the Divine Office in common, calling it “the normal and more solemn manner of the Church’s prayer.” The text provides instructions concerning the necessary roles, indicating what parts are reserved to the leader and what parts designated readers perform. It also provides step-by-step instructions for the hours, including remarks on posture, and appears to assume that group recitation of the psalms will involve chanting.

55 A Short Breviary (1944), 752-753.
56 A Short Breviary (1954), 743-744.
58 A Short Breviary (1944), 754.
59 Ibid., 754-760.
The reduction in psalmody, lessons, and feasts produces a more easily used text, shortened and simplified to better accommodate the time restraints of active laity and religious without the requirement to pray the full breviary. The shortening and the mild rearrangement of the psalter are necessary, and, while this departs from the principle of praying the entirety of the psalter in the span of a week, it does not negatively impact the structure or character of the breviary. With lessons taken from a variety of sources, the lessons for Sundays in the regular text also marked by a certain level of inconsistency that may be something of a handicap to the most fruitful use of the text. Finally, the reduction in feasts helps to simplify the calendar and to emphasize the temporal cycle over the sanctoral. While the prayer book has some shortcomings, overall, A Short Breviary’s changes produced a book that provided an effective and popular way for many to begin praying the Divine Office.

_Breviaries with Selections of Hours_

A Short Breviary was not the only accessible English-language edition of the Divine Office. Among these other editions are several different books which were published featuring texts for some, but not all, of the hours of prayer. One of the early volumes is a Latin-English Diurnal, edited by the Benedictine Nuns of the Abbey of Our Lady of Consolation at Stanbrook and published by Burns Oates & Washbourne first in 1914. This text included the complete text for all of the hours of the day except Matins.60

Two additional notable selections were produced by the Liturgical Press in 1929 and 1935. Companion volumes of a sort, the first offered Compline for the whole week, while the second offered Prime for the week. Another adaptation using selected hours was *Three Little Hours*, an English translation of the hours of Terce, Sext, and None intended for use by schoolchildren in the classroom.

*Other Modified Breviaries*

In the mid-1950s, an all-English abbreviation of the breviary was published by the Benedictine Nuns of the Abbey of Stanbrook. Translated from a Dutch modified breviary using Monsignor Knox’s English translation of the Bible, *The Little Breviary* provides a vernacular breviary with only slight modifications. *The Little Breviary* presents itself as an answer for religious and lay who wish to pray the Divine Office but who do not understand Latin or find the breviary too long.

The major change in this breviary is the reduction of Matins to three psalms and three lessons. These lessons vary, with some days featuring all Scripture, all patristic

---


62 “Third Annual Liturgical Day,” *Orate Fratres* 5:10 (September 1931), 482.

63 T. Stallaert, ed., *The Little Breviary: For the Use of Both Religious and Layfolk Containing In Simplified Form All the Office of the Roman Breviary*, trans. The Benedictine Nuns of Stanbrook Abbey (London: Burns & Oates, 1957), xi. Though it is not an original text, being a translation of a Dutch breviary, the interest of this study is primarily in the American and English language efforts which would be available in the United States, so detailed discussion of this type of breviary will be focused on the English edition rather than the Dutch. Additionally, it should be noted that this text was among the liturgical books owned by Michael Mathis.

64 Ibid., ix.
lessons, or a mix of the two and many saints’ days also including an account of the life of the saint.\textsuperscript{65} Because of the abbreviation of Matins and an additional division of longer psalms beyond what is already divided by the Roman Breviary’s psalter, there are a total of 109 psalms used.\textsuperscript{66} The final minor change \textit{The Little Breviary} makes is the shortening of some hymns.\textsuperscript{67} Overall, this text makes fewer abbreviations than \textit{A Short Breviary}, resulting in a longer, and possibly more complicated, Office than the American effort.

Later in the 1950s, another short breviary was published by Herder and Herder, featuring an English version of the German \textit{Officium Divinum Parvum}.\textsuperscript{68} This breviary spreads the psalter out over two weeks, and, as a result, is able to include 128 of the 150 psalms, more than many other shortened breviaries.\textsuperscript{69} It features three psalms or units of psalms in each of Matins, Lauds, and Vespers; Prime, Terce, Sext, None, and Compline each have one psalm on all days except Sunday, when Prime, Terce, Sext, and None each have three sections of Psalm 119 (118).\textsuperscript{70}

Lessons for Matins are included with the psalter, with one lesson per cycle for days outside of the special seasons or feasts. These lessons are all taken from the New

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., ix.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., ix.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., ix.
\textsuperscript{68} Edward E. Malone, trans. \textit{The Divine Office} (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959). This text was among the liturgical books owned by Father Mathis.
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{The Divine Office}, xviii.
Testament, with six taken from the Gospels, two from the Book of Revelation, four lessons from the Pauline Epistles, and two lessons from the Pastoral Epistles.\(^{71}\) As was the case with *A Short Breviary*, only a limited number of lessons are provided for the special seasons of the year, with only two readings, one for each of the weeks of the psalter, for each season. While many of the lessons for the seasons and feasts are taken from Scripture, patristic homilies are provided for several of the lessons. Unlike other adapted breviaries, a lesson for a Second Nocturn is provided for selected important feasts; in these cases, the first lesson is always taken from Scripture, while the second lesson is from a patristic homily or life of the selected saint. Those feasts with a lesson for a Second Nocturn provided total fourteen, including Epiphany, Easter, and Corpus Christi in the temporal cycle, and St. Joseph, the Annunciation, Sts. Peter and Paul, and the Immaculate Conception in the sanctoral.\(^{72}\) In general, the lessons appear to be somewhere around the length of the three lessons of a typical nocturn combined.

The calendar is focused on the proper of seasons, with only a limited calendar of saints. The proper of saints begins with the Feast of the Purification, on February 2, and includes propers for twenty-six feasts. The option to celebrate a number of additional


feasts is also offered, with a calendar directing users to common texts for Mary, martyrs, confessors, virgins, holy women, and the dedication of a church.\textsuperscript{73}

\textit{Full English Translations}

In addition to the modified and shortened breviaries, there were at least three different full translations of the breviary into English prior to the Second Vatican Council. The earliest edition was produced by John Chrichton-Stuart, Marquess of Bute, in a two-volume work published in 1879. In his preface, the translator indicates that he desired to assemble this work because only parts of the breviary had been translated into English, with Matins and Lauds in particular being overlooked. Highlighting goals of helping English Catholics both lay and ordained, he writes,

\begin{quote}
The object of the Translator in the present work has been to supply this deficiency by laying open to the English reader the whole of the Prayer of the Church. He thinks that this may be grateful to a considerable number of English-speaking Catholics, who would wish, at any rate at times, to read the Service of the Church, but are debarred from doing so by ignorance of the Latin language; and more especially so to converts who have been accustomed to the daily office while Anglicans. Even to some of the clergy, he is not without hope that this version may be of interest, since he has taken great pains to elucidate difficult passages, to explain the historical and other allusions, and, above all, to verify the reference to the Holy Scriptures.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{73} See: “Proper of Saints,” \textit{The Divine Office}, 460-587. See also: \textit{The Divine Office}, 650ff.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{The Roman Breviary Reformed by Order of the Holy Oecumenical Council of Trent; Published By Order of Pope St Pius V.; And Revised by Clement VIII., Urban VIII., And Leo XIII. Together With the Offices Since Granted and the Martyrology}, trans. John, Marquess of Bute (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1908), v.
A follow up edition was published posthumously in 1908 and includes the additions of the martyrology to the proper of saints, with the martyrology appearing after the proper texts for the Office for each day. It also moves the feast days particular to the English calendar to the proper of saints from the appendices, though the saints particular to Ireland and feasts celebrated in select dioceses remain in their own section. Another translation was made published by Burns, Oates, and Washbourne in 1937. This was a four-volume English text based on the shortest available version of the Latin breviary at the time. Finally, in 1950, an English translation of the breviary was published by the Benziger Brothers for the United States. Edited by Joseph Nelson, with a forward from Cardinal Spellman, the text offered the whole Divine Office in four volumes, substituting English for the Latin.

**Pius Parsch**

Finally, while he does not produce a modified breviary, Pius Parsch discusses his ideals for a breviary for the laity in the final chapter of his text, *The Breviary Explained*. Because of the importance of Parsch’s work in Mathis’ turn to liturgical studies, a review

---

75 Ibid., xiii, 905-956.

76 Charles Francis Brown, ed., *The Roman Breviary: Restored by the Sacred Council of Trent; Published By Order of S Pius V, Supreme Pontiff; And Carefully Resized by Other Popes: Reformed by Order of Pope Pius X*, vol. 2 (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1937), xix-xx. This text was among the liturgical books owned by Father Mathis.

77 Joseph A. Nelson, ed., *Roman Breviary In English: Restored by the Sacred Council of Trent; Published by Order of the Supreme Pontiff St. Pius V, and Carefully Revised by Other Popes. Reformed By Order of Pope Pius X. According to the Vatican Typical Edition, with New Psalter of Pope Pius XII; Compiled from Approved Sources* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1950).
of this presentation may be helpful. Parsch first considers and dismisses two possible approaches to providing a breviary for the laity. The first, a simple translation, he excludes because he believes the text would remain too confusing to the uninitiated. Parsch also rejects the second option, to privately abbreviate and modify the breviary to make it easier to use, because he believes “It is far too removed from the official hour-prayer” and does not have complete approval of the church.78

Parsch’s third option, which he recommends, is for the church to create its own lay breviary based on the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin or the votive Office of the Dead, using Matins, with one nocturn, Lauds, and Vespers. He argues that this arrangement can be defended historically, claiming that these were the three oldest hours and were recited by the laity, and theoretically, as he claims, “these three hours embody the finest elements of the whole day’s office, as far as content is concerned. Matins is the day’s or the feast’s prayer drama. Lauds and Vespers are the solemn morning and evening prayers, closely related to the theme of the feast.”79 He also argues that these prayers can serve as the fundamental prayers that should be part of each lay person’s day, morning and evening prayers combined with some spiritual reading. He adds to this a response to a hypothetical objection about the omission of Prime and Compline, that the


79 Ibid., 445.
two, while excellent morning and evening prayers, began as monastic prayers and are a duplication of the proper morning and evening prayers, Lauds and Vespers.  

Having presented and explained his reasons for his choice of hours, Parsch also has some suggestions concerning the contents of the breviary. In the case of Matins, he believes that there should be one nocturn and that, to avoid “the subjective element,” the psalms and lessons should come from the First Nocturn. He believes that Lauds and Vespers should remain unchanged. On the question of language, he adds that it seems likely that the vernacular would be best, but that printed lay breviaries should have both Latin and vernacular. Parsch concludes by arguing that the lay breviary should be a common, rather than private, prayer, with the faithful gathered to pray this Office each day with their pastor.

*Common Features of Modified Breviaries*

This survey has shown that there is a great variety to the different types of breviaries created to provide a more accessible form of the Divine Office. None of the breviaries take exactly the same approach, with varying numbers of psalms, lessons, feasts, and even hours celebrated. Regardless of the approach, a certain number of common characteristics emerge in all of these efforts other than the complete translations. First, many of the modified breviaries make significant changes to the number of psalms used. In most cases they use somewhere between ninety-five and one hundred ten psalms.

---

80 Ibid., 446.

81 Ibid., 448-449.
though in some cases they distribute the psalms over a longer period to use more. In the case of individual hours, the minor hours are typically reduced to a single psalm, while Lauds, Vespers, and, when it is included, Matins, typically use three psalms. Second, the majority of the abbreviated or modified breviaries reduce Matins to a single nocturn, with only one reading from either Scripture or the Fathers, and some texts eliminate Matins altogether. Third, in most of the modified texts, the breviary is shortened and simplified by the significant reduction in the number of feasts for the saints. Finally, while all of the modifications to the breviary significantly abridge the contents of the hours, many make an effort to preserve the basic structure of the Office, keeping all of the individual elements, reducing sections only in part and not in whole. Though there are exceptions to each of these characteristics, as a whole, the modified breviaries in the twentieth century made these or similar changes to make the breviary shorter and easier to pray for all Catholics who were unaccustomed to the breviary.

### 7.2.2 Groups Promoting the Divine Office

Outside of the publication of translated or modified breviaries, one of the most important efforts to assist and encourage Catholics in the United States to use the Divine Office was the organization known as the League of the Divine Office. Based off of the Society of the Magnificat in England, the league was first suggested as a means to encourage and organize the laity praying the Divine Office by William Busch in January
of 1936. The league was generally decentralized, with the local chapter being the primary level of organization and Orate Fratres serving to support the chapters by connecting them and printing articles about the Divine Office. Membership in the league required joining a local chapter, made up of seven members, with a three-month trial period for each new chapter.

The organization required each full member to agree to recite one designated hour a day for the entire week before shifting to the next hour. In this way, the seven members as a group served to pray the entirety of the day hours throughout the day, with the exception of Matins, and each member eventually recited each of the hours without an excessive burden. For those unable to commit to praying in such a fashion, the league offered an associate membership in which a person would commit to reciting one specific hour each day. At its inception, the league recommended that each member obtain a copy of The Day Hours of the Church from Burnes and Oates, and Orate Fratres recommended that English be permitted, with Latin as an option for those with the ability or when the group celebrated in common with a priest.

84 Ibid., 178-179.
85 Ibid., 179.
Outside of the League of the Divine Office, a few groups, some preceding the league, strongly encouraged their members to pray at least part of the Divine Office. In the January 1936 article, “The Breviary for the Laity,” William Busch highlights two groups, The Society of Approved Workmen and the Campion Propaganda Committee, for their commitment to praying part of the Office. The Approved Workmen, an organization formed to teach its members about Christian doctrine and worship, required some of its members to pray part of the Office privately each day, occasionally praying part of it in common with other members. The Campion Propaganda Committee, which was particularly interested in the social teaching of the church, required a larger commitment to the Office, with members required to pray Prime and Compline privately each day, with Lauds, Terce, and Vespers prayed in Latin on Sundays and more important feasts.86

7.2.3 Recommendations for Using the Breviary

Many of the same liturgical writers who promoted the use of the breviary for the laity and religious offered practical suggestions for beginning to use the text. Among the most common were recommendations about what hour to start with or plans for building up to the complete breviary. Busch, for example, suggests in “The Divine Office for All”

that those new to the Divine Office could start with Prime or Compline and, after becoming accustomed to those, shift to another of the day hours, likely Lauds or Vespers. Sheppard similarly suggests that the difficulties presented by the rubrics can be overcome by learning one hour at a time, and he recommends Compline because of its relative simplicity. After mastering one hour, he says, the new participant in the Divine Office could add another hour each time they mastered one until they were praying the complete Office. In the same article he also proposes that one might begin to make time for the Office by selecting only a portion of the day’s hours, either doing Lauds and Prime in the morning and Vespers and Compline in the evening, or simply just Prime and Compline, with the possibility of adding Matins or the whole of the Office on Sundays. Finally, Hoornaert makes similar suggestions about beginning to pray with only one or two hours. Among his recommendations are that one uses Prime and Compline as a morning and evening prayer or that one could pray both Vespers and Compline each evening. He also suggests praying only Matins or only the lessons from Matins as a possible approach for those who do not have the time for the entire breviary.

87 Busch, “The Divine Office For All,” 528.
88 Sheppard, “The Divine Office and the Laity (IV),” 266.
89 Ibid., 264-265.
7.2.4 Mathis and Making the Breviary Accessible

There are several points of comparison between these efforts and Mathis’ Vigil Service and later liturgical projects. Among the points of contrast are some differences in the choice of hours to emphasize, as well as some variances in execution of modified breviary texts. There are also a number of similarities, seen particularly in the use of the vernacular but also in certain agreement with individual authors on select topics.

The first important difference between Mathis’ major liturgical projects and related projects to facilitate participation in the Divine Office is the choice of primary text. The bulk of Mathis’ work on the Divine Office is focused on Matins, with some texts also including Lauds, until the end of his career, when he unsuccessfully attempted to produce service texts for Lauds and Vespers. In the various short and modified breviaries, however, Matins is often omitted or is the most abbreviated of the hours. A Short Breviary, The Little Breviary, and The Divine Office all reduced Matins to a single nocturn, and The Day Hours of the Church eliminates it completely. Additionally, while pamphlets with individual hours were published for Prime, Terce, Sext, None, and Compline, no pamphlet series was published for Matins. Finally, when recommending starting points for learning to pray the Divine Office, few suggest that novices begin with Matins. While the omission or marginalization of Matins is likely due to its length, as

---

91 The survey above (7.2.3) includes a number of authors who recommend Prime, Compline, both, or a combination of one or the other with another hour. At one point, Mathis was also willing to recommend Prime and Compline as a starting point. (See: Michael Mathis, “Family Life and Prayer” in The Family in Christ: National Liturgical Week Denver, Colorado, October 14-14, 1946 (Highland Park, IL: 309
well as the potential for corresponding complexity, both of which are compelling reasons, it stands as an important difference between Mathis and his contemporaries and likely reflects Mathis’ interests in not only promoting the Divine Office but also preparing participants for the following day’s Mass.

The second difference is found in the choices made in modifying the breviary. As has been discussed above, the majority of modified and adapted breviaries made their texts more accessible through abbreviation of the psalms, lessons, and feasts of the calendar. In every case, this involved reducing Matins to a single daily nocturn, with no more than three psalms and three lessons, though some used just one lesson. Mathis, however, believed that it was a mistake to shorten the breviary, especially in the case of Matins. In a lecture given at the National Liturgical Week in 1957, he claims that reducing the breviary beyond the already shortened form that emerged from the eleventh and twelfth centuries leads to “an abbreviation of an abbreviation.”92 The previous chapter has shown that Mathis instead sought to lengthen the lessons of Matins, significantly increasing the amount of Scripture and, he claimed, returning the sermons to their full length. While he did reduce the number of psalms in his adaptations of Matins, this was not primarily out of a desire to reduce psalmody but rather reflected his aim to

92 Mathis, “The Vigil Service,” 186.
use the psalms from the Missal to both increase variety and better connect the service to
the Mass of the same day. Later in his career, when he produced a trial version of Lauds
and Vespers for the first week of Advent, he provided the text of the full Office, with five
psalms or psalm units for both Lauds and Vespers in each day of the trial.

A third major difference between Mathis’ adaptation and the other popular
adaptations of the Divine Office is found in the commentary. While many of the popular
abbreviations and adaptations of the Divine Office included introductory material on the
meaning of the breviary and its various parts, along with instructions with how to pray
and, in some cases, footnotes explaining various psalms, they were primarily composed
of prayer texts without extensive explanation. One of the most important components of
Mathis’ work, however, was the extensive commentary at the beginning of each Sunday
or feast, explaining the message of the feast and discussing how the different texts of
Matins, as well as the texts of the Mass and other parts of the liturgy for the feast,
supported this message. This is a fundamental difference in approach to adapting the
Divine Office.

While there are three major differences between Mathis’ work and his
contemporaries’ work, there are also points of convergence. In a general way, Mathis’
work, like the other adapted breviaries, is attempting to promote the Divine Office for
people without an obligation to recite it. Another of these similarities is the use of the
vernacular language. While Mathis included Latin and English in some of the early
editions of his Vigil Service, the final edition was provided entirely in the vernacular.
Similarly, most of the modified and abbreviated breviaries used the vernacular only, while some texts, such as *The Day Hours of the Church*, provided both Latin and English.

Mathis’ work also agrees on certain points with select authors. In particular, Pius Parsch and Mathis share an emphasis on Matins, Lauds, and Vespers. Mathis uses Matins, and at times Lauds, for his Vigil Service, and at the end of his career he attempted to produce a similar service using Lauds and Vespers. Parsch, similarly, suggests that a hypothetical lay breviary should include Matins, Lauds, and Vespers.

Outside of Parsch, one finds in Hoornaert’s suggestions the possibility that a person could pray only Matins or only the lessons of Matins when pressed for time, and Sheppard also suggests the possibility of adding Matins on Sundays. Finally, some of Mathis’ contemporaries allowed for common prayer of some of the hours like Mathis’ texts did. A *Short Breviary* provided directions for communal celebration for each of the hours, and many of the groups supporting the use of the Divine Office among their members recommended at least occasional common recitation of the prayer.

Three questions arise from this comparison. First, what conclusions may be drawn from this section’s analysis? Next, it is important to ask why Mathis’ projects are so different from others of his day. Finally, a third question may be to ask how Mathis’ project serves to promote the breviary and to make the Divine Office more accessible to the laity compared to the projects of his contemporaries.

Concerning the conclusions that can be drawn from this section’s comparison, it is most important to say that Mathis stands apart for his commitment to celebrating the Office in its full length and even, at times, extending sections. While nearly all modified
breviaries shorten the hours, Mathis seeks to keep them at the same length or longer. Second, Mathis also stands out for his emphasis on Matins, which is little used in other attempts to assist Christians in accessing the Office. Finally, Mathis’ work is not entirely different from the work of his contemporaries, and the most important things that they share are a desire to promote the Divine Office and the understanding of the importance of the vernacular in facilitating more widespread use of the breviary.

As for why Mathis’ projects are so different from those of his contemporaries, it is likely that the root of the major differences can be found in the motivation behind Mathis’ work. While other projects were focused exclusively on providing an accessible version of the breviary for the laity and religious to use, Mathis’ Vigil Service grew out of a desire to help prepare people for the Mass for Sunday or the feast. Though other hours can be related to the Sunday or feast, and Mathis does comment on aspects of these, Matins, with its several lessons, lends itself to commentary and intellectual preparation more so than the other hours. Additionally, Mathis’ preference for maintaining the length of Matins can be attributed, at least in part, to the need to provide a sufficient number of lessons of adequate length to serve for preparation.

Beyond this need for enough texts for preparation, the preference for full-length texts may also be attributed to the limited nature of Mathis’ prayer services. While many of the modified breviaries provide texts for all or most of the hours for the whole week and much of the liturgical year, Mathis is only focused on Matins, and, later, on Lauds and Vespers; having fewer occasions of use may have allowed for the more complete text. Related to this is Mathis’ choice to spread his prayer services out over several
volumes; while the modified breviaries attempted to provide their Office in a single, easy-to-use volume, publishing in several volumes allowed for the use of a more complete text. Finally, it is possible that Mathis preferred to offer a fuller text of Matins because he placed more importance on his understanding of the historical background of a longer Office than he did on the convenience of use.

In answer to the final question, how Mathis’ work promotes the breviary and makes the Divine Office more accessible compared to his contemporaries, it is possible to say that, compared to the others, Mathis’ work has both advantages and disadvantages. On some levels, Mathis’ projects do not compete well. Many of the modified breviaries provide more hours of prayer and more days assembled in a single volume. Mathis’ prayer service lacks this level of comprehensiveness, but, had he completed his proposed Lauds and Vespers service, he would have provided texts of the three most important hours, prepared with communal celebration in mind and presented with commentary. However, in its 1957 final form, the three volumes of Mathis’ Vigil Service combined to make up 1222 pages for just Sundays and selected feasts, while *A Short Breviary* was only 758 pages in 1954 and *The Divine Office* was 661 pages in 1959. If Mathis had completed his Lauds and Vespers service, the number of pages would have been significantly higher, and Mathis’ prayer would have lacked the convenience provided by the single-volume modified breviaries, as well as the appeal of their shorter Offices.

While the other texts surpass Mathis’ work in convenience, usability, and even comprehensiveness for everyday use, Mathis’ Vigil Service could potentially excel in a limited capacity by providing a tool to promote the use of the Divine Office on Sundays.
In this case, Mathis’ texts could align with some recommendations for beginning the Office, including those that suggest beginning with reciting the Office on a day with more leisure, like Sunday, or those that suggest expanding their commitment to include Matins on Sunday. With regards to the second suggestion, Mathis’ Vigil Service provides a more comprehensive option for Matins than the modified breviaries. Finally, Mathis’ Vigil Services, complete with their commentary, could serve to clearly show the relationship between the Mass and the Divine Office that was written about by many of its promoters.

7.3 Conclusion

It is now possible to draw some conclusions about how Mathis compares with his contemporaries in promoting and facilitating the use of the Divine Office. The most important of these conclusions is that the attempts by Mathis to provide texts of the Divine Office for use by the laity and religious are radically different from those of his contemporaries. In his adaptation of Matins to the form of his Vigil Service, Mathis provides a truly unique approach to making the Divine Office available and accessible to a wider audience. In particular, Mathis’ initially near-exclusive use of Matins and his emphasis on the use of full or expanded breviary texts rather than abbreviations set his work apart from other English-language attempts to provide adaptations of the breviary for wider use. However, his work is not entirely different, as Mathis’ modifications share both the use of the vernacular and the general goal of promoting wider use of the Divine
Office with other adaptations. Mathis’ writings about the Divine Office also display certain similarities with the writings of his contemporaries, including emphases on how the Divine Office educates Christians and how it relates to and prepares for the Mass, as well as important differences, particularly in Mathis’ omission of any discussion of the Office as the work of the Mystical Body.

Overall, while Mathis took a unique approach to adapting the Divine Office that maintained the integrity of the lessons of Matins, his Vigil Service texts were not as well suited as other projects for promoting and facilitating the regular use of the Divine Office by beginners. While Matins was well suited to Mathis’ needs for preparing participants for Mass, its corresponding length and complexity make it a difficult text for those unfamiliar with the breviary. Ultimately, Mathis’ Vigil Service is effective in its goal of preparing participants for Mass and was likely particularly viable in prayer or study groups with at least some members who were familiar with the Divine Office, but it was limited in what it could offer as a text to promote the Divine Office with beginners.
PART 4:

MICHAEL MATHIS’ OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS
CHAPTER 8:

MICHAEL MATHIS’ OTHER LITURGICAL PROJECTS

In addition to his work with the Notre Dame Liturgy Program and producing his Vigil Service prayer books, Mathis had varying degrees of involvement with a number of programs and projects connected with the liturgical movement in the United States. This included both paper contributions and administrative leadership with the Liturgical Conference and its National Liturgical Weeks, working on an English translation of the Roman Ritual for the dioceses of the United States, organizing and hosting a conference on the revised Holy Week in 1956, and helping to coordinate the American delegation for the First International Liturgical Congress of Pastoral Liturgy in Assisi and Rome in 1956. This chapter will examine Mathis’ role in each of these wider projects in order to show the significance of his contributions to the liturgical movement in the United States beyond his accomplishments in liturgical education in the Liturgy Program.
8.1 The Liturgical Conference

One of the early ways that Mathis became involved with the liturgical movement in the United States following his liturgical “conversion” was attendance and participation in the National Liturgical Weeks. Beginning with his paper at the 1946 conference in Denver, Mathis would become an important contributor to these annual gatherings, eventually delivering seven papers, adding comments during the discussion sessions that would be included in the official proceedings, and serving as a member of the conference’s board of directors for several years. A detailed review of Mathis’ work with this group will help to illustrate his level of connection with this important component of the liturgical movement in the United States. Before looking at Mathis’ contributions to the Liturgical Conference, however, it will be helpful to first provide some background on the organization itself.

The first major liturgical gatherings and predecessors of the liturgical weeks were held in Collegeville in 1929 and 1930 and were followed by a number of additional liturgical days in various cities in the 1930s. Eventually, the first National Liturgical Week was held in Chicago in 1940. Initially under Benedictine leadership and called the Benedictine Liturgical Conference, the conference dropped its specifically Benedictine affiliation after the third liturgical week and became simply the Liturgical Conference. The conference became an important part of the liturgical movement in the United States.
from the 1940s until the 1960s, attracting thousands of participants over the years.\textsuperscript{1} Discussing the impact of the Liturgical Conference, Keith Pecklers claims, “those national weeks were a moving force in the popularization of the American liturgical movement and in educating American Catholics toward liturgical renewal.”\textsuperscript{2} Virgil Funk also notes the importance of the Liturgical Conference in his treatment of the liturgical movement. He claims, “The history of the liturgical movement in the United States is certainly dominated by the activity surrounding these National Liturgical Weeks.”\textsuperscript{3}

Evidence for the extent of Mathis’ early involvement in the organization is unclear. Kennedy calls Mathis a “charter member,” but does not give any specifics about what level of involvement that indicates.\textsuperscript{4} In contrast, Schidel reports that Mathis was initially hesitant to participate in the Liturgical Conference because “He had been accused of trying to take over one mission organization to which he had belonged and so he thought it would be best to work on his own.”\textsuperscript{5} Accounts of the beginnings of the Liturgical Conference confirm that Mathis was not one of the founders of the


\textsuperscript{2} Pecklers, \textit{The Unread Vision}, 200.


organization. For example, Funk lists the planners of the first week as “Revs. Ducey, Diekmann, Laukemper, and Huelsdmann, with Msgrs. Morrison, Hellriegel, Busch, and Hillenbrand…” However, Mathis was also clearly involved in the first week, as the proceedings of the 1940 conference show that Mathis led a post-presentation discussion during the week. It is somewhat difficult to reconcile Schidel’s claim about Mathis’ involvement with this information, but it is possible that he means to indicate that Mathis limited his participation at first, becoming more involved only at a later point. This would fit with the other evidence for Mathis’ involvement, as he would not begin giving presentations until the mid-1940s and did not serve in an official leadership role until the end of that decade.

### 8.1.1 Papers


---


for Death” (1955), “Some Public Prayers for Religious” (1956), and “The Vigil Service” (1957). Interestingly, none of Mathis’ presentations were on the topics he was most qualified to discuss, liturgical education, the missions, or biblical studies. Instead, his papers cover a range of topics and show that Mathis pursued a more diverse set of interests within the liturgical field.

Of his papers, the 1950 paper was a summary of another speaker’s paper, given when the original speaker had to cancel, and the 1957 paper has already been discussed along with Mathis’ work on the Vigil Service. The papers on the Mass from 1951 and 1955 form a thematic pair and should be reviewed to see Mathis’ approach to understanding the role of the liturgy in Christian life. The 1946 paper on family prayer and Mathis’ 1956 paper on prayers for religious both address the Divine Office and, therefore, also serve as a pair that may be examined together. The final paper to consider is Mathis’ 1955 paper on “Preparing for Death,” which reflects his lengthy experience as a hospital chaplain and gives insight into his pastoral approach to one of the sacraments.

The first of Mathis’ papers under consideration here, “The Mass, The Source and Center of Christian Piety,” takes its direction from Pius XII, who refers to the Mass in this fashion in Mediator Dei. In a somewhat disjointed essay, Mathis argues that

---


Christian piety, which he defines as “godliness, as worship in the strict sense of the term, and as that gift of the Holy Ghost by which we fulfill our duties of worship with holy joy” is supported by the Mass because it is there that the Christian comes into contact with the sacrifice of the cross.\textsuperscript{10} Using a number of quotes from \textit{Mediator Dei}, Mathis then says that Christians must participate in the Mass by putting on the mind of Christ, spiritually becoming a sacrifice and dying with Christ.\textsuperscript{11}

Mathis’ discussion of becoming spiritual victims and dying with Christ takes him to the topic of asceticism, which he claims is related to piety because it comes from the Eucharist. Further, he adds that this asceticism is derived from the asceticism of Christ and is intended to assimilate the faithful to Christ. It includes “(1) prayer, (2) contemplation of the mysteries of Christ and the lives of the saints, (3) moral practices, and (4) the vows of religion.”\textsuperscript{12} In describing these in more detail, Mathis quickly deals with the need for prayer, which he claims is to come into repeated contact with Christ, and contemplation, which he says is necessary both to come to know Christ and to be inspired by the stories of the saints. Mathis then claims that all Christians are required to practice an ordinary asceticism that includes keeping the commandments and exercising both moral and theological virtues. Finally, he also directs attention to the more


\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 153-154.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 156-157.
extraordinary asceticism of clerics and religious. In all of these cases, Mathis points to the work of God and the human effort required to practice each aspect of asceticism. Discussing moral practices, for example, he says, “What floods of graces on God’s part, and what strenuous efforts on man’s, even this ordinary dying to sin and living by grace demands!” Additionaly, the asceticism described by Mathis not only leads into the liturgy and helps Christians to put on Christ and die with Christ in the liturgy, but it is also fed by the liturgy. Mathis claims that the liturgy supports the ascetic life “by teaching divine life through word and example, and… by making available to us the graces merited by Christ in the Mysteries of the Mass, and also through the intercession of the saints.”

The remainder of the paper is then concerned with asceticism and its relation to the liturgy. It seems that one is meant to draw out the idea that Christian asceticism is how one is able to die with Christ in the Mass and thus participate in a way that puts the Christian into contact with the sacrifice of Christ and serves as the source and summit of piety as Mathis defines it, but this is never entirely clear. Ultimately, Mathis concludes the paper abruptly with a single-sentence paragraph that claims, “These are some of the reasons we may sincerely thank our Holy Father for directing our attention to the great

13 Ibid., 158.
14 Ibid., 158.
fact that “The Mass is the source and center of Christian piety,” without giving any explicit statement of exactly what these reasons are.15

In the 1955 paper on “How Can Religious Make the Mass the ‘Source and Center of Christian Piety,’” Mathis argues that the Mass can be the source of community life and says he will make three claims about the Mass that illustrate this. The first claim is that “the Mass is the only liturgical function left in the Church where God’s word is given and can be heard by all Catholics in the proper atmosphere; that is, in the midst of praising God and of prayer.”16 Because of this, Mathis argues, communities should seek to praise God in song, especially using the five “songs” of the Mass in the High Mass; he also adds here the importance of Lauds and Vespers, and encourages religious communities to take these as their prayer instead of a prayer formulated by their founder.17 With his second point, Mathis claims that religious can make special use of the offertory to “renew this sacrifice of ourselves [from their religious vows] to God.”18 He continues, “We have the great offering we made of ourselves on our profession day. This we ought to renew daily at the Offertory.”19 After these comments, Mathis moves to the Secret and the Unde et

15 Ibid., 159.


17 Ibid., 81-82.

18 Ibid., 82.

19 Ibid., 83.
memores, which appear to make up the third part of the Mass he wants to highlight, though he also underscores their connection to offering, as in the second point. Mathis claims that both of these are associated with becoming victims and offering the sacrifice with Christ. He concludes that the Mass then becomes the source and center of Christian piety when, having become victims and having offered the sacrifice with Christ, one asks “to be filled with every heavenly blessing.”

Both of these papers present some problems in their structure and organization. Though Mathis gives a lengthy definition of Christian piety in the beginning of the first paper, and quickly says that the Mass is the source and center of Christian piety because it brings us into contact with Christ’s sacrifice, he does not go into any real detail about how the various aspects of Christian piety that he describes are related to participation in the Mass and instead transitions to asceticism, simply noting that both piety and asceticism have their source in the Mass but never really returning to the question of how Mass is the source and summit of Christian piety. The second paper offers a list of three things, but seemingly never clearly offers the third thing; instead, Mathis gives a paragraph each to the Secret and the Unde et memores, but it is unclear if either or both of these are intended to be the third item in his list or if they are part of his discussion of self-offering and the offertory, the second of the three points. However, the papers do have some strong points, including their advocacy for the importance of the Mass in

\[\text{\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.}\]
Christian life. Overall, the texts do serve a helpful role in discussing liturgical spirituality with a wide audience, but Mathis does not always communicate his message well within them.

Mathis’ first paper delivered at the Liturgical Week was his 1946 paper “Family Life and Prayer.” While the paper’s subject is family prayer, Mathis’ major focus in the presentation is liturgical morning and night prayers. After introducing his paper with a note that he will not discuss prayers like the Angelus and rosary that might be prayed by the family, but instead concentrate on morning and night prayer “because they have a special liturgical significance” and “because such prayers have been prayed from earliest Christian antiquity,” Mathis looks at these types of prayers in their Jewish background, in the New Testament church, and in the church of the first four centuries before briefly discussing developments from the fourth and fifth centuries to his own day and offering some conclusions on morning and night prayers.\textsuperscript{21}

Beginning with the Jewish background of the liturgy, Mathis follows many scholars of his time in arguing that the earliest Christian prayers were influenced by the Jewish prayers of the first century, and, quoting Louis Duchesne, he claims that they consisted primarily of readings, chants, prayers, and homilies.\textsuperscript{22} Because of the length of the Hebrew evening prayer, Mathis instead compares the “Prayers before Retiring to Rest


\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 85.
at Night,” to Compline, noting that both include “the singing of Psalm 90 [91] and the blessing at the end.” Here, he also highlights differences such as the inclusion of the New Testament in Compline, as well as specifically Christian prayers. A final, major difference that he points out is in interpretation, even of shared elements. Here, Mathis discusses a focus on earthly rewards in the Jewish interpretation contrasted with the Christian focus on heavenly reward and also points out a Christological focus of Christian interpretation.

Moving to the earliest Christians in the biblical account, Mathis starts by looking at the example of Jesus. He argues that Jesus praised prayer in common and gave the Lord’s Prayer, which, with its plural language, suggests communal intentions. Mathis also says that the gospels record instances of Jesus’ disciples praying in common and attending the Jewish services of their time. Beyond the Gospels, he also underscores Paul’s regulations on community prayer in 1 Corinthians 14 and finishes the section by noting, “The content-elements of these common prayers of the Corinthians are Scripture readings, singing of psalms, instruction and charismatical gifts.”

For his examination of the church until the fourth century, Mathis draws heavily on Book 8 of the Apostolic Constitutions, quoting large sections of the directions for

\[\text{"Ibid., 85."}\]
\[\text{"Ibid., 87-88."}\]
\[\text{"Ibid., 88"}\]
\[\text{"Ibid., 89-90."}\]
morning and evening prayer.\textsuperscript{27} Summarizing what can be learned from these contents, Mathis again says that the main contents of the morning and evening prayers are “psalms, prayers and blessings, the readings from Sacred Scripture and their explanation by the Fathers in time either omitted, or perhaps concentrated in another hour.”\textsuperscript{28} He also remarks that morning and evening prayers continue to be prayed in common and says that the text shows the beginnings of the canonical hours.\textsuperscript{29}

Mathis reports that over time a system came into place for designating the biblical selections, and that the Office reached its peak around 750 A.D. To illustrate the breadth of “spiritual food” available during this period, he turns to the Rule of Benedict and says that all 150 psalms were prayed within the week, with the entire Bible with explanation read over the course of the year. Unfortunately, Mathis notes, by the eleventh century the Divine Office was abbreviated, particularly in the lectionary, leading to the shortened lessons found in the Roman Breviary.\textsuperscript{30}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{27} Though Mathis presents the Apostolic Constitutions as representing Christian prayer of the first four centuries, it is a composite text, edited together in Syria in the late fourth century. It gives insight into the liturgy in Syria at this time and includes material from earlier documents, but does not represent a description of services going back to the earliest centuries of Christianity. Robert Taft uses this text to discuss the Cathedral Office in the area around Antioch in the fourth century (Robert Taft, \textit{The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office and Its Meaning for Today}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986), 44-48). For additional information on church orders, see: Paul F. Bradshaw, \textit{The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73-97.

\textsuperscript{28} Mathis, “Family Life and Prayer,” 92.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 92

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 93.
\end{flushright}
Mathis concludes the paper by looking at certain important components to returning common morning and night prayer to families and churches. First, he argues, it is essential to understand the reasons why lay participation in the Divine Office declined, though he says it is difficult to say why this was. As a starting point for returning to common morning and evening prayer for beginners, he offers, “Sunday Compline and Prime in common have often been suggested as a night and morning prayer, respectively.”  

Next, he says that a vernacular text is necessary, and recommends the English translation of the Nuns of Stanbrook as well as *A Short Breviary*, noting that the latter is more readily available in the United States. Finally, he says that a commentary on the breviary texts, particularly the writings of the Fathers, can be a very helpful tool, and he ends his paper by noting that his own commentaries are the only ones of which he is aware.

Mathis’ paper on “Some Public Prayers for Religious,” has two main sections. In the first section, Mathis argues that religious should seek to make sung Lauds and Vespers their common morning and night prayers. Further, he contends that religious priests should not follow the common practice of praying some private morning and night prayers in public while praying their breviary in private. At the heart of Mathis’ argument are the claims that Lauds and Vespers are “designed for public prayer and which are at the same time the public worship of the Church,” and that they were the daily prayers of
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31 Ibid., 93
32 Ibid., 92-93.
the early church. He also argues that it is crucial to maintain a distinction between public and private prayer, noting that both are necessary to the spiritual life of religious men and women. Finally, he maintains that while it is good to recite Lauds and Vespers as a group, it is better to sing, because the components of Lauds and Vespers are musical and, he notes, “recitation of songs has something incongruous about it, just as would a crowd of spectators at a football game reciting in unison [sic] a great football song, like ‘Cheer, cheer for old Notre Dame.’”

In the second half of the article, Mathis presents a letter about the liturgy that he had written to his order’s general chapter at the request of his superior general. He begins the letter by noting that the liturgical life of the community could be improved, though the shortcomings were not the fault of the founder but of the situation with regards to liturgical and private prayer at the time of the order’s founding. Mathis then claims that making liturgical changes to the prayer life of the community is important because doing so follows the message of the recent popes, because changes will improve the spiritual life of members, and because, if they do not make changes, they risk losing vocations of those who have already experienced a more full liturgical life in their parishes.

---


34 Ibid., 119.

35 Ibid., 120-121.
The letter as reproduced in the paper offers three recommendations, together with reasons for the implementation of the first two. The first is to replace the community’s morning and night prayer with communally sung Lauds and Vespers. In support of this suggestion, Mathis claims it is redundant to add private morning and evening prayers to the morning and evening prayers of the Office, which the priests are required to pray. He also adds that Lauds and Vespers are the traditional morning and evening prayer of Christians. From a practical standpoint, he recommends beginning with the novitiate, as there is more time to implement the changes, and says that priests should pray in Latin, as it is the liturgical language and because there is not a good version of Lauds and Vespers in the vernacular with chant notation. He does allow, however, that brothers should be permitted to pray in English.36

Mathis’ second recommendation is that the novitiate adopt his Vigil Service. His arguments here are largely a rehearsal of his common claims about the Vigil Service. These include that it was a prayer used to instruct clergy and laity and that it “is a presentation of the divine economy of salvation as it is given in revelation, both in Sacred Scripture and in oral tradition, preserved chiefly in the liturgy of Matins.”37 No reasons are provided as to why he thinks the order should request a promotion of the feast of the

36 Ibid., 121-122.

37 Ibid., 122.
Exaltation of the Cross, but he notes that this was the one recommendation that was completely successful, while the others were forwarded to a committee.  

Both of these papers exemplify some of Mathis’ views on the Divine Office and show how his thinking on the topic shifted over the years. In the first place, both papers highlight Mathis’ emphasis on the importance of the Divine Office in Christian prayer as well as his belief that prayer at morning and night served as the primary prayer times for the early Christians. Additionally, both papers show Mathis’ belief in the utility of the vernacular in certain liturgical circumstances; Mathis’ thinking on the vernacular will be discussed in greater detail below in section 8.2.4. However, we also see Mathis’ evolution from accepting the recommendation of Prime and Compline as suitable morning and evening prayers in the 1946 paper to recommending Lauds and Vespers a decade later. Additionally, the 1946 paper’s recommendation of A Short Breviary can be contrasted with Mathis’ comments in another paper, his 1957 text on the Vigil Service, which rejects shortened versions of the Divine Office, calling them “an abbreviation of an abbreviation.”

The quality of the two papers also differs somewhat. The 1946 paper fails to explain why using the Divine Office is particularly suitable for family prayer and does not make any attempt to address the question of why lay participation in the Office
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38 Ibid., 122-123.

faltered over the centuries. In contrast, the paper on prayers for religious is one of Mathis’ stronger Liturgical Week presentations. It not only offers important liturgical recommendations for religious but, with his letter, also provides a template for how religious might approach their superiors about introducing aspects of a more liturgical prayer life and presents realistic expectations for the success of these recommendations. Finally, his advice that the use of Lauds and Vespers begin with the novitiate also shows that Mathis took a practical approach to the implementation of the ideals of the liturgical movement.

Mathis delivered his paper on “Preparing for Death” as part of the 1955 Liturgical Week’s consideration of the American Ritual. According to Schidel, this talk “was the fruit of his years of experience as hospital chaplain in preparing the dying for the coming of Christ at death.” In the text, Mathis explains his own approach to preparing the dying for their death by using Gospel parables, especially the parables of the ten virgins and of the vigilant servant in Matthew (Matthew 28:1-13; Matthew 24:42-47) as well as the vigilant servant in Luke (Luke 12:35-40). Mathis claims that by using these, and other parables that focus on the coming of the Lord, he is able to convince the patient of the importance of Christ’s coming at death. After the patient has accepted this, Mathis then uses texts from the breviary, particularly making use of the Fathers, that explain his chosen scriptural passages to show the meaning of Christ’s coming at death. Through this

process, Mathis says he wants to both prepare the patient for the Lord’s coming and help him or her approach that moment joyfully. In doing so, he hopes to return to what he says was an early Christian attitude of welcoming the moment of Christ’s coming at death.\textsuperscript{41}

The paper does not directly address the American Ritual, though it was the theme of the conference, and spends little time discussing the sacraments as administered at the end of life, only briefly mentioning confession and advocating for having a copy of the ritual and candles prepared in advance of the approach of death.\textsuperscript{42} Instead it provides one potentially helpful blueprint of how to give an extended ministry to the sick and dying that encourages hope and preparation over despair and sadness. Mathis’ texts may be particularly useful for giving extensive pastoral treatment to those with protracted illnesses, of which he cites cancer as one especially suited to his method.\textsuperscript{43}

### 8.1.2 Administrative Work

In addition to his presentations, Mathis also made important contributions to the Liturgical Conference by serving in leadership roles within the organization. From 1948 to 1956, he served as a member of the board of directors, and in 1957 and 1958 he served


\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 47.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 44.
on the Advisory Council. Mathis also served as the chairman for the committee on “Religious Communities and the Liturgy” from 1955 through 1958, chairing the workshops on religious and the liturgy at the Liturgical Weeks from 1955-1957. In a promotional letter for the group, Mathis reported that the committee held special sessions at the annual weeks of the Liturgical Conference and described the role of this group as a clearing house for religious who are anxious to take advantage of the directives and the spiritual riches which our recent popes have given the whole world by the restoration of the liturgy, and also to learn about efforts being made by other religious communities to reach this objective.

The meetings of this committee during the annual conferences included papers that particularly focused on liturgy in religious formation, liturgies for profession of vows, and the Divine Office.

8.1.3 Mathis’ Contributions to the Liturgical Conference

Mathis’ overall contributions to the Liturgical Conference appear to be somewhat mixed. Mathis’ contributions as a speaker were generally unremarkable and were, at

44 Schidel, “Never Too Much,” 27.

45 Michael Mathis to Reverend and dear Mother Superior, 6 August 1956, CMTH 7/26, UNDA.

times, in need of more clarity in organization and structure. His papers on prayers for religious and ministry to the sick stand out as exceptions that offer greater insight into Mathis’ approach to implementing a liturgical program in his own life and ministry. In the years without a paper from Mathis, his specific contributions to the direction of the conference and the program of the Liturgical Week are less clear. However, his work as the chairman of the committee on religious and the liturgy stands out as a specific contribution to the program of several liturgical weeks. Additionally, his position as a member of the board of directors does at least suggest that Mathis had emerged as an important figure and leader in the American liturgical movement by the mid-1950s. One helpful assessment of the importance of Mathis’ work with the organization may be found in Kathleen Hughes’ biography of Godfrey Diekmann. She reports, “When asked who were the most influential in those early days of the Liturgical Weeks throughout the forties, Godfrey singled out H.A.R., Martin Hellriegel, Reynold Hillenbrand, William Busch, Gerald Ellard, and Michael Mathis.” Though she does not provide details of Mathis’ involvement, this shows that other liturgical leaders perceived Mathis’ contribution to the organization to be significant. Ultimately, while the observable impact of his work with the Liturgical Conference was limited, his activities with the conference

demonstrate the wider range of Mathis’ liturgical interests and help to show his involvement in the broader liturgical movement in the United States.

8.2 The American Ritual

One of the most important projects that Mathis was involved in for the liturgical movement in the United States was the creation of a Latin-English ritual for authorized use in the United States in the mid-1950s. This project was begun in 1951 by Archbishop Edwin O’Hara of Kansas City, with Gerald Ellard working on the translation. Mathis joined the project in 1952, after Ellard was forced to withdraw because of health concerns, and helped bring the text to completion. This section will look at Mathis’ role in the project and its immediate reception and significance.

8.2.1 Vernacular in the Liturgy and Vernacular Rituals

In order to understand the importance of Mathis’ work on this project, it will be helpful to establish the background for the vernacular ritual. The development of the vernacular ritual has its roots in the general promotion of the vernacular as one of the major characteristics of the liturgical movement. Expansion of the vernacular even had support at some of the highest levels, with Pope Pius XII indicating that it might be desirable for vernacular to be used in certain situations in his encyclical, Mediator Dei. Discussing the vernacular, he says,
The use of the Latin language, customary in a considerable portion of the Church, is a manifest and beautiful sign of unity, as well as an effective antidote for any corruption of doctrinal truth. In spite of this, the use of the mother tongue in connection with several of the rites may be of much advantage to the people.48

However, despite his support for the vernacular, Pius also adds the important provision that permission must be obtained from the Holy See when seeking its use.49

In the United States, many liturgists also strongly promoted the vernacular. According to Pecklers, “during the 1930s and 1940s, there was no liturgical issue more discussed in pastoral circles in the United States than that of the vernacular.”50 Among the most vocal of the proponents of the vernacular was the Vernacular Society, which was founded in 1948 and published its own journal, Amen.51 Additionally, many articles supporting expansion of the vernacular were published in Orate Fratres/Worship, including articles in favor of the vernacular from Virgil Michel and H.A. Reinhold.52

In many parts of the world, the sacraments and blessings found in the Roman Ritual were some of the first liturgical rites to receive translations authorized for use. In a paper on bilingual rituals delivered to the International Liturgical Congress in Assisi in

48 Pius XII, Mediator Dei, §60.

49 Ibid.

50 Pecklers, The Unread Vision, 63.

51 Ibid., 63, 66-72.

1956, Cardinal Pierre Gerlier of Lyons provides a helpful history of these developments. After discussing the history of the ritual and the vernacular from the early church through the Protestant Reformation, Gerlier notes that the earliest moves towards increasing the amount of vernacular in the ritual began with the allowance of some vernacular for certain German-speaking dioceses by Pius XI. Greater steps would be taken during the reign of Pius XII, however, including vernacular rituals for select mission countries, a ritual for French-speaking countries in 1947, and a Latin, French, and German ritual for Strasbourg and Metz in 1951. Additionally, Germany received permission for a Latin and German Collectio Rituum, which Gerlier regards as significant for its use of the continuous rite for the last sacraments, in March of 1950. These important steps towards the use of the vernacular in certain rites helped to make it possible for the American liturgical movement to request English translations of the same rites.

8.2.2 The Vernacular Ritual for the United States

According to Edwin O’Hara, the project to bring the vernacular in the sacraments of the ritual to the United States began with a resolution of the Liturgical Conference in its 1947 annual meeting. The cause was taken up by the Episcopal Committee of the

Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in the November 1951 bishops’ meeting, and the committee established a group to study the possibility of requesting increased use of English for the ritual. This group, under the direction of Gerald Ellard, composed a rationale for the request for expanded English in the liturgy and produced a proposed English translation of the ritual. The group completed its work in 1952 and submitted their proposal and translation to the bishops.\(^{54}\)

Though the statement explaining the rationale for the translation of the ritual was not published, O’Hara quotes several important sections in his paper on the new ritual. This text references the history of the development of the Roman Ritual, highlighting the late creation of the *editio typica* and the permission for local variations in the text as well as discussing the recent history of vernacular in the ritual. The statement also argues for the great catechetical benefit in translating the prayers, noting the large numbers that could benefit from the instructional value of the liturgy of baptism, and highlights the great comfort that could be brought to the dying by having the last rites in their native language.\(^{55}\)

The bishops accepted the statement on the ritual, but requested that additional work be done on the translation. O’Hara reports that the bishops gave three instructions on a revision for the translation. With these instructions, the committee was required


(1) to use the solemn form of “Thou” and “Thee” when referring to the divine persons; (2) to engage scholars who would be especially qualified to render the meaning of the medieval Latin of the Ritual, and (3) to break down long sentences into briefer form.\(^{56}\)

Mathis also adds that the committee was concerned with the “Englishness” of the translation, which had been made based on work by H.P.R. Finberg of London.\(^{57}\)

Unfortunately, poor health prevented Ellard from continuing after the submission of the initial translation and statement on the ritual. In his place, O’Hara approached the president of Notre Dame, Theodore Hesburgh, to request that they establish a committee consisting of members from the Liturgy Program and the Medieval Institute. This new committee was chaired by Mathis and included Joseph Garvin of the Medieval Institute, Mary and John Ryan, who worked with Mathis in the Liturgy Program, and Ermin Vitry, who taught the chant courses in the Liturgy program.\(^{58}\) Within the group, Mathis would report at the 1955 Liturgical Week, Garvin served as the primary Latin expert, and the Ryans worked to ensure that the translation was well-written English.\(^{59}\) This committee was concerned principally with translation; the majority of decisions about what should or should not be included were made prior to Mathis and Notre Dame joining the project. This can be seen in Mathis’ response to a question about why certain sections of the ritual

\(^{56}\) Ibid., 7


\(^{58}\) Ibid., 306.
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were retained in Latin only, where he simply states, “By the time we got hold of the Ritual most of these questions were settled.”60 Because of this, the specific contents of the ritual may be said to represent the work of other groups and are unconnected with Mathis.

Mathis reports that the new committee set to work to prepare a new translation, frequently consulting with both O’Hara and relevant scholars. The committee would describe its goals for the translation in a statement attached to the manuscript copy of the ritual. Mathis includes this statement in his paper on the ritual, and it is worth quoting at length. The statement says:

A good translator, says St. Thomas in the prologue of his little work Against the Errors of the Greeks, must, while preserving the sense of the truths which he is translating, adapt his style to the genius of the language in which he is expressing himself.

It is this principle that we have tried to keep in mind in translating the Collectio Rituum. We have therefore been at some pains to assure a translation that should be: accurate, clear, idiomatic, eloquent, functionally appropriate, and hieratic. Negatively, we have tried to make sure that it would not be slavishly exact or loosely free; that it would not sound either archaic or foreign, but American; that it would not be difficult to read aloud; that it would not be inappropriate to the given rite; and that it would not be lacking in that simple dignity characteristic of the prayer of the Church.61

---


Following these guidelines, the group produced a translation that was presented to the bishops in November of 1953. This text was accepted by the bishops and forwarded to Rome to the Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1954.\footnote{Ibid., 307-308.}

The Congregation of Rites approved the request of the U.S. bishops in 1954, and Archbishop Albert Meyer of Milwaukee announced this approval during the Liturgical Week in August of that year.\footnote{Ibid., 308.} The decree of the congregation, eventually published with the *Collectio Rituum*, gave permission for its use and set some restrictions, requiring that some prayers be in Latin only. These restrictions included the form of the sacraments, as well as certain prayers connected with exorcisms and select blessings.\footnote{Collectio Rituum Ad Instar Appendicis Ritualis Romani Pro Dioecesisibus Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1954), v-vi.} O’Hara says that these restrictions were not unexpected, and Mathis takes the need for the use of Latin in the form of the sacrament for granted.\footnote{O’Hara, “The New American Ritual,” 7; Mathis, “Collectio Rituum,” 308.}

The published text provided Latin and English in side-by-side columns for those sections where English was permitted. In many of the places where only the use of Latin is permitted, including the form of the sacrament, an English translation was also provided in a footnote; in these cases, the English was permitted to be read before or after the Latin. Among the rites included in this ritual were the sacraments of baptism, extreme unction and Viaticum, and matrimony, as well as rites for burial for adults and children

\footnote{Ibid., 307-308.}
and a large number of blessings.\(^{66}\) The sacrament of confirmation when performed by a priest was also provided, but the text was entirely in Latin with English footnotes.\(^{67}\) Mathis also points out a number of features of particular note, including a continuous rite for the last rites that eliminates repetitions and places anointing before Viaticum, as well as a number of changes to the marriage rite and the addition of a ceremony for the anniversary of a wedding.\(^{68}\)

### 8.2.3 Reception of the American Ritual

The new American Ritual was generally well received in many parts of the English speaking Catholic Church. Mathis claims that “it has been praised in diocesan newspapers and by eminent ecclesiastics and scholars throughout the English-speaking world.”\(^{69}\) Writing for *The Furrow*, John P. O’Connell claims, “Priests, by and large, seem to feel that the Holy See has given them another marvellous tool for their pastoral work (but not a panacea).”\(^{70}\) However, implementation relied heavily on the diocesan bishops, whose permission was required to use the text in a given diocese. O’Connell notes that

\(^{66}\) See: *Collectio Rituum Ad Instar Appendicis Ritualis Romani Pro Dioecesisibus Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1954), vii-ix for complete contents.

\(^{67}\) *Collectio Rituum*, 35-39.

\(^{68}\) Mathis, “Collectio Rituum,” 308.

\(^{69}\) Ibid., 309.

there are no statistics about the number of dioceses that had permitted use of the new ritual; he claims that there are some places where permission has not been given or is only granted for select items and that there are other places where the bishop has supported the new text and sent copies to the priests of their diocese.\footnote{Ibid., 430-431.}

J.B. O’Connell, who served as one of the many consultants on the project, also spoke highly of the text in his review in *The Clergy Review*. His praise of the translation work is of particular note, as the Notre Dame committee was principally focused on this aspect of the text. Observing that the most important part of a bilingual ritual is the vernacular translation, he says,

> The English versions of the *Collectio*—while susceptible, doubtless of the improvements that the actual use of the ritual and the criticism of competent scholars will in due time suggest—maintain a high level of excellence in accuracy, intelligibility and literary style.\footnote{J. B. O’Connell, “The New American Ritual,” *The Clergy Review* (April 1955), 214.}

Speaking positively about the translation, he points out the use of “you” for the recipient of the sacrament, the lack of archaic language, and the helpful addition of the pronoun “he” at the end of some prayers. However, he also critiques the use of “and with your spirit” as “[a] rather unintelligible hebraism,” the translation of “exaudi” as “hear”, and the frequency of the vocative “O;” he also points to a few specific translation difficulties. O’Connell does not believe these are major issues, however, saying simply that they

\footnote{Ibid., 430-431.}

might be looked at in future revisions. As a whole, he gives a positive review, saying, “The preparation of this bilingual ritual—which involved so much zealous and painstaking labour on the part of those to whom this difficult task was entrusted—[and] its adoption by the hierarchy of the United States of America… mark a very great and welcome advance in the ‘liturgical movement.’”

Liturgically oriented journals and conferences also welcomed the newly available English text. The “Liturgical Briefs” column of Worship offered some first impressions of the text in January of 1955, praising the amount of English permitted and the number of sacramentals included; it also highlighted the changes to the last sacraments. H.A. Reinhold gives a more mixed reaction in his Timely Tract column of the April 1955 edition of Worship. While he refers to the vernacular ritual as a “great gift,” saying, “we should all thank God for it,” he is also critical of the text. He calls for further expansion of the vernacular and particularly critiques the requirement for Latin in the form of the sacraments, saying, “As for the essential words: we lead the faithful in a masterful climax to the brink of sacramental reality and then, as if our mother tongue were somehow less efficacious, we drop into Latin.” Though his paper is concerned with bilingual rituals in
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general, rather than the American Ritual in particular, Gerlier’s presentation from the Assisi Congress emphasizes the wealth of blessings available in the American Ritual and points out that several other English-speaking countries were quick to request permission to adopt this ritual.78

Overall, these reviews show that the work on the ritual was perceived as an important and helpful step, and, in doing so, highlight the importance of Mathis’ work to make it possible. Many wished for more English in the project, but this does not indicate a negative review of the work of Mathis and his colleagues, who were responsible for the translation, not the selection of materials.

8.2.4 Mathis and the Vernacular

Looking beyond the ritual in particular, Mathis’ work on this project presents an opportunity to closely examine his beliefs about the use of the vernacular in the liturgy. His role as chairman of the committee translating the text and his work with vernacular in the Vigil Service makes it clear that he does not oppose the expansion of the vernacular. However, examination of his various statements as well as the statement of the committee concerning their procedure for translation will help to reveal the nuances of his beliefs on the topic.

A few elements from the committee’s statement on their principles of translation should be noted. The committee’s statement shows that they do not believe an accurate translation is based solely on word-for-word accuracy. While the statement acknowledges that they do not want to translate the text too loosely, they also say they do not wish to be slavishly literal. Additionally, they indicate a desire to reflect their audience in their translation, first in the quote from Aquinas that begins the statement, and later in their requirement that the translation “would not sound either archaic or foreign, but American.”

Mathis’ comments elsewhere reveal that he desired a cautious pace with the vernacular particularly to ensure quality and accuracy in the translated texts. For example, in his comments following a presentation on the sacraments for the sick and dying, Mathis defends the slow process of introducing Latin by arguing that the church takes its time out of a desire to ensure quality of translation. Here he argues that the church took centuries to shift from a Greek-only liturgy through a bilingual liturgy to a Latin liturgy, saying that the church moved slowly because “the Church wasn’t taking any chances of anybody putting in something which did not belong there, or giving a poor translation.” He goes on to emphasize the sacred character of the liturgy and encourages people to be patient with their desires for the vernacular.
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In comments made during the same conference, Mathis also defended Roman restrictions on the vernacular by citing the difficulties of translating ecclesiastical Latin. He claims, “We are very much convinced that there are dangers in the vernacular, actual dangers,” and points to inadequate translations made by people who understand Latin, but not Christian Latin. Here, he suggests that an excellent model of how to translate can be found in Germany, where the bishops gathered excellent scholars of liturgy and Christian Latin to create a translation of the Mass. This text excels, he suggests, because it “preserves the great idea of our Christian Latinity and the spirit of the liturgy.”

Ultimately, he argues, translations of liturgical text must preserve both the spirit and the prayer form of the liturgy, something that he believes requires an extensive knowledge of not just Latin, but Christian Latin. The strength of Mathis’ belief in the importance of Christian Latin may be seen in his attempts to support students in acquiring facility with this form of Latin with his failed Liturgy Program II project; had this project been successful, it would have produced English-speaking scholars from the United States who were particularly qualified for this type of work.

Mathis’ ideas appear to suggest a measured approach on the question of the vernacular. His use of the vernacular in the Vigil Service, his proposed Lauds and
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Vespers service, and his work on the translation of the American Ritual make it clear that Mathis did not oppose the vernacular. At the same time, Mathis advocated for caution in adopting the vernacular, particularly emphasizing the need to establish quality translations. Overall, Mathis can neither be said to oppose the vernacular nor to advocate a rushed implementation of it throughout the liturgy, instead encouraging a gradual and cautious approach to ensure the highest quality vernacular product.

8.2.5 Mathis and the Vernacular Ritual

Though he was not involved in much of the decision-making process about the contents, which are most often praised, Mathis’ work with the committee overseeing the ritual’s translation remains an important contribution. Kennedy is correct to note that this translation that Mathis assisted with helped advance the cause of the vernacular in the liturgy in the United States and helped Catholics come to a better understanding of important and common liturgical rites. Additionally, that O’Hara turned to Notre Dame and Mathis to revise and complete the translation shows the respect that Mathis and the Notre Dame Liturgy Program had earned within liturgical circles in the United States. This also showcases the extent to which Mathis and the Liturgy Program at Notre Dame were connected with the greater liturgical movement in the country. Finally, Mathis’

86 Kennedy, Michael Mathis, 23-24.
work with the vernacular ritual and his comments about liturgical translation connected with the ritual highlight his moderate stance on the use of the vernacular in the liturgy.

8.3 The New Rites for Holy Week

In November of 1955, the Holy See promulgated a revision of the Ordo for Holy Week, making a number of significant changes to the liturgies from Palm Sunday through the Easter Vigil beginning with Palm Sunday, March 25, 1956. Shortly after the promulgation of these revisions, liturgical experts and pastoral leaders throughout the world began preparing Catholic clergy and laity for the various changes in the rites for Holy Week. Unfortunately, there was a limited amount of time between the revised text’s arrival in the United States and Easter, which, in 1956, was in March. Liturgical leaders rushed to quickly prepare Catholics, using pamphlets, articles, books, and conferences. The Liturgical Conference dedicated significant effort to a campaign to help prepare Catholics in the United States for the new Holy Week. Aloysius Wilmes detailed their efforts in the May 1956 issue of Worship. These efforts included production of a bibliography on Holy week, together with numerous articles and catechetical materials, and a conference at Notre Dame on the new rites.87 Worship also published several articles on the new rites, dedicating the entirety of the March 1956 issue to the subject, and Catholic and other religious publishers, including The Liturgical Press, Ave Maria

Press, and the Bruce Publishing Company, put together commentaries and English missals for the new Holy Week.88

8.3.1 The Notre Dame Holy Week Seminar

One of the major projects to familiarize and prepare priests for the revised rites for Holy Week was a seminar hosted by the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame, at the urging of the Liturgical Conference. This conference, organized by Mathis, took place from February 7-8, 1956 at Notre Dame; eight-four priests were in attendance, a large number of whom were serving as official delegates for thirty-nine different dioceses.89 The three-day seminar on the changes in the rites featured four major talks and a discussion period.

The first talk and the report’s fifth chapter can be discussed very briefly, while the second, third, and fourth talks require additional description and comment. The first lecture was given by Benedict Ehmann and briefly lists the changes in the musical parts


89 Forward to An Analysis of the Restored Holy Week Rites for Pastoral Use: A Report of the Seminar for Priests Arranged and Conducted by the University of Notre Dame, February 7-9, 1956, at the Request of the Liturgical Conference, ed. Notre Dame Liturgical Committee (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956), ix.
of Holy Week, broken down by parts sung by the priest and ministers, the parts for the choir, and the parts for the people. The lecture's strongest point is its advocacy for congregational singing, both referencing pontifical pronouncements promoting congregational participation through music and including a section in the list of changes on the people’s chants in the new Holy Week. However, since the majority of this presentation, as recorded in the published report, is made up of listing changes, its character is primarily functional. The fifth chapter is not a lecture given at the conference, but is instead an outline of how someone might adapt the new Holy Week rites for a bishop. While potentially helpful for priests planning liturgies for their bishop, it was not a distinct talk given during the program.

Following the first, brief lecture on music in the new Holy Week rites, the second lecture, from Frederick McManus, presents an overview of the changes to the ritual for the entire week. Before getting into the primary work of describing the rites as they should appear following the new order, however, he gives a few introductory remarks on the nature of liturgy, on congregational participation, and on general norms for the week.

---


The talk begins then with a call to not overestimate the importance of the details, saying that

the liturgy does not consist principally or primarily of the external rites, or the expressions or the forms of the material elements. Rather the principal element of the holy liturgy is the interior worship that is expressed through the rites, through the ceremonies with which we will be concerned this morning.⁹²

Next, he adds that many of the concerns people have will seem unimportant when they see the new Ordo and see how clear the rubrics are. He also points out the importance given to participation by the rubrics, noting that participation is mentioned in the decree and is reflected in the frequent mention of the people in the rites themselves.

Commenting on the importance of the inclusion of the people in the rites, McManus says,

The Holy See has for about fifty years been urging and begging and exhorting the priests to let the people give the responses, sing the chants, take part in these rites, express outwardly that worship which they have inwardly. Now the principle is being incorporated gradually into the liturgical books, and it seems to me that there is a serious obligation for us to bring this to the attention of the people.⁹³

These opening comments are then followed by a lengthy description of how the rites for these days are carried out, with particular emphasis on what is changed and on areas where the texts highlight congregational participation or the need for the congregation to

---


⁹³ Ibid., 8.
be able to see. Finally, McManus concludes with some practical suggestions for preparing for a successful Holy Week.94

The next lecture comes from Gregory Bainbridge and discusses the meaning of the rites of Holy Week. This talk follows a general pattern of introducing the changes and then offering a few comments on the meaning found in the rites for that day. Bainbridge also comments on the quality of the changes or criticizes them when he believes they fall short. Commenting on a positive change, for example, he highlights the requirement to use hosts consecrated at the Holy Thursday Mass for communion on Holy Thursday and Good Friday. Concerning Holy Thursday in particular, he says, “One thing the revision has effected is the complete integration of the partaking of the Lord’s table, the unification between the offering of the victim and the eating the victim offered.”95 Among his more critical assessments is his consideration of the proscription of communion for all but the bishop at the Chrism Mass, where he says, “Personally again, I come away with the feeling that this Mass, instead of being a grand community offering, has been degraded into forming a framework for blessing the oils…”96 He is also critical


96 Ibid., 34.
of the ceremonies for the transfer of the Blessed Sacrament on Holy Thursday, calling it “too baroque, and too unpractical.”

The final talk of the seminar was given by Martin Hellriegel on the topic of “Holy Week in the Parish.” This talk is mostly structured to include a brief reflection on the meaning of each day, followed by practical suggestions for implementing the new Ordo in the parish with maximum participation. He provides a recommendation for continuing to feature a Tenebrae service despite the change in rubrics that prohibited the anticipation of Matins and Lauds in the evening. Here, in addition to proposing a service Wednesday night at the cathedral, where the services would be permitted to be anticipated because of the morning Chrism Mass, he suggests a simplified paraliturgical vernacular service that could serve a similar purpose as Tenebrae. Among his other suggestions are placing an emphasis on the veiling of statues and crosses during Passiontide, printing music to encourage congregational participation, bringing some school students to the Chrism Mass, beginning the Palm Sunday procession in the parish hall when beginning in another church is not practical, and explaining each of the parts of the Good Friday service before beginning them. However, while recommendations are provided through

97 Ibid., 36.

Holy Saturday, Hellriegel does not provide suggestions for the Easter Vigil, instead providing brief reflections and exclamations about the various parts of the service.99

While the major talks described the rites and their meaning, particularly highlighting the changes, not every aspect of the revised rites could be discussed by the presenters. Because of this, the seminar and the report both conclude with a lengthy question and answer session based on questions formulated in small discussion groups. Questions included in this section look to many different topics but most often take the form of clarifications and questions about permissible adaptations. 100

This seminar provided an important service to the Catholic Church in the United States. With extensive changes for the rites of the entirety of Holy Week, and the revised rites arriving in the United States after the beginning of 1956, it was crucial to provide as much instruction and catechesis as possible very quickly. Organized and chaired by Mathis, this seminar at Notre Dame helped to accomplish this in an impressive fashion. In the seminar, the rites were described and explained, suggestions for implementation were made, and priests were given an opportunity to ask questions about the changes. Its treatment of the rites was detailed, informative, and honest in its criticism and praise, and the suggestions and answers to questions were practical and helpful. Additionally, though


the seminar was only a part of a massive, nationwide catechetical effort, it played an important role as the only major national conference and as the official conference sponsored by the Liturgical Conference. Ultimately, the seminar accomplished the important task placed before it, and in doing so it underlined the potential value of Mathis’ Notre Dame Liturgy Program as a center for promoting liturgical education as well as Mathis’ own value as a leader and organizer for the liturgical movement.

8.3.2 Notre Dame Holy Week Missal

In addition to organizing the Holy Week conference, Mathis was also involved, as part of the Notre Dame Liturgical Committee, in the creation of a brief missal with commentary for the revised week.101 This text includes an introductory commentary, followed by the texts for the primary liturgies for each day of the week, with an introduction and directions for each day. The text is primarily given in English, but Latin is given where the congregation might participate outwardly. The book ends with Gregorian chant for common parts of the ordinary of the Mass, including the Kyrie, Gloria, Creed, Preface Dialogue, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei.

101 This is the same committee that also worked on the American Ritual (See: 8.2.2). The forward to this missal and commentary specifically identifies the committee as the translators of this text and indicates that Mathis is the director of the committee. The Liturgical Committee, The New Holy Week Missal, vii.
The introductory commentary includes sections discussing why people should attend the Holy Week services, what has changed and how the revision makes it easier to attend Mass during the Triduum, an exhortation to go to confession early in the week, rules for fasting for afternoon and evening Masses, and the people’s responses during Mass. The introduction opens by claiming that the reason people should attend the Holy Week services is because of the special spiritual benefits of the Holy Week liturgies, saying, “we need to take part in the chief ceremonies of Holy Week in order to be spiritually healthy.”

The committee’s commentary next considers the changes to Holy Week by first looking at the change in times for the services. Though the introduction goes into the history of the times for the celebration, noting that the new times are closer to the services’ original times, and mentions the correspondence between these times and the traditional times associated with the events, it focuses on how the new times allow more people to attend. The introduction also provides a basic overview of the different changes to each day, with an accompanying note about their meaning and significance. For example, concerning the foot washing on Holy Thursday, the commentary says,

After the Gospel it is now allowed publicly in each church to carry out the beautiful ceremony of the washing of the feet to teach us that the fruit of receiving

---

102 Ibid., 1-12.
103 Ibid., 1.
104 Ibid., 1-3.
Holy Communion should be loving service of one another—especially of those in any kind of spiritual, mental or physical need.  

The introduction concludes with an overview of the various opportunities for Catholics to participate through word or action during the revised ceremonies of Holy Week. Here the text highlights two common moments of participation, the response to “Dominus vobiscum” and the frequent “Amen,” and it notes particular places for participation, giving emphasis to moments of sung participation, such as the singing of the “Gloria, laus et honor” on Palm Sunday or “Pange Lingua” on Holy Thursday.

The Notre Dame Liturgy Committee’s Holy Week Missal provided a helpful tool for introducing the new rites to the laity. The text does not go into extraordinary depth, but instead focuses on the important details that will help a person prepare for and participate in the revised rites for Holy Week as fully as possible. The commentary and introduction provide helpful background to the changes and the meaning of Holy Week, while the text itself allows the reader the opportunity to better understand what is happening during the ceremonies of the week and to verbally participate during the people’s parts. In this way, it was one of a number of texts that filled an immediate need for preparatory materials for the laity in the short time between promulgation and implementation of the new rites.

105 Ibid., 5
106 Ibid., 10-12.
8.3.3 Mathis and the Implementation of the Revised Holy Week

In general, reports about the implementation of the new Holy Week were largely positive. In a report for the Assisi Congress, O’Hara claims,

The reports sent in from more than ninety archdioceses and dioceses clearly indicate that the first observance of the restored Holy Week rites in the United States was an overwhelming success so far as the general enthusiasm and enormous increases in attendance and in the reception of holy Communion are concerned.107

He also points out that there was an “extraordinary” amount of preparation, both on the diocesan level and on a larger scale.108 In its discussion of the first year of the new Holy Week, Worship remarks on the very favorable response to the new Holy Week but adds some criticisms. It particularly notes that there was difficulty achieving the active participation called for by the revised rites and suggests that one of the causes of this problem was likely inadequate time for preparation.109 In a discussion of the Liturgical Conference’s efforts to promote the new Holy Week, John C. Cort highlights a number of obstacles faced by liturgical promoters, including many magazines, journals, and bulletins having already established their issues through the months after Easter by the time promotional materials were produced and difficulties garnering interest in the stories
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362
outside of Catholic media. However, he also notes the very positive reaction and high demand for the materials and programs that the Liturgical Conference was able to put together and reports,

All of us were amazed, too, at the response given to the Priests’ Seminary on Holy Week at Notre Dame, hastily organized by the Conference and University under the direction of Fr. Mathis. Some 99 priests from 40 dioceses attended the sessions, and the interest was deep and lively.

Cort concludes that despite the difficulties in promoting the revised Holy Week, it was largely successful, saying, “As things worked out, the new Holy Week went over with a smash.” Together with the other conferences and publications dedicated to the revised rites, Mathis’ contributions at Notre Dame helped prepare the clergy and people of the Catholic Church in the United States for the new Holy Week and, in doing so, helped to ensure this generally successful implementation of the new rites for their first celebrations that spring.

### 8.4 The First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy

In 1956 Mathis briefly played an important role for the United States in the worldwide liturgical movement. Following his work on the preparation for the revised

---
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Holy Week and the publication of the American Ritual, Mathis served on the American preparatory committee for the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy in Assisi and Rome. In this role, Mathis performed important organizational and coordinating work that underscored his important role in the liturgical movement in the United States.

Though billed as the “First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy,” the 1956 meeting in Assisi was not the first international gathering for the liturgy. According to the preface of the American edition of the proceedings of the Assisi Congress, the first such meeting took place in 1951 at Maria Laach, where forty European scholars gathered to discuss the liturgy. This was followed by meetings in Strasbourg (1952), Lugano (1953), and Louvain (1954). These early meetings had a scholarly focus.113 Mathis himself, along with Diekmann, Reinhold, and John Ross-Duggan, attended the Lugano week.114

The Assisi Congress was dedicated to “The Renewal of Pastoral Liturgy during the Pontificate of Pope Pius XII” and featured the president of the Congregation of Rites, Cardinal Cicognani, as its president and included five cardinals as vice presidents; the event also concluded with an audience with Pope Pius XII in Rome.115 Presentations were given by both international liturgical leaders, such as Josef Jungmann, and members of the hierarchy, including Cardinals Lercaro and Gerlier. These presentations covered a


115 Assisi Papers, “Preface,” v-xv.
variety of topics, including liturgical arts, preaching, vernacular rituals, the reformed Holy Week, breviary reform, and sacred music.

The conference was very successful in drawing representatives, hosting over fifteen hundred delegates. Among these were four bishops who served as vice presidents for their particular language group, numerous other bishops, abbots, and religious superiors from throughout the world, and the personal representatives of nine cardinals. Concerning the large number of bishops and other important ecclesiastical authorities attending and speaking at the conference, Diekmann writes, “The presence of so many members of the hierarchy from so many countries, of Cardinals and their delegates, and of officials of the SRC, constituted the greatest single encouragement ever given to the liturgical movement - apart, of course, from Mediator Dei and other papal initiatives.”

Mathis played an important but limited role in this conference. Together with Diekmann, he served on the American organizing committee and was responsible for selecting and coordinating the American delegation, which reached one hundred and ten persons, for the conference. The work of this organizing committee included recruiting an American cardinal to serve as a vice-president for the congress, finding an American bishop to give a report on the restored Holy Week in the United States, choosing the members of the American delegation, fundraising for the American portion of the congress’s expenses, and organizing the delegation from several other countries,

including India, Australia, and South Africa. Because this important role in organizing the committee required extensive correspondence with and knowledge of leaders in the American liturgical movement, the selection of Mathis for this position demonstrates both his level of connection with the liturgical movement in the United States and the trust placed in him by the leadership of the project. Unfortunately, Mathis was unable to attend the conference due to ill health, so his involvement ended before the conference itself.

8.5 Conclusion

The projects that have been surveyed above clearly show that Mathis made major contributions to the liturgical movement in the United States. Though this chapter has considered some of Mathis’ written contributions to liturgical literature through the Liturgical Weeks, the majority of his contributions considered here highlight his work primarily as an organizer and administrator. In this fashion, he helped coordinate a major conference on the revised rites of Holy Week, worked to assemble the American delegation for the first International Liturgical Week, oversaw the final stages of translation for the American Ritual, and served on the board of directors for the Liturgical Conference for most of the decade.

The significance of these projects, and Mathis’ role in them, should not be underestimated. Mathis’ conference on the Holy Week revisions helped to prepare a large number of priests, many of them serving as representatives for entire dioceses, for the successful implementation of the new rites for Holy Week and served as an important component of a larger publicity campaign to ensure positive reception of the revised rites. With the Liturgical Conference, Mathis helped to lead one of the driving forces of the liturgical movement in the United States, the annual gathering of liturgically minded priests, religious, and lay persons. Finally, the American Ritual helped to expose many Catholics in the United States to liturgical rites in the vernacular on a regular basis, and Mathis’ work was absolutely essential in the production of the final accepted product.

Every one of Mathis’ additional projects also highlights his high stature in the liturgical movement. That Mathis and Notre Dame were selected to work on the ritual translation and the Holy Week conference show that the program had become well known and was trusted to perform these tasks well. Mathis’ work for the American organizational committee for the Assisi conference required that he be able to coordinate with the most prominent liturgists in the United States, as well as several members of the hierarchy; for Mathis to be selected for this task, there would have to be at least a perception that he was well connected within the liturgical movement in the United States. Finally, Mathis’ membership on the board of directors for the Liturgical Conference clearly shows that he was felt to be a leader in an organization that featured some of the most important names in the liturgical movement in the United States. As a whole, Mathis’ roles in these tasks show that his work was not limited to a small corner
of Indiana, but rather that he was involved in a wide variety of liturgical projects relevant to the entire nation and that he was an important leader within the country’s liturgical movement.
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CONCLUSION
CHAPTER 9:

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has closely studied the work of Michael Mathis, C.S.C., exploring several of his most important liturgical projects and directly comparing his work to similar efforts by his contemporaries. These examinations and comparisons have shown that Mathis played a vital part in the liturgical movement in the United States during the last two decades of his life. This concluding chapter will underscore the established significance of Mathis’ role by first summarizing the important conclusions of each of the major chapters considering his liturgical work. Next it will detail Mathis’ most meaningful contributions to the liturgical movement and consider his overall legacy. It will conclude with a final consideration of Mathis’ place in the liturgical movement.

9.1 Summary

This project has closely examined the contributions of Michael Mathis to the liturgical movement in the United States. In particular, it has focused on Mathis’ largest
projects, the Liturgy Program he founded at the University of Notre Dame and his Vigil Service publications. These projects were then compared to similar initiatives in liturgical education and to attempts at producing prayer books with modifications to the Divine Office in order to determine the place of Mathis’ work within the context of the wider liturgical movement. Finally, this dissertation considered Mathis’ secondary liturgical contributions to better understand the role he played in the movement in the United States. Before presenting overall conclusions on Mathis’ significance to the liturgical movement, it will be helpful to review these chapters and their conclusions.

Mathis’ best-known and most substantial liturgical project was his founding and directing of the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame from 1947 until his death in 1960. This dissertation studied the program’s development from its initial year as an undergraduate program through the development of the graduate program and its evolution in the 1950s prior to Mathis’ death. It offered a detailed examination of the types of courses taught, the structure of program requirements, the composition of the student body, and the liturgical life offered from 1947 until 1960. A second chapter examined a number of projects related to the Liturgy Program, including annual workshops for priests and seminarians, seminars for liturgical architects, a publishing program, and an attempt to introduce a year-round program focused on preparation for advanced theological and liturgical studies.

Analysis of the Liturgy Program found that it was well received and was successful by several measures. Over the period of more than a decade, with Mathis at the helm, the program grew considerably in both number of courses and total number of
students; this growth is a strong indicator of success. Additionally, reviews in respected journals, along with other references to the program in *Orate Fratres/Worship*, showed that American liturgical leaders believed that the Liturgy Program was effective and helped to advance the liturgical movement in the United States. Further consideration of the program in light of its stated goals also demonstrated that it likely achieved its intended purpose, which was to successfully train teachers, scholars, and pastoral leaders while providing significant training in Gregorian chant to liturgical musicians. Finally, investigation of the Liturgy Program’s secondary projects indicated that they served both to reinforce the program’s efforts toward its primary goals and to extend its impact beyond the academic offerings of the summer session.

After this detailed presentation of the Liturgy Program and related projects, similar liturgical education initiatives were reviewed. This survey of other liturgical education projects focused on efforts in the United States but also included several European programs. Comparison of Mathis’ program to other American programs found that they shared a number of common features, including a focus on liturgical art and music, an emphasis on the importance of the development of liturgical educators, a vocationally diverse student body, and attempts to combine liturgical study with liturgical practice. The Notre Dame program, however, stood out for its longevity, diversity of courses, emphasis on research, and degree offerings. Compared to European liturgical education programs, Mathis’ program often had a similar curriculum but was somewhat weaker academically, particularly with regards to the strength of its faculty. Overall, this chapter found that Mathis’ Liturgy Program provided a great service to the American
liturgical movement by offering a level of liturgical education for future scholars, pastoral leaders, and educators that was unavailable anywhere else in the United States.

Next, investigation turned from Mathis’ efforts in liturgical education to his work with the Divine Office. The chapter began by exploring the origins of Mathis’ Vigil Service and his understanding of its meaning and purpose before examining how the service evolved over the years in both structure and content. The Vigil Service was compared to the existing breviary of Mathis’ day, and the contents of its commentary were considered. Mathis’ attempts to begin developing a similar Lauds and Vespers service were also examined with a brief discussion of the sample text and his promotion of the service. While acknowledging that there were some potential problems with the Vigil Service and noting some historical misconceptions, this chapter found that Mathis’ liturgical projects, which occupied the majority of the liturgical portion of his career, successfully reached a large number of Catholics and provided a conceivably helpful interpretation of liturgical texts along with a means for Catholics to deepen their Sunday celebration.

The following chapter examined the promotion of the Divine Office in the liturgical movement in the United States. This study began with a look at different arguments used to encourage Catholics to participate in some aspect of the Divine Office and compared these with Mathis’ work on the office. Mathis was shown to offer many of the same arguments for the use of the Divine Office as his contemporaries. The second half of the chapter analyzed a number of modified breviaries, designed to facilitate lay participation in the Office, and compared them to Mathis’ liturgical projects. Here,
Mathis stood apart for his primary choice of Matins and for his desire to avoid abbreviation of the official prayer. The chapter concluded that Mathis’ Vigil Service represented a unique approach to the Divine Office that, while well suited to its purpose of preparing participants for the day’s Mass, was limited in its ability to introduce and popularize the Divine Office when compared to the modified breviaries of his contemporaries.

The final chapter considered Mathis’ major liturgical contributions beyond his work with the Liturgy Program and the Vigil Service. This included Mathis’ work as a contributor to and as a member of the board of directors of the Liturgical Conference, his work organizing a conference on the revised rites for Holy Week in 1956, his chairmanship of a committee tasked with translating the Roman Ritual into English for use in the United States, and his role in coordinating the American delegation for the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy, held in Assisi and Rome in 1956. These four projects highlighted Mathis’ work as an organizer and administrator while exhibiting his prominence within the liturgical movement in the United States. Moreover, each of these projects, and Mathis’ contributions to them, made an important impact on the movement at the time.

9.2 Contributions

Having summarized the conclusions of the major investigations of this project, it is important to underline the most impactful ways in which Mathis advanced the
liturgical movement in the United States. His influence will be treated in three major sections, beginning with Mathis’ most significant contributions, those stemming from his work as the founder and director of the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame. This will be followed by consideration of the most important contributions Mathis made in his work with the Divine Office and other liturgically related projects.

9.2.1 The Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame

The survey of existing scholarly literature has shown that the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame is widely regarded to be Mathis’ most significant contribution to the liturgical movement. Through examination of the Liturgy Program’s degree program, its extracurricular projects for priests and seminarians and for artists and architects, and its publishing program, as well as through comparison with other liturgical education projects, this dissertation has shown the wide extent of Mathis’ contributions through the Liturgy Program. This evaluation has confirmed the assessments of Mathis’ contemporaries and modern scholars about the importance of this program.

The central component of Mathis’ influence through the Notre Dame Liturgy Program was his work leading the program’s annual summer session degree program in liturgical studies. This degree program offered a graduate-level education in liturgical research that could provide for the diverse needs of parish priests, future scholars, teachers at levels ranging from elementary school to college and seminary, and other pastoral and musical leaders. Students were offered a mix of courses that provided both a
comprehensive education in liturgy and specialized training that addressed the relationship between the liturgy and different areas of pastoral or educational work. Many of these courses were led by leading liturgical scholars and reformers from both the United States and Europe, ensuring a high standard of academic quality and making students aware of the latest developments in the liturgical movement and liturgical research. In addition to coursework, the program included, as an essential aspect of its summer sessions, regular participation in the Divine Office and the Mass, with students particularly encouraged to participate through chant; this worked to form students not just through lectures and seminars, but also through liturgical experience. In the end, Mathis’ Liturgy Program summer session provided the liturgical movement in the United States with pastors, teachers, musicians, and potential scholars who were well educated in the fundamentals of liturgical studies and equipped to perform liturgical research. The students Mathis educated were able to draw on this foundation in their various vocations.

The program also expanded its reach by hosting annual conferences for priests and seminarians and for artists and architects. The clergy workshops allowed ministers who could not spend the entire summer at Notre Dame an opportunity to receive an introduction to liturgical studies, to see demonstrations of how to incorporate the liturgy into the classroom, and to hear lectures on special, practically focused, liturgical topics. Seminars for artists and architects allowed a particular group with an interest that intersected with liturgical concerns to receive specialized lectures that would aid them in developing plans for churches.
Mathis’ Liturgy Program was also a home for liturgical scholarship. Each year Mathis worked to assemble the best possible faculty for the Liturgy Program, often drawing on a growing network of friends and former summer session teachers to help him locate potential professors, and he was largely successful in this task. Among the many well-known scholars and liturgical leaders who lectured at Notre Dame for at least one summer session were Gerald Ellard, Godfrey Diekmann, Martin Hellriegel, H.A. Reinhold, Donald Attwater, Josef Jungmann, Jean Daniélou, Pierre Gy, Louis Bouyer, Johannes Hofinger, and Christine Mohrmann. Some, like Hofinger or Bouyer, returned to lecture for multiple summer sessions, while others came only once. Additionally, Mathis, with the help of several colleagues, was able to successfully bring to publication the lectures of a number of these leading professors, especially through the Notre Dame Liturgical Studies Series. Other scholars have identified these recruiting and publishing efforts as among the most important of Mathis’ contributions.¹ This assessment is certainly accurate, as these professors helped strengthen the academic components of Mathis’ program, allowing it to offer courses that reflected the latest developments in liturgical scholarship and the liturgical movement. Furthermore, Mathis’ recruitment of prominent scholars helped to spread awareness of the program, with notices of the program in Orate Fratres/Worship often highlighting the professors, and allowed the

program to provide new scholarly publications to the liturgical movement in the United States.

The importance of Mathis’ work with the Liturgy Program has been demonstrated particularly by the survey of other liturgy programs and comparison with Mathis’ program in this project’s fifth chapter. When Mathis founded his program, there was no place in the United States for seminary professors, other educators, or anyone interested in the liturgy to receive a serious academic grounding in the field. Mathis began to fill this void. While other attempts were made to provide a place for the study of the liturgy in the United States, Mathis’ Notre Dame program stood out for its academic excellence, its status as a degree-granting program, and its longevity. Other programs either failed after only a few years, did not cover the liturgy as comprehensively as Mathis’ program, or did not emphasize research or grant advanced degrees. Some programs focused only on the artistic or musical aspects of the liturgy, which, while important, did not satisfy the need for training in the history and theology of the liturgy in general or of specific rites in particular. Ultimately, Mathis’ program was an important contribution to the liturgical movement in the United States because it offered a type of training that could not be had anywhere else in the country.

9.2.2 Michael Mathis and the Divine Office

Mathis’ contributions were not limited to his work in liturgical education, however, as he actually spent a longer period of his life working with the Divine Office.
Most significantly, from the early 1940s until its final publication in 1957, Mathis worked on producing a series of prayer texts and commentaries that he called his Vigil Service. This service presented a modified version of the office of Matins together with an introductory commentary on how the meaning of a particular Sunday or feast was reflected in the liturgical texts of the day. With thousands of people exposed to this service, it is likely that it had at least some impact in the liturgical movement, but the extent of its influence is difficult to measure. As an adaptation of the Divine Office, it takes a unique approach, using Matins rather than Lauds and Vespers or some of the minor hours and often choosing to expand the text rather than abbreviate it. Yet, Mathis’ work provided a prayer service that emphasized the relationship between the Mass and the Divine Office discussed by many authors in their promotion of the Divine Office. Most importantly, the service offered spiritual insights and enriched the celebration of Sunday for its many participants and subscribers.

9.2.3 Other Contributions

Finally, Mathis’ overall contribution to the liturgical movement is strengthened by many of his additional projects beyond his work with the Liturgy Program and the Divine Office. This includes Mathis’ work with the American Ritual, his work with the Liturgical Conference, and his efforts in preparing for the revised Holy Week. In the case of the American Ritual, Mathis took over the project and brought it successfully to completion when poor health prohibited Gerald Ellard from continuing with the
translation. Mathis’ committee was commissioned to edit the text that had been submitted to the bishops as part of the initial proposal for a vernacular ritual. Under his leadership, the committee created a new translation taking into account the bishops’ concerns. While Mathis was not the originating force behind this text, his committee produced a text that was praised by liturgical leaders of his day and provided an important vernacular liturgical text for the Catholic Church in the United States in the 1950s.

Additionally, Mathis served at different points on the board of directors and advisory council for the Liturgical Conference. While the extent of his contributions to these committees is not entirely clear, Mathis’ presence in these groups shows he played a part in one of the more significant organizations in the liturgical movement in the United States. More concrete is Mathis’ role as chairman of the committee on religious communities and the liturgy; here, Mathis helped organize one of several special sessions during the Liturgical Week and brought together speakers who could offer insights to religious about how to deepen their liturgical lives. Lastly, through his work organizing the seminar in the revised Holy Week, Mathis took part in an important effort launched by the Liturgical Conference to prepare Catholics in the United States for the new Holy Week that would debut that year. Mathis’ particular contribution here likely helped dozens of priests bring a clear understanding of the rites back to their dioceses to assist with the implementation of the revised rites. Though none of these projects was Mathis’ primary contribution to the liturgical movement, and though in some cases he was one of several involved, he nevertheless performed an important role in each of them.
9.3 The Legacy of Michael Mathis and His Work

Michael Mathis’ legacy can be examined in two primary ways. The first is to ask what his lasting contribution to the field of liturgical studies may be. In this respect, Mathis’ Liturgy Program stands apart from many of his other projects. Beyond this lasting contribution, however, the second means of evaluating Mathis’ legacy is to consider how his emphases may continue to offer insights liturgists today.

9.3.1 Enduring Achievements

Mathis’ most enduring achievement is without a doubt his work establishing the Liturgy Program at the University of Notre Dame. The hundreds of students that participated in this program carried their new knowledge of the liturgy to their parishes, schools, and seminaries. The formation they received in Mathis’ Liturgy Program likely helped many to better promote the liturgy through their various ministries in subsequent years. Following Mathis’ death, the program continued under the leadership Daniel Sullivan, C.S.C., who led the program with the assistance of a “policy committee” that included a number of priests of the Congregation of Holy Cross, as well as Cornelius Bouman and William Leonard.² In the decades that followed, liturgical studies continued to be a part of graduate studies in theology at Notre Dame, where a Ph.D. program in

liturgy has been offered from 1965 to the present. Between Mathis’ original Liturgy Program and its descendants in the university’s theology department, Notre Dame has continuously offered a graduate degree program in liturgy for nearly seventy years.

However, outside of the Liturgy Program, few of Mathis’ accomplishments have endured into the present. The American Ritual translated by Mathis and his committee, though an important contribution at the time, was replaced with another translation within a few years. The Vigil Service offered helpful commentary that helped prepare its subscribers for more reflective celebration of the Sunday liturgy, but it was particularly connected with Mathis, and revisions of the Divine Office in the early 1960s and after the Second Vatican Council made changes that departed from the direction Mathis took with his service. Finally, the Liturgical Conference continued its success for several years after Mathis’ death, but while the conference itself was influential in the liturgical movement in the United States, Mathis was not one of the organization’s founders, and there is no evidence of any lasting impact that he may have made on the organization outside of the years of his involvement.

3 James F. White, Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today (New York: Paulist Press, 1995), 100.

9.3.2 Wisdom for the Present

Examination of Mathis’ achievements in liturgy has highlighted certain characteristics and emphases of his work which continue to be instructive today. As was the case with his contributions to the field, the most important insights Mathis’ career offers are related to liturgical education, but his work with the Divine Office may also have some relevance to liturgical scholarship today.

Mathis believed that a liturgical education grounded in research was necessary for the promotion of the liturgy. He claimed that “progress is going to be made in the liturgical movement very largely in proportion to the results of academic research,” that people without a background in liturgical research could “do a lot of harm to the liturgy,” and that, as a result, the type of education his program offered was essential. This training in liturgical research was useful not simply to future scholars and university or seminary professors but also to people involved with the liturgy on multiple levels, including elementary and secondary school teachers, parish priests, and musicians. The importance of liturgical education was endorsed by the Second Vatican Council, which, in addition to noting the necessity of liturgical training for seminary professors, added that liturgy should be taught in seminaries and theological faculties “under its theological,

5 Michael Mathis, “Special Lecture,” CMTH 14/04, 2, 7.
historical, spiritual, pastoral, and juridical aspects.” It also called for pastors to “see to the liturgical instruction of the faithful and their active participation, internal and external, in the liturgy, taking into account their age, condition, way of life and standard of religious culture.” In order to accomplish these goals, there remains a need for the type of liturgical education that Mathis spearheaded. Universities that offer degrees in liturgical studies play an important role in this project by continuing to offer essential training in liturgical research to future seminary and college liturgy professors. These schools, as well as seminaries and other colleges and universities that train religious educators and church ministers, can also follow in Mathis’ footsteps by providing significant education in liturgical studies and research to the educational and ministerial professionals who are responsible for liturgical formation and education in schools and churches. Mathis’ Liturgy Program thus provides a valuable example for higher education in liturgy today.

Moreover, Mathis also stressed the importance of both liturgical practice and liturgical study in the Liturgy Program. During his time as the founder and director of the program, its regular daily schedule included participation in at least a few hours of the Divine Office as well as daily Mass. These celebrations provided students with a reference point for their studies; for example, it is easier to analyze the different parts of

---


7 Ibid., 19.
the Mass or the Divine Office if one regularly takes part in those liturgies. Thus, while Mathis strongly believed in the importance of “scientific” study of the liturgy, he also firmly believed that the nature of the liturgy required liturgical participation in order to be properly understood. Mathis’ program was an immersion in the liturgy, guiding participants and illuminating their studies. In the present day, joining liturgical study with practice would, at the very least, allow students to have practical points of reference to the liturgies being studied in the classroom. More ideally, immersive programs in liturgical study motivate students for deeper study in the field and inspire them to promote the liturgy more zealously.

Finally, while Mathis’ particular approach to using Matins to enrich the celebration of Sunday was not without its problems and has been made obsolete by the changes to the Liturgy of the Hours following the Second Vatican Council, it is possible to find inspiration in the spirit of his work. In particular, Mathis hoped to use the Office to prepare people for the Sunday Mass. Though the readings of Office of Readings of today do not have the same level of correspondence with the Sunday Mass that Mathis explored with his Vigil Service, in many cases they may still serve to prepare participants for Sunday Mass by giving them a greater understanding of the feast or liturgical season. Mathis also hoped that his service would serve in an educational function, particularly increasing knowledge of the Scriptures. While the Office of Readings does not feature as much Scripture as Mathis’ later Vigil Services, it still has the potential to introduce its users to a significant amount of Scripture. Finally, another of Mathis' goals for his Vigil Service was to make the Divine Office available to more people. While this dissertation
found that Mathis’ approach was unlikely the most helpful, the desire to promote the Office remains important today.

9.4 The Place of Michael Mathis in the Liturgical Movement

Finally, as a result of this study, it is possible to identify Michael Mathis’ place in the liturgical movement in the United States. To start with, it must be acknowledged that Mathis came to be interested in the liturgy late in his life and was not part of the first wave of liturgical pioneers in the United States. This role belongs, for the most part, to the founders of *Orate Fratres* and its early editors, famous names such as Virgil Michel, William Busch, Patrick Cummins, Gerald Ellard, Martin Hellriegel, Justine Ward, and others. However, by the end of the 1940s and throughout the 1950s, Mathis occupied an important position within the liturgical movement in the United States. This dissertation has shown that during this period, he made a number of essential contributions, most importantly by founding and directing the country’s first graduate degree program in the liturgy, but also through his work with the Divine Office and the American Ritual and his association with the Liturgical Conference. His central place in the movement is evidenced not only by his actions but also by the extent of his collaboration with other liturgical leaders. Specifically, in the course of his various projects, Mathis worked with many of the most prominent scholars in the American liturgical movement. Among those that he recruited to teach at Notre Dame were Godfrey Diekmann, H.A. Reinhold, Gerald Ellard, Reynold Hillenbrand, Martin Hellriegel, and Ermin Vitry; in addition to these
well-known leaders, Mathis cooperated with Aloysius Wilmes, Shawn Sheehan, and Jane Marie Murray in various years in the Workshop for Priests and Seminarians, Frederick McManus for the Holy Week Seminar, Maurice Lavanoux in the 1957 Seminar for Artists and Architects, Archbishop Edwin O’Hara on the American Ritual and Assisi Conference, and Mary Perkins Ryan on the publication of numerous texts. He also worked with numerous other liturgical leaders while on the Board of Directors of the Liturgical Conference. Finally, the extent of his acquaintance with many of the liturgical leaders in the United States is evidenced by the choice of Mathis to co-chair the American organizing committee for the First International Congress in Pastoral Liturgy in Assisi with Godfrey Diekmann.

Michael Mathis played an absolutely essential role in the liturgical movement in the United States. Despite discovering the importance of the liturgy late in his lifetime, Mathis rose to become an active and important member in this movement to bring renewal to Catholic liturgical life. Mathis was involved in various projects that helped to promote better understanding of the liturgy and worked to renew the prayer life of Catholics throughout the country, often collaborating with other liturgical leaders in the process. Most importantly, however, Mathis created and directed the Notre Dame Liturgy Program. The program quickly became an essential part of the liturgical movement in the United States, offering an opportunity for study of the liturgy that was simply not available anywhere else. For this reason alone, Mathis may be considered an important figure in the liturgical movement; yet, he also did much more to support the movement...
and to promote renewed awareness of the importance of the liturgy in the United States. Mathis can rightly stand among the ranks of the leading liturgists of his time.
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