

The process was "set in place by an ecumenical council, not by a group of radical individuals."

Archbishop Weakland points out that Pope Paul VI personally was very concerned about the implementation of the council and he followed its course very carefully. The pope "made it clear over and over again that the revision in progress was a revision of the Latin or Roman rite. It was not to be conceived of as a new or parallel rite." Pope Paul VI was convinced, however, that "two Latin rites would only be divisive in the church." The archbishop comments: "How right he proved to be!"

Archbishop Weakland admits that after the council, liturgical abuses arose throughout the church as a result of "excessive zeal and exuberance." But, in his opinion, these had begun to disappear by the early 1980s, by which time the essentials of good liturgy were being emphasized and "the needed sense of the sacred was being reestablished." What totally derailed the liturgical renewal, in the archbishop's view, was the decision of Pope John Paul II to grant in 1984 the indult that allowed the Tridentine usage to flourish again.

"Since that time," he states, "the liturgical renewal in the United States has been in disarray."

The one point of agreement between Cardinal Ratzinger and Archbishop Weakland is that the liturgical life of the church today is in crisis. Beyond that, it would be difficult to reconcile their positions. The tendency to take sides is tempting, but, in my opinion, it should be suspended. "Progressive" advocates of ongoing liturgical reform would wisely consider the merits of Cardinal Ratzinger's assessment, and proponents of "conservative" liturgical directions would do well to consider Archbishop Weakland's point of view.

With Cardinal Ratzinger, is it not time to ask if the process of postconciliar liturgical renewal was not too drastic, an excessive severance from the immediate past, too much the work of scholars bound by the time-conditioned convictions of the 1960s? Were mistakes made in the postconciliar reform process that we can only now see? Many

*Editorial continued on page 12*

## ANTIPHON Publication of The Society for Catholic Liturgy

*Editor:* M. Francis Mannion

*Editorial Assistance:* Kyle J. Betit, Arlita Llenares, Judith W. Rock

### *Officers and Board*

*President:* Msgr. M. Francis Mannion, The Cathedral of the Madeleine, Salt Lake City, Utah

*Vice President:* Richard Proulx, Chicago, Illinois

*Secretary:* Fredric M. Roberts, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

*Treasurer:* Duncan G. Stroik, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana

Mark E. Bradford, St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Rev. Giles R. Dimock, O.P., The Franciscan University of Steubenville, Steubenville, Ohio

Eamon Duffy, Cambridge University, Cambridge, England

Pamela Jackson, Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Emmitsburg, Maryland

Archimandrite Boniface Luykx, Holy Transfiguration Monastery, Redwood, California

Michael J. McCallion, Archdiocese of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan

Lauren Pristas, Benedictine College, Atchison, Kansas

Matthew Walsh, Holy Name Cathedral, Chicago, Illinois

The Society for Catholic Liturgy, 331 East South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84111

(Phone: 801-328-8941; FAX: 801-364-6504)

*Antiphon* is published three times yearly; subscription \$12