

Andrzej Żądło

University of Silesia in Katowice

ORCID 0000-0001-9249-9811

The Idea of Unity and Catholicity of the Church in the Custom of Mentioning the Bishop’s Name in the Eucharistic Prayer

Abstract: The *editio tertia emendata* of the Paul VI Missal was made available to the Church in 2008. Particularly noteworthy among the many *emendationes* of this edition is the one that refers to the situation when the bishop celebrates the Holy Mass outside his own diocese. In the Missal published in 2002, it was suggested that this mention should be as follows: *et me indigno famulo tuo, et fratre meo N., Episcopo huius Ecclesiae N.* In the revised edition it is proposed that the “guest” bishop should mention his brother first (*et fratre meo N.*), who for him is the bishop of the diocese where he celebrates Mass, and only later mention himself (*et me indigno famulo tuo*). In doing so, he should also not additionally define the local Church as “N.,” i.e., for example, Varsovian or Washingtonian, which, as such, do not exist, but he should pray for the bishop of “this Church” (*huius Ecclesiae*), within which he celebrates the liturgy in communion with the universal Church, emphasized by fraternal unity with the local pastor. The article shows that this modification is of great theological significance and corresponds to the ecclesiology of Vatican II.

Keywords: bishop, diocese, Eucharist, name, unity, Church, Paul VI Missal

The present study is focused on one detail of the problem announced by its title. It concentrates on the solutions proposed in the various editions of the post-conciliar Missal of Paul VI regarding the question of mentioning the Bishop’s name in the intercessory prayers of the Great Prayer of the Eucharist when a Bishop *extra dioecesim suam celebrat*.¹ This issue will be presented in the thematic context which

¹ “Institutio generalis Missalis Romani,” no. 149.

the Church's longstanding practice of mentioning the name of the Bishop in the Eucharistic celebration serves.

1. The idea of the unity and catholicity of Christ's Church at its beginning

Unity was one of the basic features that characterized the Church from the very beginning of its existence. As described in the Acts of the Apostles, "one spirit and one heart animated all the believers. None of them claimed as his own what he possessed, but they had everything in common [...]. None of them lacked, for [...] to each was [...] given according to his need" (Acts 4:32.34–35).

The idea of unity also began to characterize the liturgy celebrated under the leadership of Bishops, especially the Eucharist, celebrated from the time of Jesus on the first day of the week, that is, the Lord's Day. It was then, at a time when Christian communities were not yet numerous, when they were united first around the Apostles and then around their successors – Bishops – and formed centers of Christian life and worship under their leadership and pastoral care, that Christians would come together for the Sunday Eucharist presided over by their Bishop. This gave rise to the gradual crystallization of the ancient centers of religious life in Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and then also in Constantinople.²

When, after a single program of religious policy towards Christianity in the Roman Empire had been agreed upon in 313 and, consequently, after the Church had been granted freedom of existence and action,³ the local church in Rome, encompassing seven regions since the time of Clement I (c. 91–101), was divided over the course of the fourth century into smaller units (the predecessors of the parishes that arose later) with their own titular churches. Such division occurred first within the pope's Roman parish and later also outside it, i.e., on the outskirts of Rome. For pastoral reasons, presbyters sent to such units could not concelebrate Sunday Mass

² Cf. Hofmann, "Znaczenie Kościoła," 190–191.

³ Cf. Śrutwa, "Edykt mediolański," kol. 666; Chupungco, "Storia della liturgia," 122; Nadolski, *Liturgika*, 83–84.

with their own bishop (the pope), because they had to celebrate it in the titular churches to which they were sent. For this reason they received from the pope the so-called *fermentum*, that is, a particle of the host consecrated by him, sent to them through acolytes in the manner of leaven,⁴ as an expressive gesture, realized every Sunday, of the local-horizontal communion of the Roman presbyterium and of the whole community of believers with the bishop and as a symbol of the unity of the Sacrifice commemorated in many Masses.⁵ It was also a sign of the historical-vertical unity,⁶ which expresses the faith of the whole Church in the power of the one and only Sacrifice of Christ⁷ which radiates with equal efficacy to all the faithful, irrespective of where and when they gather together for the Eucharistic celebration.⁸

2. The idea of unity and catholicity of the Church expressed through the custom of mentioning at Mass the name of the bishop of Rome and the diocesan bishop

At the same time, in the fourth century, the custom began to crystallize in Rome of including prayers of intercession in the Canon. In the course of the fifth century, they found their permanent place and

⁴ Cf. “Fermentum,” 466; Krakowiak, “Fermentum – Sancta,” col. 136; “Kościół tytularny,” 687.

⁵ Cf. Metzger, “Storia della celebrazione,” 118–120.

⁶ On the balance experienced by the Church of the times in question in living the vertical-horizontal communion, cf. Giraud, “Dimensione verticale,” 159–176.

⁷ To make this fact clear, in the liturgy was implemented the so-called rite of *Sancta*, which consists in the fact that one part from the host consecrated and broken by the pope during the Eucharistic celebration was allocated to be combined (at the words: *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*) with the consecrated wine (*mittit in calicem de Sancta*) during the next Mass, to emphasize the unity of Christ’s Sacrifice mentioned above, since each successive Mass is one and the same Sacrifice. This was also done by the bishop or presbyter who substituted for the pope in his absence or inability to preside at the celebration. See “Ordo Romanus I,” no. 95; “Ordo Romanus II,” no. 6. Cf. Metzger, “Storia della celebrazione,” 120; “Fermentum,” 466; Sinka, *Liturgia*, 206–207.

⁸ Cf. Kunzler, *Liturgia Kościoła*, 388. See also Emminghaus, *Die Messe*, 281; Nautin, “Le rite,” 514–522.

are still present in the Eucharistic Prayer. In the Roman Canon these prayers are divided into two parts. In the first, following the *Sanc-tus*, the assembly prays for the Church in general and her hierarchy, for those present at Mass and offering the sacrifice, and for those for whom the sacrifice is offered in particular circumstances. In the second part of these prayers, located after the transubstantiation, the assembly intercedes for the deceased and for those who minister in the Church.⁹ A characteristic feature of these prayers of intercession was that the mention of the Church was accompanied by the mention of its visible head – the pope, or the head of a given sector of the universal Church, that is, a bishop – especially when, from the sixth century onwards, the title of the pope was reserved for the Bishop of Rome, in contrast to the earlier period (3rd–5th century), when such a title was common to all bishops.¹⁰ Consequently, the custom of praying for the pope and for one’s own bishop¹¹ was consolidated outside Rome to express the ecclesial community, which means that the words “together with your servant, our pope N.” (*una cum famulo tuo papa nostro N.*) were followed by “and our Bishop N.” (*et antistite nostro N.*). This way of mentioning the bishop in the first part of the intercessory prayers of the Roman Canon is already confirmed in the Gelasian Sacramentary “Vetus” (cf. n. 1244) and in sacramentaries circulated throughout the ninth century.¹²

⁹ Cf. Vagaggini, *Il Canone*, 70–71.

¹⁰ Cf. Barba, *Missale Romanum*, 73. It is worth noting and emphasizing at this point that the monograph cited in this footnote and referred to in many further places in this study is – with the exception of only one, its sixth chapter – a re-edition of the articles that Maurizio Barba published between 2008 and 2015 in *Rivista Liturgica* (two articles) and in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (five articles), as he himself informs us in the relevant references. The second chapter of this monograph is entitled *Il ricordo del vescovo nella Messa: garanzia della legittimità e cattolicità della celebrazione eucaristica* and constitutes a completed and expanded version of the article published in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 122 (2008) 385–396, entitled *La menzione del vescovo nelle intercessioni della Preghiera Eucaristica*. In the present paper we refer to a more recent and completed version of it, that is, to the one comprising the contents of the above-quoted monograph.

¹¹ Cf. Maas-Ewerd, “Nominari debet,” 269–281; Kunzler, *Liturgia Kościola*, 374. See also Righetti, *Manuale di storia*, 371; Cuva, “...una cum...,” 131.

¹² Cf. Cuva, “...una cum...,” 131.

3. Mentioning the name of the bishop at Mass during the second millennium of Christianity

Everything which, in the matter of mentioning the bishop's name at Mass, crystallized in the second millennium of Christianity, was regulated by the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae* of the Missal of Pius V of 1570, which in the period preceding the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council functioned in the version published by Pope John XXIII in 1962. In chapter VIII (*De Canone Missae usque ad Consecrationem*), in item 2 of this *Ritus servandus*, we read the following regulation on the mention of the bishop's name:

Latin version	Translation
<p>Ubi dicit: <i>una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N.</i>, exprimit nomen Papae: Sede autem vacante verba praedicta omittuntur. Ubi dicitur: <i>et Antistite nostro N.</i>, specificatur nomen Patriarchae, Archiepiscopi, vel Episcopi Ordinarii in propria dioecesi, et non alterius Superioris, etiamsi celebrans sit omnino exemptus, vel sub alterius Episcopi iurisdictione. Si vero Episcopus Ordinarius illius loci, in quo Missa celebratur, sit vita functus, praedicta verba omittuntur, quae etiam omittuntur ab iis qui Romae celebrant. Si celebrans est Episcopus, Archiepiscopus vel Patriarcha, omissis praedictis verbis, eorum loco dicit: <i>et me indigno servo tuo.</i> Summus autem Pontifex cum celebrat, omissis verbis: <i>una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N. et Antistite nostro N.</i>, dicit: <i>una cum me indigno famulo tuo, quem gregi tuo praeesse voluisti.</i> Et continuant omnes, ut sequitur: <i>et omnibus orthodoxis, atque catholicae...</i></p>	<p>When he says: <i>una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N.</i>, he mentions the name of the Pope. If there is a sedisvacancy, he omits these words. When he says <i>et Antistite nostro N.</i>, he mentions the name of the patriarch, archbishop, or bishop ordinary of the diocese in question, and not the name of any other superior, even if the celebrant is not incardinated to that diocese or is under the jurisdiction of another bishop. If, however, the ordinary bishop of the place where the Mass is celebrated has died, these words are omitted, even by those who celebrate in Rome. If the celebrant is a bishop, archbishop, or patriarch, the words mentioned above are omitted, and in their place he says: <i>et me indigno servo tuo.</i> When the celebrant is the Pope, he omits the words <i>una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N. et Antistite nostro N.</i> and says: <i>una cum me indigno famulo tuo, quem gregi tuo praeesse voluisti.</i> All continue the remaining part as follows: <i>et omnibus orthodoxis, atque catholicae...</i>^A</p>

^A *Missale Romanum ex decretum SS. Concilii Tridentini, LX.*

In the *Ordo Missae* of the 1962 Missal, we find a specific, concise formula, in the style of the *Te igitur* prayer (within which it appears), by which the name of pope and bishop was mentioned until Vatican II. This formula is: *una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N. et Antistite nostro N.* The exception was when the Mass was celebrated by the pope and the bishop, which was provided for, as shown above, in *Ritus servandus*.¹³

4. The present regulations on the subject

In the current Roman Missal all Eucharistic Prayers require the mention of the name of the pope and the bishop of the diocese where the Mass is celebrated. By observing this mandate, the celebrating communities emphasize their unity in faith with their pastors and the universality (catholicity) of the Church.¹⁴ The preservation of both of these features – the unity and universality of the Church – means the Eucharist is celebrated in a worthy manner and meets the requirement once made by St Ignatius of Antioch to the Smyrnaeans not to do anything without the bishop, since the Church is where he is,¹⁵ and from him “*vita [...] fidelium in Christo quodammodo derivatur et pendet.*”¹⁶

It is worth remembering, however, that in the preparatory work for the post-Vatican II Roman Missal and its General Introduction, no special attention was given to the question of mentioning the bishop’s name in the Eucharistic Prayer, but it was considered a matter of course to take over the practice proposed by the post-Tridentine

¹³ See Cuva, “...una cum...” 385. Cf. Barba, *Missale Romanum*, 75–76.

¹⁴ Cf. Congregation for Divine Worship, *De nomine episcopi*, 347. For Polish translation see *Posoborowe prawodawstwo*, 20–24.

¹⁵ See Ignatius Antiochenus, *Letter to the Church in Smyrna* 8,1–2 [138]. Cf. Barba, *Missale Romanum*, 74.

¹⁶ Vaticanum II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 41.

Roman Missal in this matter,¹⁷ adding only the possibility of mentioning coadjutor bishops and auxiliary bishops.¹⁸

From the Second Vatican Council to our own day, the matter of mentioning the name of the pope and the bishop in the Eucharistic Prayer has been governed by a decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship, *De nomine episcopi in prece eucharistica proferendo* of October 9, 1972, approved by Paul VI on September 5, 1972, and prepared and published at the specific request of certain Ordinaries and Episcopal Conferences.¹⁹ The following regulations are included in this decree²⁰:

1. In the Eucharistic prayer the following should be mentioned:
 - a. Diocesan bishop
 - b. A bishop that has been moved to another diocese, but still governs the present one
 - c. Apostolic administrator [...] established either permanently or temporarily;
 - d. Apostolic Vicar and Prefect
 - e. Prelate and Territorial Abbot.
2. Apart from the persons listed above it is “permitted” to mention [...] coadjutor and auxiliary Bishops [...], as long as they are ordained bishops. If there are several of them, they are mentioned together, after mentioning the name of one’s own ordinary [...]. In this case the names are omitted;
[...]
4. Using appropriate formulas:

¹⁷ See *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia*, *De nonnullis*, no. 2: “In iisdem novis Precibus eucharisticis, saltem in editionibus Canonis ad usum Episcoporum, post verba ‘et Episcopo nostro N.’ vel ‘et Episcopi nostri N.’ in intercessionibus occurrentia, ponantur verba quae ipsi respondent ‘et me indigno servo tuo’ vel ‘mei indigni servi tui,’ eadem ratione ac in Canone Romano adhibenda quando Missa celebratur ab Episcopo.” The aforementioned climate of preparatory work for the post-Vatican II Roman Missal and its General Introduction is noted by Barba, *Missale Romanum*, 76.

¹⁸ The distinctions made by the *Code of Canon Law* of 1917 (canon 198) have been followed in this regard.

¹⁹ This decree and its consequences are discussed by Roman Michałek in his short study entitled “Imię biskupa w Modlitwie Eucharystycznej.”

²⁰ See Congregation for Divine Worship, *De nomine episcopi*, I a–e, 347–348.

[...]

- b. [...] when several are to be mentioned, the general formula is used: “together with Our Bishop N. and his auxiliary Bishops
- c. If a priest celebrates Mass in a foreign territory but for the faithful of his own diocese [...], then the formula used is: “together with our bishop N. and the bishop of the local Church N.”
- d. When a bishop celebrates the Mass:
- in the territory of his own Church, he may mention [...] co-adjutor or auxiliary bishops
 - outside the territory of his own Church, he shall apply the following formula: “together with my brother N. the bishop of the local Church and me your unworthy servant.”

The provisions and instructions contained in the above-mentioned decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship were included, with some modifications and accommodations, in the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal*, which in its pre-typical version was published in 2000, and in 2002, with slight corrections to the text and necessary additions, it was integrated into the Roman Missal published at that time in its third edition.²¹

This Missal, together with the General Introduction to it, has been revised over the years and, as it turned out, has undergone necessary corrections. As a result of this work, changes were made to the form, some parts of the text were corrected, some parts or phrases were eliminated, while others were introduced.²² The relevant part of the version of the General Introduction, refined and published together with the Missal in 2008,²³ determines as follows in number 149, compared with previous editions:

²¹ See *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II*, 17–86.

²² The changes and additions made are presented by Maurizio Barba (*Missale Romanum*, 35–56).

²³ The most recent version of the Roman Missal, published in 2008, was released in 2015 by Downers Grove. *The General Introduction to the Roman Missal* can be found in that edition on p. 14–61.

Editio typica 1969	Editio typica 1970	Editio typica altera 1975	Editio prae-typica tertia 2000	Editio typica tertia 2002	Editio ty- pica tertia emendata 2008
No. 109:			No. 149:		
Sacerdos prosequitur Precem eucharisticam iuxta rubricas, quae in singulis Precibus					
continentur (are contained)		indican- tur (are indicated)	exponuntur (are exposed)		
Si					
sacerdos celebrans			celebrans		
est Episcopus,					
post verba: <i>una cum famulo tuo</i>		in Precibus , post verba:			
<i>Papa nostro N.</i> subiungit: <i>et me indigno</i>					
<i>servo tuo...</i>		<i>famulo tuo...</i>			
[...]					
Si autem Episcopus extra dioe- cesim suam celebrat, post verba: <i>Papa nostro N.</i> subiungit:					
<i>et me indigno famulo tuo, et fratre meo N., Episcopo huius Ecclesiae N.</i>		<i>et fratre meo N., Episcopo huius Ecclesiae, et me indigno famulo tuo.</i>			
vel post verba: <i>Papae nostri N.</i> , subiungit:					
<i>mei indigni famuli tui, et fratris mei N., Episcopi huius Ecclesiae N.</i>		<i>fratris mei N., Episcopi huius Ecclesiae, et mei indigni famuli tui</i>			
[...]					

In tracing the evolution of the passages on the mention of the bishop's name in the Eucharistic Prayer in the two versions of the third edition of the Roman Missal published to date (2002 and 2008), we note the introduction of two corrections that address the case of a bishop celebrating the Eucharist outside his diocese.

4.1. First correction: the order in which the names of bishops are mentioned when one of them celebrates the Eucharist outside his own diocese

The first correction was to change the order of mentioning the name of the bishop who, for some reason,²⁴ is just present in a given diocese and celebrates the Eucharist there, as well as the local bishop. In the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal 2000/2002* it was recommended that in such a case the bishop who is temporarily present in a given diocese and celebrates Mass there should say his own name first and then the name of the local bishop. This solution was in opposition to what the Congregation for Divine Worship had regulated in 1972 with a decree approved by Pope Paul VI (September 5, 1972), providing that “outside the territory of one’s own Church, the following formula shall be used: ‘together with my brother N. the bishop of the local Church and me your unworthy servant’” (*extra fines propriae Ecclesiae, formula erit: “una cum fratre meo N., Episcopo [...] huius Ecclesiae et me indigno famulo tuo”*).²⁵ *Editio typica emendata* (2008) introduced a correction recommending that the bishop, staying for some time in a diocese other than the one he is pastor of, should articulate first the name of the local bishop and then his own. Thanks to this correction there was a return to what had been made a norm by the aforementioned Congregation for Divine Worship shortly after the Second Vatican Council.²⁶

²⁴ These reasons may include participation in a congress, symposium or conference. Cf. Cuva, “...una cum...”, 140, n. 20.

²⁵ Decree *De nomine episcopi*, IV d, 348.

²⁶ At this point it is worth emphasising the anticipatory step taken by the Polish version of the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal*, consisting in the fact that already four years before the publication of the *editio typica tertia emendata* (2008),

Perhaps someone might ask whether this is not a purely technical matter or a matter of courtesy. In answer to this, it should be emphasized that it is certainly more than a matter of courtesy. It is strictly theological, since, according to the aforementioned Decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship, “the Bishop is mentioned in the Eucharistic Prayer not only or not primarily out of respect [for his person], but also for reasons of communion and charity. The intention is to emphasize that he is the minister of the grace of the highest priesthood and to obtain God’s blessing on his person and ministry in the celebration of the Eucharist, which is the summit and source of all the Church’s activity.”²⁷ In essence, then, it is about the local Church and her spiritual well-being, not about the dignity, superiority or priority of one person or another. It is not about the person of the bishop as such, but about the bishop who, in a particular community where another bishop may be present at any given moment, by the will of Christ and in the power of the Holy Spirit, fulfils the office-ministry of priest and guide for his local community of believers which, under his pastoral care, is heading for its heavenly homeland, as well as being the guarantor of ecclesial unity and – at the same time – of ecclesial universality, thanks to communion with the Pope, whose name he mentions in intercessory prayer before his own or his brother’s name in the episcopate.

i.e. in 2004 (at that time the Polish translation of this Introduction appeared in print in Poznań), and then in its renewal in 2006, contrary to the provisions of the Latin version of the *General Introduction* 2000/2002, the order in which the names of bishops are mentioned in the present situation was maintained, as it was decreed in 1972. The relevant passage in the Polish version reads: “if a bishop celebrates outside his diocese, after the words: *together with [...] our pope N.*, he adds: *with my brother N., bishop of the Church N., and with me, your unworthy servant*” (no. 149).

²⁷ “Episcopus in prece eucharistica memoratur non tantum vel non praecipue honoris gratia, sed ob causam communionis et caritatis, sive ad significandum oeconomum gratiae summi sacerdotii (cf. Vaticanum II, *Lumen gentium*, no. 26), sive ad divina auxilia pro eius persona et ministerio impetranda in ipsa celebratione Eucharistiae, quae est totius actionis virtutisque Ecclesiae culmen et fons (cf. Vaticanum II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no. 10)” (*De nomine episcopi*, 347).

4.2. Second correction: removing the abbreviation “N.” from the text of the intercessory prayer.

The second of the abovementioned corrections found in the *editio typica emendata* of the Roman Missal of Paul VI consists in removing from the text of the intercessory prayer the abbreviation “N.” which was introduced into the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal* in 2000/2002. This abbreviation demanded specifying which Church was meant in the bishop’s prayer for his brother in pastoral ministry. Thus, the 2000/2002 version of the Introduction demanded that the local Church (diocese) within which the Eucharist was celebrated be “given” an unspecified name. This requirement for bishops celebrating the Eucharist outside their own diocese was in itself incomprehensible and unsupported by earlier Church documents. The decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship *De nomine episcopi in prece eucharistica proferendo*, already mentioned several times in this study, proposed that the bishop in such a situation, that is, *extra fines propriae Ecclesiae*, should pray as follows: “together with my brother N. bishop of the **local** Church (*huius Ecclesiae*) and me your unworthy servant.”²⁸ The proposal to add to the clear and complete expression [...] *episcopo huius Ecclesiae* an unspecified N. (the name of the Church) at the end of the phrase complicated the matter from the theological point of view. To the thoroughly theological reality, which is the Church of Christ in the local dimension, that is, this concrete Church (*haec Ecclesia*),²⁹ it began to attach the terminology of administrative and typically secular origin, drawn from an area foreign to ecclesiology, and thus provoking confusion in the doctrine of the Church. There was a solution, which in fact is unfortunately

²⁸ Congregation for Divine Worship, *De nomine episcopi*, IV d, 348.

²⁹ It should be mentioned that the liturgy is never celebrated in some virtual reality, in some neutral territory. It is always celebrated within a concrete local Church which, while existing and exercising its mission in a given territory (*locus*), is not administratively identified with that territory. For the Church is not an administrative unit, but a community of faith, a gathering called by the Lord and given over to the pastoral care of the Bishop. Hence the local Church is where the bishop is who is its focus, just as the universal Church is where Christ Jesus is (cf. Ignatius Antiochenus, *Letter to the Church in Smyrna* 8,2 [138]), not within the boundaries of a given place.

still sometimes practiced, in which the bishop who celebrates the Eucharist outside his diocese refers to his brother as “*episcopum huius Ecclesiae N.*”³⁰ Such formula (although omitting the pronoun *huius*) is currently used by almost all Polish bishops celebrating the Eucharist outside their diocese, despite the fact that since 2008 we have in Poland a revised edition of the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal*, translated into Polish and included in the second, expanded and supplemented edition of the *Missal for Polish dioceses* of 2013.³¹ In the latest version of the Introduction to the Missal the expression *et fratre meo N., episcopo huius Ecclesiae N.*, from 2000/2002, has been replaced by the still poorly known expression *et fratre meo N., episcopo huius Ecclesiae* (“with my brother N., bishop of the **local Church**”).³²

³⁰ At this point it should be noted that the Polish translation of the General Introduction to the Roman Missal (published in Poznan in 2006) is characterized by a certain freedom in its approach to the Latin text, because it does not take into account the present in the Latin version of the indicative pronoun *huius* (in the genitive singular), and therefore advocates giving the name (N.) to the local Church, within which the Eucharist is celebrated (“with my brother N., bishop of the Church of N.”). If we took the Diocese of Cracow as an example, the passus in question would read: “with my brother Mark, Bishop of the **Church of Cracow.**” In the case of other dioceses, the reference would be to “the Church of Poznań, Warsaw, etc.” Cf. the Polish version of the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal* (2006), no. 149.

³¹ See p. [15]–[74].

³² Taking the aforementioned Diocese of Cracow as a further example, a bishop celebrating Mass outside his own diocese will say: “with my brother Mark, bishop of the **local Church.**” Cf. *Ogólne wprowadzenie do Mszału rzymskiego* (2008), no. 149. It is worth noting here the (varied) terminology used by the Polish translations of the liturgical books when it comes to the mentioned indicative pronoun *huius*, omitted in the Polish edition of the Introduction to the Missal (2004 and 2006). In the translation of the decree *De nomine episcopi* in reference to the pronoun *huius* the term **local** (Church) was used (cf. *Posoborowe prawodawstwo*, 23–24). The same solution was used in the Roman Ritual: *Obrzędy bierzmowania dostosowane do zwyczajów diecezji polskich*, Katowice 2019 (see *Wprowadzenie teologiczne i pastoralne*, no. 4 – here we encounter the expression: “Due to its importance to the **local church.**...”). In the Polish edition of the 2008 Introduction to the Missal we find a literal translation of the pronoun *huius*, rendered in Polish as (the Church) **of this place**. The conclusion to be drawn from this observation is that committees, subcommittees, or groups of specialists involved in translation work must be

Looking for an answer to the question of the origin of the solution adopted in the Introduction of 2000 and included in the *editio typica tertia* of the Roman Missal (2002), promoting the addition of the name (N.) to the expression “of the local Church” (*huius Ecclesiae*), it is worth referring again to the decree of the Congregation for Divine Worship to see that such a formula was envisaged there for priests celebrating Mass in a foreign territory, but for the faithful of their own diocese, e.g. because of a pilgrimage. In such circumstances, the priest was to pray as follows: “together with our bishop N. and the bishop of the **local** Church (Church of here) N.” Another interpretation of the solution functioning in this respect in the period before 2008 may be suggested by a supposition that the liturgical documents of the Church were penetrated by a popular, so called “circulating” way of expression, strongly rooted in the mentality of those who worked on the content of the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal* in 2000.

5. Pastoral conclusion

Many of us give in to the wave of unreflective speech, not always characterized by concern for the correctness of language and its adequacy to reality. This happens, for example, when in everyday communication or in speeches, and sometimes even in documents, we speak of the “Church of Warsaw, of Milan,” etc. We say this even though, after deeper reflection and consideration, we are able to realize that from the ecclesiological point of view these expressions do not make sense, because they do not correspond to reality, and from the practical point of view they draw unjustified and unnecessary lines of division, isolation, lines that harm the idea of the unity and communion of the Church, so dear to the Second Vatican Council.

The words once addressed by St Paul to the Corinthians seem adequate at this point: “What I mean is that each one of you says, ‘I belong to Paul or ‘I belong to Apollos’ or ‘I belong to Cephas,’ or ‘I belong to Christ.’ Is Christ divided?” (1 Cor 1:12–13). When one hears in common speech about the Church as the Church of Milan,

vigilant about the uniformity of the vocabulary used in translations of liturgical books, especially in the case of re-editions or new translations.

Paris, or Krakow, a question similar to Paul's comes to mind: is the Church divided? Is it different from the one professed in the Creed, that is, one, Christ's and universal, that is, Catholic?

The Church of Christ is realized in concrete local (particular) communities, which are not, however, defined according to the *locus* (e.g. city) in which she exists and carries out her mission, but according to the bishop, who realizes Christ for the community gathered around him and is the guarantor of His real presence. Hence, the Church is the People of God living and ministering in a given area (diocese or parish), city or country, but not identified with the area, city or country (so, to give a few examples, it is not the Church of Madrid, Fatima, France or Poland). We form a *unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam*, belonging to Christ and fulfilling His mission in a particular region, city or village – wherever we live, move and are, we are his family, descended from God's lineage (cf. Acts 17:28). This, then, is the reason why the most recent translation work on Paul VI's Missal in its third edition, revised in 2008, must continue with care, prudence and maximum competence not only in the linguistic sphere but also – and perhaps above all – in the ecclesial-theological sphere.

Here is a summary of the relevant passages from item 149 of the *General Introduction to the Roman Missal* of 2000/2002 (*editio typica tertia*) and 2008 (*editio typica tertia emendata*), including all four Eucharistic Prayers. The differences are highlighted as underlining:

Relevant passages from the General
Introduction to the Roman Missal
editio typica tertia

Sacerdos prosequitur Precem eucharisticam iuxta rubricas, quae in singulis Precibus exponuntur.

Si celebrans est Episcopus, in Precibus, post verba: *Papa nostro N.* subiungit: *et me indigno famulo tuo* (I, II i III Eucharistic prayer),

vel post verba: *Papae nostri N.*, subiungit: *mei indigni famuli tui* (IV Eucharistic prayer).

Si autem Episcopus extra dioecesim suam celebrat, post verba: *Papa nostro N.* subiungit: *et me indigno famulo tuo, et fratre meo N., Episcopo huius Ecclesiae N.* (I, II i III Eucharistic prayer),

vel post verba: *Papae nostri N.*, subiungit: *mei indigni famuli tui, et fratris mei N., Episcopi huius Ecclesiae N.* (IV Eucharistic prayer).

In unaquaque Prece eucharistica, praedictae formulae aptandae sunt, normis grammaticorum attentis

Relevant passages from the General
Introduction to the Roman Missal
editio typica tertia emendata

Sacerdos prosequitur Precem eucharisticam iuxta rubricas, quae in singulis Precibus exponuntur.

Si celebrans est Episcopus, in Precibus, post verba: *Papa nostro N.* subiungit: *et me indigno famulo tuo* (I, II i III Eucharistic prayer),

vel post verba: *Papae nostri N.*, subiungit: *mei indigni famuli tui* (IV Eucharistic prayer).

Si autem Episcopus extra dioecesim suam celebrat, post verba: *Papa nostro N.* subiungit: *et fratre meo N., Episcopo huius Ecclesiae, et me indigno famulo tuo* (I, II i III Eucharistic prayer),

vel post verba: *Papae nostri N.*, subiungit: *fratris mei N., Episcopi huius Ecclesiae, et mei indigni famuli tui* (IV Eucharistic prayer).

In unaquaque Prece eucharistica, praedictae formulae aptandae sunt, normis grammaticorum attentis

Idea jedności i powszechności Kościoła w zwyczaju wzmiankowania imienia biskupa w Modlitwie eucharystycznej

Abstrakt: *Editio tertia emendata* Mszału Pawła VI została przekazana do użytku Kościoła w 2008 roku. Wśród wielu *emendationes* tejże edycji na szczególną uwagę zasługuje ta, która odnosi się do sytuacji, kiedy to biskup celebrował Mszę św. poza własną diecezją. W Mszału opublikowanym w 2002 roku sugerowano, aby to wzmiankowanie miało postać: *et me indigno famulo tuo, et fratre meo N., Episcopo huius Ecclesiae N.* W wydaniu poprawionym proponuje się, by biskup „gość” na pierwszym miejscu wymieniał swego brata (*et fratre meo N.*), którym jest dla niego biskup diecezji, na terenie której sprawuje Mszę św., a dopiero później wzmiankował siebie (*et me indigno famulo tuo*). Czyniąc tak, ma też nie dookreślać Kościoła lokalnego jako „N.,” a więc np. jako warszawskiego czy waszyngtońskiego, jako że takie nie istnieją,

lecz ma się modlić za biskupa „tego Kościoła” (*huius Ecclesiae*), w obrębie którego sprawuje liturgię w jedności z Kościołem powszechnym, eksplicytnie podkreślonej braterską jednością z miejscowym pasterzem. Artykuł pokazuje, że ta zmiana ma swoją dużą wagę teologiczną i koresponduje z eklezjologią Soboru Watykańskiego II.

Słowa kluczowe: biskup, diecezja, Eucharystia, imię, jedność, Kościół, Mszał Pawła VI

Bibliography

- Barba, M., “La menzione del vescovo nelle intercessioni della Preghiera Eucaristica,” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 122/4 (2008) 385–396.
- Barba, M., *Missale romanum. Processi evolutivi nella terza edizione emendata del 2008* (Theologica uxentina 6; Roma – Monopoli: Viverien 2015).
- Chupungco, A.J., “Storia della liturgia nei primi quattro secoli,” *Scientia liturgica. Manuale di Liturgia. I. Introduzione alla liturgia* (ed. A.J. Chupungco; Casale Monferrato: Piemme 1998) 109–128.
- Congregation for Divine Worship, Decree *De nomine episcopi in prece eucharistica proferendo* (1972), *Notitiae* 8 (1972) 347–349.
- The Consilium for the Execution of the Liturgy Constitution, “Declaration *De nonnullis in novis precibus eucharisticis definiendis* (1968),” *Notitiae* 4 (1968) 356.
- Cuva, A., “‘...una cum... antistite nostro N.’ La menzione del Vescovo nella Preghiera Eucaristica,” *Notitiae* 27 (1991) 130–142.
- Emminghaus, J.E., *Die Messe. Wesen, Gestalt, Vollzug. Durchgesehen und überarbeitet von Th. Maas-Ewerd* (5th ed.; Klosterneuburg: Verlag Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk 1992).
- “Fermentum,” *Leksykon liturgii* (ed. B. Nadolski; Poznań: Pallottinum 2006) 466–467.
- Giraud, C., “Dimensione verticale e dimensione orizzontale nella preghiera della Chiesa,” *Il concilio venti anni dopo. III. Il rapporto Chiesa-mondo* (ed. N. Galantino; Roma: AVE 1986) 159–176.
- Hofmann, J., “Znaczenie Kościoła rzymskiego i jego biskupa dla Kościoła powszechnego od ‘konstantyńskiego przełomu’ do Soboru Chalcedońskiego (451),” *Rocznik Teologii Katolickiej* 8 (2009) 175–192, <http://hdl.handle.net/11320/1296>.
- Ignatius Antiochenus, *Letter to the Church in Smyrna*, in *Pierwsi świadkowie. Pisma Ojców apostołskich* (ed. M. Starowieyski; trans. A. Świderkówna; Biblioteka Ojców Kościoła 10; Kraków: Wydawnictwo M 2010) 136–139.
- “Institutio generalis Missalis Romani,” *Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum, auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum, Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum* (3rd ed.; Vatican: Typis

- Vaticanis 2002) 17–86; (USA edition, Downers Grove, IL: Midwest Theological Forum 2015) 14–61.
- “Kościół tytularny,” *Leksykon liturgii* (ed. B. Nadolski; Poznań: Pallottinum 2006) 686–687.
- Krakowiak, C., “Fermentum – Sancta,” *Encyklopedia katolicka*. V. (ed. L. Bieńkowski *et al.*; Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego 1989) col. 136.
- Kunzler, M., *Liturgia Kościoła* (Amateka: Podręczniki teologii katolickiej 10; ed. and trans. L. Balter; Poznań: Pallottinum 1999).
- Maas-Ewerd, T., “Nominari debet. Zur Nennung des Papstes, des Ortsbischofs und des Kollegiums der Bischöfe im eucharistischen Hochgebet,” *Gratias agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet* (eds. A. Heinz – H. Rennings, Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder 1992) 269–281.
- Metzger, M., “Storia della celebrazione eucaristica in Occidente,” *Scientia liturgica. Manuale di Liturgia*, III. *L'Eucaristia* (ed. A. J. Chupungco; Casale Monferrato: Piemme 2003) 114–143.
- Michałek, R., “Imię biskupa w Modlitwie Eucharystycznej,” *Collectanea Theologica* 43/4 (1973) 54–56.
- Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum* (3rd ed.; Vatican: Typis Vaticanis 2002).
- Missale Romanum ex decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum auctoritate Pauli PP. VI promulgatum Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura recognitum* (3rd ed.; Downers Grove, IL: Midwest Theological Forum 2015).
- Missale romanum ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini restitutum Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum. Editio typica 1962* (eds. M. Sodi – A. Toniolo; Monumenta Liturgica Piana 1; Vatican: Typis Vaticanis 2007).
- Nadolski, B., *Liturgika*. I. *Liturgika fundamentalna* (2nd ed.; Poznań: Pallottinum 2014).
- Nautin, P., “Le rite du « fermentum » dans les églises urbaines de Rome,” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 96 (1982) 510–522.
- “Ordo Romanus I,” *Les Ordines Romani du haut Moyen Âge*. II. *Les textes (Ordines I–XIII)* (ed. M. Andrieu; Réimpression anastatique; Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 1971) 67–108.
- “Ordo Romanus II,” *Les Ordines Romani du haut Moyen Âge*. II. *Les textes (Ordines I–XIII)* (ed. M. Andrieu; Réimpression anastatique; Louvain: Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 1971) 113–116.
- Posoborowe prawodawstwo kościelne. Dokumenty prawno-liturgiczne*. V. Book 1 (coll. and trans. E. Szałafrowski; Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej 1974).
- Righetti, M., *Manuale di storia liturgica*. III. *La Messa. Commento storico-liturgico alla luce del Concilio Vaticano II* (3rd ed.; Milano: Ancora 2014).

Sinka, T., *Liturgika* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Teologicznego Księży Misjonarzy 1994).

Śrutwa, J., “Edykt mediolański,” *Encyklopedia katolicka*. IV. (ed. R. Łukaszyk *et al.*; Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego 1985) col. 666.

Vagaggini, C., *Il Canone della Messa e la riforma liturgica. Problemi e progetti* (Quaderni di Rivista Liturgica 4; Torino: Elle Di Ci 1966).

Vaticanum II, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963).

Vaticanum II, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen gentium* (1964).