

Systematic Heortology: A Proposal

Joris Geldhof

Joris Geldhof is Professor of Liturgical Studies and Sacramental Theology at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven, Belgium. He is Vice-Dean for Research and belongs to the Research Unit Pastoral and Empirical Theology. He also chairs the Liturgical Institute. In the latter capacity he is also the editor-in-chief of the bilingual journal Questions Liturgiques. He is a member of the Liturgical Theology Seminar.

Introduction: On the Infrastructure of Liturgical Studies

In their influential *Introduction to the Study of Liturgy*,¹ noted German scholars Benedikt Kranemann and Albert Gerhards develop and defend what one could call the majority position on the outline of the field of liturgical studies. It consists of three parts: historical research, outreach to the pastoral field, and theological reflection. Ideally, these three areas mutually and fluently interact, making liturgical studies a naturally interdisciplinary affair. In practice, however, this interdisciplinary conversation rarely happens, especially in the world of academic theology, quite ironically so. Scholars of the liturgy are mostly (trained as) historians and philologists, i.e. specialists of liturgical texts from the past, or practical theologians, increasingly employing approaches from the social sciences, ritual studies, ethnography, and anthropology. These developments, while not at all uninteresting in and of themselves, at best even promising for the future of the field, nevertheless impact the role of thorough theological thinking. Strange as it may seem, liturgical theology is pretty much the little brother of liturgical studies, with two older sisters, liturgical history and pastoral liturgy, who catch much more attention and have much more access to social events. This relative underrepresentation of liturgical theology is in a way as old as the field of liturgical studies itself. It can even be explained genealogically if one subscribes to Reinhard Meßner's contention that the *Mutterdisziplin* of *Liturgiewissenschaft* is *Kirchengeschichte*,² that the roots of liturgical studies lie in Church history.

Regarding the study of the liturgical year in particular, the above sketch of the outline of liturgical studies in general neatly applies. Scholarship dealing with liturgical feasts and seasons often bears a strong, sometimes even exclusive, historical

1. Benedikt Kranemann—Albert Gerhards, *Introduction to the Study of Liturgy*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2017). The original German version of the book was published in 2007, with a third edition in 2013.

2. Reinhard Meßner, *Einführung in die Liturgiewissenschaft*, 2nd ed. (Paderborn et al.: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2009), 19.

mark. Questions about Christian feasts usually tend to exclusively look at their origins, thereby assuming that by studying their origins and by becoming increasingly aware of the complexity of these origins (with Jewish or pagan backgrounds, with New Testament references, with sociocultural and politico-economical contingencies playing a role, etc.), one immediately catches their full meaning.³ The two big sisters find each other easily: sister historical research does the hard work of studying the sources, textual and material, while sister pastoral liturgy does an equally hard job of explaining everything to the less educated. The smallest one of the family, theological reflection, is almost systematically forgotten.

These critical observations on the infrastructure of liturgical studies help explain where the proposal for a “systematic heortology” comes from. With a reference to the Greek word *heortè*, meaning feast, I am making a case for a heortology, by which I understand a theological account (*logos*) of (i) what a Christian feast is in general and (ii) what the meaning of particular Christian feasts could be. With the addition of the adjective “systematic,” I deliberately underline the connection with systematic theology. More than a subdiscipline or a specific area of expertise, I understand systematic theology to be a reflexive labor, tirelessly attempting to think through the truth, beauty, and goodness of whatever has been given together with God’s revelation and its human acceptance, the Christian faith. Systematic theology, thus understood, is not primarily about acquiring as much knowledge as possible about Christianity, its churches, texts, and traditions, i.e., about Christian things, but about broadening and deepening one’s insight into God’s subtle manifestation in world and history.

Practically, my proposal for a systematic heortology consists of five programmatic avenues for thought, each one implying thorough research and creative reflection. The question I would like to formulate an answer to, albeit an incomplete one at this stage, is what needs to be done to develop a systematic study of the liturgical year and its feasts, which is both intellectually plausible and culturally credible in today’s context. To do that properly, I think at least five things should be done, probably more (but the constraints of an academic paper prevent me from engaging a sixth or seventh one at once): (i) an open conversation with philosophies and other anthropological theories of feasts; (ii) a serious rehabilitation of the notion of mystery, guided by a rediscovery of commentaries on the liturgical year which saw the light of day in the context of the early 20th century Liturgical Movement; (iii) a renewed theological attention for the sanctoral cycle and the veneration of the saints; (iv) a thorough liturgical hermeneutics of the euchological material

3. Karl Adam, *Das Kirchenjahr mitfeiern: Seine Geschichte und seine Bedeutung nach der Liturgieerneuerung* (Freiburg—Basel—Wien: Herder, 1979); Matias Augé, *L’anno liturgico: È Cristo stesso presente nella sua Chiesa* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2009); Karl-Heinrich Bieritz, *Das Kirchenjahr: Feste, Gedenk- und Feiertage in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 7th ed. (München: Beck, 2005); Robert Féry, *Jours de fêtes: Histoire des célébrations chrétiennes* (Paris: Seuil, 2008); Paul F. Bradshaw—Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons in Early Christianity* (London—Collegeville: SPCK—Liturgical Press, 2011).

provided for individual feasts;⁴ and (v) an engagement with the visual arts, including not only icons, but also sculptures, stained glass windows, paintings, etc., in whose extraordinarily rich patrimony rest unique forms of theologizing which too often remain overlooked in liturgical theological scholarship.⁵

In what follows are presented these five pillars underpinning any future systematic heortology; each time, I will also indicate some unavoidable limitations.

A Fine Phenomenology of the Feast: Engaging Josef Pieper

A systematic heortology would greatly benefit from an interdisciplinary dialogue with philosophers and anthropologists who have reflected on what it means that the human being celebrates feasts. Looking at the emergence of cult and culture, which probably co-imply each other, where does the genesis of feasts lie? Can one say that the feasting human being is co-existent with *homo religiosus*? What does it say about humans' religiosity that they also celebrate feasts, and what does it say about feasts that most human beings are also susceptible to religion, or, as a renowned Dutch theologian put it, "incurably religious"?⁶ Are feasts related to the observation that the human being is *homo ludens*, the playing being, also needing rules for the games it plays? What is the connection between routine, the need for it, and the rhythms of time and life on the one hand, and the phenomenon of feasts and the incredible variety among them on the other hand? Is there at all something common to all feasts, or everything which is named a feast? Is it possible to imagine the human condition without feasts? How do feasts interact with human emotions, with the body, with the senses, with stories and storytelling, with fantasy and reason? How do feasts capture and express the collective memories of people and peoples? Who is in control of what is celebrated, and how are feasts manipulated?

Manifestly, the phenomenon of feasts raises many fascinating philosophical questions. A philosopher who devoted much time and energy to thinking about feasts is the German university professor Josef Pieper (°1904—†1997), to whose work I limit myself for deriving from it two fundamental and thought-provoking ideas about feasts which I think are indispensable for the design of a veritable systematic heortology.⁷

4. I am limiting myself to the Roman rite, but, *mutatis mutandis*, the exercise could be easily extended to other liturgical families.

5. Of course, it is impossible to do justice to all these elements in detail. Given the programmatic nature of the present contribution, the best that can be done is to give a specific example. The purpose of that one example is merely of a methodological nature: it shows how a systematic heortology is extended beyond the study of texts and reaches out to the (visual) arts. For its hermeneutical work of interpreting, thinking, and explaining, a systematic heortology not only reads but also looks.

6. Harry Kuitert (°1924—†2017) characterized human beings, even in the most secularized societies, as "ongeneeslijk religieus."

7. Josef Pieper, *Zustimmung zur Welt: Eine Theorie des Festes* (München: Kösel, 1963); Id., *Über das Phänomen des Festes* (Köln—Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1963).

First, Pieper is convinced that feasting is something intrinsic to the human condition, but he does not limit that observation to something a cultural theorist or sociologist could come up with, too. According to Pieper, this is an insight with metaphysical weight. The act of feasting, he argues, is impossible without acknowledging the primal goodness of being. The very fact of being is not something simple or entirely neutral for him, but good. When feasting, humans assent, and cannot but assent, to that original goodness of being, confirm it, align with it, embrace it.

Second, Pieper rejects the supposition that the specificity of feasts can be explained through the contrast with ordinary work or quotidian life. Against the idea that feasting originates in the need for interruption because daily life cannot go on continuously, he argues that the celebration of a feast is rather to be considered as the elevation or point of culmination of all human activity and labor than as one peculiar type of activity set apart from all the rest.

It would lead us too far to further analyze these two clusters of thought, but with the first one, Pieper is reacting against contemporary existentialists, who were inclined to interpret human existence against the backdrop of an abyss of emptiness and pervading meaninglessness. The second one is directed against communist and other social constructivist theories that make sharp distinctions between different and independent spheres of life. I, for my part, think that Pieper's inspiration for an account of feasts which does neither buy into nihilism nor into a functionalist view on the human condition is tremendously important for a systematic heortology. Put differently, a systematic heortology would always imply at least an openness towards metaphysics. Solidly rooted in existential phenomenology and profoundly familiar with the tradition of Christian thinking, Pieper's work sets an example here worth pursuing. A metaphysical sensitivity accounts for a healthy realism, for which reality does not coincide with the visible.

A Theory of Mystery: Engaging Dom Columba Marmion

Closely related to such a metaphysics is a fundamental reflection on the concept of mystery, in which, philosophically speaking, elements of the visible and the invisible are dynamically intertwined. In fact, mystery is not primarily a concept that one tries to grasp but a reality that one attempts to participate in. Moreover, mystery in a Christian sense does not simply evoke something enigmatic for human cognition or, with a wink to Rowan Williams, the idea "that the world is full of 'sacredness';" it pertains to "the very specific conviction that the world is full of the life of a God whose nature is known in Christ and the Spirit."⁸ Therefore, an awareness of the

8. Rowan Williams, "Foreword," in Geoffrey Rowell—Christine Hall, eds., *The Gestures of God: Explorations in Sacramentality* (London—New York: Continuum, 2004), xiii. As a matter of fact, Williams here talks about sacramentality, not mystery. I think, however, that his statement neatly applies.

meaning of mystery does not require the mastery of the intellect (first), but a willingness and preparedness to engage oneself. The notion of mystery itself always contains a dimension of hospitality, and the appropriate response to the invitation offered is a happy and thankful reception. In the words of famous French theologian Louis-Marie Chauvet, it is a “don” (gift) inviting a “contre-don” (return-gift) of oneself.⁹ One can decide to refuse the invitation, be firm not to surrender or to accept it, but one can never deny having been and therefore always *being* invited.

A particularly meaningful theological elaboration of the idea of mystery as (primordially meant to be) something to participate in, to have communion with, and to share with others, is expressed by Dom Columba Marmion, a Belgian monk of Irish descent, abbot of Maredsous, and—very importantly with respect to the origins of the Liturgical Movement—the teacher of Dom Lambert Beauduin (°1873—†1960) as well as, so to speak, the discoverer of his exceptional theological talent. Marmion coined the deceptively simple phrase that Christ’s mysteries are “our” mysteries.

What makes the mysteries of Jesus ours is, above all, that the Eternal Father saw us when seeing His Son in each one of the mysteries Jesus lived, and that Christ accomplished them as head of the Church. Because of that, I will even say that the mysteries of Christ are more our mysteries than they are His.¹⁰

Marmion sounded these mysteries very deeply and used the liturgical year as a leading principle. Every feast it contains, including every Sunday throughout the year (*per annum*; somewhat awkwardly translated in English as “ordinary” time), is an invitation as well as an occasion for getting involved. What one gets involved in, is the Body of Christ. “Let us not forget,” says Marmion, “that Christ Jesus *wills* the holiness of His mystical body: all His mysteries come down to the firm establishment of that holiness.”¹¹ This call to holiness is universal, it is extended to all peoples and persons without distinction. By accepting it and living it out, one is adopted as one of God’s children. What Christ is by nature, God’s Son, everyone can become by adoption. It is probably a bit exaggerated, but somehow similar to famous patristic and medieval thinkers who received solemn nicknames such as *doctor gratiae* (Saint Augustine), *doctor angelicus* (Thomas Aquinas) or *doctor seraphicus* (Saint Bonaventure), one could consider blessed Columba Marmion the *doctor adoptionis*. To be adopted into the divine mysteries is the fulfillment of a Christian life.

9. Cf. Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995), 108, 276–78, 283–86. Chauvet applies the concept of “return-gift” to the practical ethics which is involved in the Christian sacraments and also argues that the Jewish identity can be recognized in this structure of gift and return-gift.

10. Columba Marmion, *Christ in His Mysteries*, trans. Alan Bancroft (Leominster: Gracewing, 2009), 18.

11. Marmion, *Christ in His Mysteries*, 20.

Without going into the details, it is relevant to note that Marmion's reflections on Christ's mysteries and the liturgical year have to be situated in a Benedictine monastic context, where scholarly work went hand in hand with spiritual deepening, and where day and night were rhythmized by worship. The same privileged circumstances provided Dom Odo Casel (°1886—†1948) in the abbey of Maria Laach in the Rhineland, Germany, with everything he needed for his fine investigations into Christian antiquity and the early developments of liturgy. Casel realized that the Latin notions *mysterium* and *sacramentum* meant virtually the same, both in liturgical sources and in homilies and treatises by the church fathers. The (re)discovery of this almost full overlap of meaning arguably caused the greatest revolution in 20th century Catholic theology, precisely in the field of sacramental theology, with its close ties to the Liturgical Movement, as Joseph Ratzinger, not without some sense for exaggeration, suggested in an article dated 1966.¹²

The point I want to make here is that the full theological potential of the notion of mystery has not yet been exhausted and that the consequences of looking at the liturgical year through the lens of mystery is today as promising as it was when Casel conducted his research on ancient Greek and Latin sources and when Marmion held his spiritual conferences. The latter, moreover, are not to be put aside as mere spiritual nourishment or piety-enhancing literature; they constitute an example of systematic heortology in their own right. That being said, there are other stimulating commentaries on the liturgical year out there. They are usually considered merely spiritual and, or because, not academic enough, but this assessment rests on certain biases to which I don't subscribe. By way of example, one could refer here to Thomas Keating's *The Mystery of Christ: The Liturgy as Spiritual Experience*,¹³ Philip Pfatteicher's *Journey into the Heart of God: Living the Liturgical Year*,¹⁴ or Martin Connell's two-volume study with the intriguing title *Eternity Today: On the Liturgical Year*.¹⁵

12. Joseph Ratzinger, "Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz,;" Id., *Theologie der Liturgie: Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz*, Gesammelte Schriften, vol. 11 (Freiburg—Basel—Wien: Herder, 2008), 197: "Die vielleicht fruchtbarste theologische Idee unseres Jahrhunderts, die Mysterientheologie Odo Casels, gehört dem Bereich der Sakramententheologie zu und man kann wohl ohne Übertreibung sagen, dass seit dem Ende der Väterzeit die Theologie der Sakramente keine solche Blüte erlebt hat, wie sie ihr in diesem Jahrhundert im Zusammenhang mit den Ideen Casels geschenkt wurde, die ihrerseits nur auf dem Hintergrund der Liturgischen Bewegung und ihrer Wiederentdeckung des altchristlichen Gottesdienstes zu begreifen sind."

13. Thomas Keating, *The Mystery of Christ: The Liturgy as Spiritual Experience* (New York: Continuum, 2008).

14. Philip H. Pfatteicher, *Journey into the Heart of God: Living the Liturgical Year* (Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2013).

15. Martin Connell, *Eternity Today: On the Liturgical Year*, 2 vols. (New York—London: Continuum, 2006). The title of the first volume is *On God and Time, Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Candlemas*, and of the second one *Sunday, Lent, The Three Days, The Easter Season, Ordinary Time*.

A Theology of the *Sanctorale*: Engaging the Communion of Saints

In that latter work, Connell writes: “The Liturgical year is the church’s temporal medium for assembling its people to celebrate as the communion of saints at prayer.”¹⁶ It is worth pausing and chewing a bit (ruminating as it were) on this statement, which is as dense as it is concise. I want to highlight three things. First, the notion of ‘temporal medium’ is striking. It suggests that time itself is a primary bearer of symbolic meaning, at least if one is willing to interpret the word ‘medium’ here not in an instrumentalist but in a more substantial way. Second, the use of the verb ‘to celebrate’ is central to what is conveyed in the statement. The liturgical year, essentially, *is* a celebration. Third, Connell’s statement stands out in that it undeniably puts a fierce ecclesiological emphasis. The idea is advanced that the gathered assembly is put in conjunction with the communion of saints, whereby this conjunction is not something artificial or fictitious. Rather, the act of conjunction happens smoothly, almost naturally, i.e., without there being an absolute separation between the living and the dead. It is indeed an old and trustworthy tradition to consider the ones baptized and called for Christian worship *saints*. Their vocation is to help sanctify world and history, time and space, “always and everywhere,” by virtue of having accepted—or indeed “adopted”—the invitation to participate in the paschal mystery.

In other words, what is supposed here is a realism of sorts, a realism which, in the words of David McCarthy, “turns to the seemingly insignificant rather than the exceptional; it turns to ordinary people, the passing of time, and the multitude of ordinary things in the world.”¹⁷ Yet, it is precisely in the ordinary that an openness for transcendence offers and manifests itself, so that a communion beyond the limits of lived space and time can be established. McCarthy appropriately calls this realism a “hagiographic realism,” which “has a sacramental character where participation in the wholeness of reality is transferred to specific things and events in time, transferred not primarily as thing or text but through living relationships.”¹⁸ This complex of living relations is the communion of saints, which indeed deserves substantial theological rehabilitation.

A very helpful suggestion to connect this rehabilitation of the communion of saints with the celebration of the liturgy comes from Cardinal Walter Kasper. In a long essay in which he discusses contemporary challenges for liturgical theology and in which he makes a noted plea for a “new liturgical culture,” he comments on the idea that the church constantly moves between calling together the community of the faithful (*congregatio fidelium*) and preparing them for the communion of

16. Connell, *Eternity Today*, vol. 1, 52.

17. David Matzko McCarthy, *Sharing God’s Good Company: A Theology of the Communion of Saints* (Grand Rapids—Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), 46.

18. McCarthy, *Sharing God’s Good Company*, 45.

the saints (*communio sanctorum*).¹⁹ This constant move is the core of her very life; it is, as it were, the pulse of the heart of the Body of Christ. Kasper reminds his readers that the roots of this life lie in careful listening to the Word of God, which is to be understood not as a transfer of information but as communication. Through this *communication*, the *community* of the people sanctified by the sacraments of the Church is sustained by its being (called to be) a *communion* of saints. The common response or reaction to these elevated thoughts is, quite understandably, to turn immediately to the sacraments of baptism and Eucharist, as Kasper actually does. My proposal, however, is to shift the attention to the liturgical year instead, which is as sacramental or indeed as “mysterial”—a word coined to establish a difference with ordinary interpretations of what is “mysterious”—than the sacraments themselves. A systematic heortology thus unleashes a renewed dealing with the sanctoral cycle. Most attention has always gone, and rightly so, to the temporal cycle, with its continuous sequence of Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, a short period of ordinary time, Lent, the Triduum, the Easter season culminating in the solemnity of Pentecost, a long stretch of ordinary time, and Advent again. Evidently, because of the undisputed primacy of Christ, the temporal regime prevails over the sanctoral regime.²⁰ But it would be a serious mistake to neglect the *sanctorale*, for it contains so much truth, beauty, and goodness as well.

In other words, because of the central importance of the communion of saints, a systematic heortology would certainly not only engage the *proprium de tempore*, but also the *proprium de sanctis*, even with a special predilection. For it is “[t]he communion of saints [which] populates connections between the personal and the metaphysical, between now, people across time, and the future fullness of the kingdom of God,”²¹ as McCarthy eloquently puts it. A systematic heortology tirelessly explores the *sanctorale* to find the myriad ways in which these connections are made concrete and can be made into liturgical invitations for active participation in God’s mysteries.—In the next section I give an example of how that could work based on a detailed analysis of the sources.

19. Walter Kasper, “Aspekte einer Theologie der Liturgie: Liturgie angesichts der Krise der Moderne—für eine neue liturgische Kultur,” in Id., *Die Liturgie der Kirche*, Gesammelte Schriften, vol. 10 (Freiburg—Basel—Wien: Herder, 2010), 58–64.

20. Such is made abundantly clear by the Roman Catholic Church’s *Universal Norms on the Liturgical Year and the Calendar*, an often-understudied document that was nevertheless of tremendous importance for the implementation of the liturgical reforms in the wake of Vatican II. It was published in 1969. The basic inspiration for the norms here stipulated comes directly from *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, whose fifth chapter is entirely devoted to the liturgical year. What strikes one is that not only the Lord’s feasts but also the veneration of the saints is connected to the paschal mystery (cf. nr. 104), which thus functions as a kind of bridge between the different registers of the liturgical year.

21. McCarthy, *Sharing God’s Good Company*, 57.

A Subtle Hermeneutics of Liturgical Texts: Comparing the Feast of Saint Laurence (August 10) with the Memorial of Saint Martin of Tours (November 11)

To gain insight into how a systematic heortology might work in practice when it considers the sanctoral cycle and the veneration of the saints, it makes much sense to start with the feast of Saint Lawrence, celebrated on August 10 in the middle of the summer (in the northern hemisphere at least). A famous martyr, Saint Lawrence is tremendously important for the Romans, the city and church of Rome, and the Roman rite. The liturgy of his feast can count as a standard for comparing all the other saints, for it contains special material for all the components of a feast according to the Roman rite. Generally speaking, one can discern a law that says: the more specific euchological material a feast or memorial contains, the more important the saint. Saint Lawrence has unique material for almost every element, both in the register of the Eucharist and in the liturgy of the hours. Setting this standard sheds light on another very meaningful saint for the Roman rite, Saint Martin of Tours, arguably one of the most important saints of the European Middle Ages and the first non-martyr saint.²² It is on purpose that I select for the present reflections a saint from Rome and another one from Gaul, for, as liturgical historians know well, the history of the Roman rite shows many influences, not least among which are Gallican.

What, however, do the liturgical books say about Saint Lawrence and Saint Martin of Tours and what do the corresponding feasts look like? A systematic heortological approach would look not only at the missal for responding to these questions, which is the common reaction for many pastoral commentaries on the liturgical feasts (of the saints), but it would take into account *all* the liturgical books, including the breviary, the lectionary, and the martyrology. Let us start with the last one.

The Martyrology

The *editio typica* of the *Martyrologium Romanum* was published only in 2001, a second edition very soon followed in 2004.²³ There are 11 saints mentioned on November 11, including saints from Egypt, Brabant, Tuscany, Japan, Poland, Bulgaria as well as Theodore the Studite of Constantinople (°759—†826), not unknown among the guild of theologians. However, the slightly larger font leaves

22. It is a deliberate choice not to treat here the veneration for Mary, which has had a special status in the liturgy in general and the liturgical year in particular, with not just one but many feasts of diverse origins and meanings. A fitting survey of Marian feasts is offered by Katherine E. Harmon, *Mary and the Liturgical Year: A Pastoral Resource* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2023). This choice does not mean, of course, that a systematic heortological analysis of the liturgical material for Marian feasts, along the lines of what is done below, would not be a meaningful thing to do. However, already because of the size of such an undertaking, it clearly goes beyond the limits of the present contribution.

23. The *Martyrology* can be said to be the last fruit of the encompassing reforms of liturgical books in the aftermath of Vatican II.

no doubt that it is the commemoration of Saint Martin that prevails.²⁴ The brief biographical note of ten lines only (which is more than is common in the martyrology) mentions his descent from Pannonia, today in Hungary. It further says that his parents were pagans, that he joined the army and so ended up in Gaul. There he became a catechumen and was baptized. He left the army and withdrew near Ligugé as a hermit, during which time he was spiritually accompanied by Saint Hilary of Poitiers. Ordained a priest, he was then elected bishop of Tours and excelled by his exemplary ascetic life and pastoral zeal. He founded monasteries and parishes, preached the Gospel to the poor peasantry, and educated the clergy.

As usual, the martyrology does not give birth and death years of the saint, but it does mention that November 11 is actually not the day of Saint Martin's death but of his burial (*depositio*). However, we know from historical research that Martin lived in the fourth century; he was presumably born around 316 and probably died in 397, at the extraordinary age of around eighty-one. It is also known that even during his lifetime he enjoyed special recognition because of his holy way of life and that immediately after his death, by analogy with the apostles and the martyrs, he was venerated as a saint.²⁵ An official canonization as we know it today was inexistent in the first millennium, but for the historical development of the veneration of the saints, Martin of Tours occupies a peculiar place, since, as mentioned above, he is supposedly the first saint-not-martyr. With him starts a long series of so-called *confessores* (confessors or pastors, a distinctive category of saints) as well as a new practice and thinking concerning the saints. In any case, Martin of Tours became one of the most popular saints of the Middle Ages.²⁶

A comparison with what the *Martyrologium Romanum* says about Saint Lawrence reveals many similarities in approach. The text mentions nine saints on August 10, including martyrs from Alexandria, Japan, France, and Spain, including religious from the Franciscans and Salesians, Polish priests who died in the concentration camp of Dachau, and a bishop from Scotland. There is no doubt, however, that the feast of Saint Lawrence prevails, as the text about him is put in a slightly bigger font.²⁷ Even if historical certainty has become important in the theology of the veneration of the saints (at least since the Council of Trent), and even if nothing is known with certainty about Saint Lawrence, this feast has stood the test of the ages. Readers of the martyrology learn that he was a deacon who wished to un-

24. *Martyrologium Romanum*, editio altera (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 2004), 616–17.

25. His *vita* was written by Sulpicius Severus (363—ca. 420), a Christian author from Aquitaine, who had known Martin personally and became an admirer of him. He also knew Paulinus of Nola (ca. 354—†451), another church father who was instrumental in the earliest promotion of the veneration of the saints, in his case particularly Felix of Nola.

26. Olivier Guillot, *Saint Martin, apôtre des pauvres* (Paris: Fayard, 2008).

27. *Martyrologium Romanum*, 444–45.

dergo the same fate as his bishop, pope Xystus (Sixtus II),²⁸ that, according to Leo the Great, he was ordered to hand over the church's treasures to the authorities, but that, in response to that order, he came up with the poor of the city, that he was tortured for this brave gesture, died by flames, and that he was buried at the Campo Verano, which subsequently carries his name.²⁹

As the texts of the martyrology are usually read on the day before the celebration of a saint's feast, some essential information about who they were is supposed to be known on the day itself. Generally speaking, the liturgical books do not come back to any of the biographical details, certainly not extensively. It is important to realize that the liturgy of the Roman rite is extremely scarce, even reluctant so it seems, to give any concrete information about a saint's life. Rather, it emphasizes their significance and role in the communion of saints, their relationship with God, and their efforts for His Church. Neither do the liturgical books simply promote the lives of the saints as high-standing ethical examples; liturgy is neither moral teaching nor hagiography. Therefore, if there are any allusions to a saint's life, this is to be interpreted as a sign of their extraordinary significance. An explicit mention of their names is already a lot.

Moreover, one could derive from the liturgy a generalizable principle implying that the more specific euchological and scriptural material is provided for the hours and the mass on the day of their celebration, the more important a saint is. If we apply this principle to the feasts of Saint Lawrence and Saint Martin, one can infer that they truly are important saints. Painstaking attention to the liturgical weight of a saint is critically important from the perspective of systematic heortology, as it helps nuance the contributions of historical research, pastoral commentaries, hagiography, devotions, and spiritual interpretations. Basing ourselves only on the liturgical material provided for the *memoria* of Saint Martin and the *festum* of Saint Lawrence,³⁰ we can see that both of them are more important than other famous saints of the Roman rite, especially those who lived in modern times.

The Missal

When one looks at the mass forms, available in the Roman missals of 1570, 1962, and 2008—i.e., the first one promulgated in the immediate aftermath of the Coun-

28. There were severe persecutions under emperor Valerian in Rome in 258. According to tradition, the pope together with four deacons, among whom Lawrence, were killed.

29. The Basilica of San Lorenzo fuori le mura, one of the seven pilgrimage churches in Rome, is situated right next to the impressive cemetery of Campo Verano.

30. These are technical terms which refer to a different rank in the hierarchy of feasts. The highest rank is *sollemnitatis*, then there is *festum*, and finally *memoria*, which can be either obligatory or optional. In what follows, I forgo consistent use of the technical terms and mostly simply speak of feast.

cil of Trent,³¹ the last version of that one before the liturgical reforms issuing forth from Vatican II,³² and the one currently in use³³—one can observe some interesting tendencies. First, there is specific liturgical material provided for the feasts of both saints; there are no references to *communio* of either martyrs or confessors (which is not to say that it is theoretically excluded that this material shows correspondences with these *communio*). Second, one finds the names of the saints mentioned in the three orations or presidential prayers, at least in MR 2008, because in the past this was not the case.³⁴ Third, the feast of Saint Lawrence shows more continuity than the feast of Saint Martin. As far as the three orations on Saint Lawrence are concerned, one observes an entirely new collect, which no longer refers to the “flames of our vices” that were “overcome by the fire of his tortures,”³⁵ and moderate modifications to the prayer over the offerings and the prayer after communion. Concerning Saint Martin, one observes three completely new prayers in MR 2008 as compared to MR 1570, with an emphatic replacement of the *secreta* in MR 1962, whereby the latter has an entirely different text than in MR 1570. Strikingly, this text was again modified in MR 2008.³⁶

In sum, by and large, the two feasts presently show a great amount of correspondence at a structural level. In the past, however, this was different. Unlike the feast of Saint Martin, the feast of Saint Lawrence knew a vigil and an octave, which no longer exist today in the Roman rite. In the *Missale Romanum* of 1570, the ninth of August contains a mass form “in vigilia sancti Laurentii,” with specific euchological elements for all the individual components.³⁷ In addition, there was a rubric that said: “infra octavam sancti Laurentii fit idem officium quod in die:” during the octave, the same mass form is to be used as the one for the day (of the feast itself).³⁸

31. *Missale Romanum, editio princeps (1570)*, ed. Manlio Sodi—Achille Maria Triacca, Monumenta Liturgica Concilii Tridentini, vol. 2 (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012). Henceforth MR 1570.

32. *Missale Romanum, editio typica 1962*, ed. Manlio Sodi—Alessandro Toniolo, Monumenta Liturgica Piaana, vol. 1 (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2007). Henceforth MR 1962.

33. *Missale Romanum, editio typica tertia, reimpressio emendata* (Roma: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 2008). Henceforth MR 2008.

34. On this point, there is indeed a remarkable difference between the two saints if one compares the euchology of MR 1570 and MR 1962. Lawrence is mentioned in all the respective prayers; Martin, however, is neither mentioned in the *secreta* and *postcommunio* of MR 1570 nor in the *postcommunio* of MR 1962, but he is in the opening prayers of MR 1570 and MR 1962 as well as in the *secreta* of MR 1962.

35. MR 1570, 528; MR 1962, 706.

36. For the study of more similarities and differences, see the annexed tables. For a more general discussion of changes in the sanctoral between the missals of 1570 and 1962, see my contribution “International Saints from the Roman Missal: A Liturgical Perspective,” in Eleonora Rai—Michela Catto (eds.), *From Europe to Overseas: Saints, Martyrs, Heroes and Soft Power in an Early Modern Global Perspective* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2025), 337–53.

37. MR 1570, 527–28.

38. MR 1570, 529.

The Breviary

In the liturgy of the hours, the feast of Saint Martin has a special antiphon for the invitatory, which does mention his name;³⁹ the feast of Saint Lawrence takes over the invitatory's antiphon from the common of one martyr—which is the usual thing to do in case there isn't anything specific provided. This is already an indication of the hypothesized importance of the feast of Saint Martin but does not necessarily imply that the feast of Saint Lawrence would be less important.

The importance of both feasts is unambiguously confirmed when one looks at the “hinges” of the liturgy of the hours, lauds and vespers. One observes that in both cases, the feasts of Saint Martin and Saint Lawrence not only have an antiphon for the canticles of Zechariah and Mary, i.e. the Benedictus and the Magnificat, which regularly happens on saints' feasts, but additionally for the three psalms provided for both hours. Most strikingly, exactly half of these antiphons additionally mention Lawrence and Martin *nominatim* (cf. table below). In the case of Saint Martin, the antiphon accompanying the canticle of Mary in the evening prayer is the most elaborate among them and, compared to other antiphons, a quite elaborate one indeed:

This blessed bishop loved Christ with all his strength and had no fear of earthly rulers; though he did not die a martyr's death, this holy confessor won the martyr's palm.⁴⁰

In translations of this antiphon in other vernacular languages, Saint Martin is even addressed directly, unlike the English which speaks about him in the third person singular. In the case of Saint Lawrence, the Magnificat antiphon is not particularly elaborate, but it does mention the saint's name:

Blessed Lawrence said: The night is not dark for me; all things shine as in the noonday light.⁴¹

Furthermore, lauds and vespers on Saint Martin and Saint Lawrence have a special concluding prayer (*oratio*) for the occasion, which is also used in the office of readings.⁴² On Saint Martin, the short readings only minimally deviate from

39. *The Liturgy of the Hours*, Vol. IV: *Ordinary Time, Weeks 18-34* (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1975), 1552: “Come, let us worship our God as we celebrate the feast the Saint Martin.”

40. *The Liturgy of the Hours*, Vol. IV, 1556.

41. *The Liturgy of the Hours*, Vol. IV, 1309.

42. “Father, by his life and death Martin of Tours offered you worship and praise. Renew in our hearts the power of your love, so that neither death nor life may separate us from you. Grant this through our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever.” *Ibid.*, 1555. Correspondingly: “Father, you called Saint Lawrence to serve you by love and crowned his life with glorious martyrdom. Help us to be like him in loving you and doing your work. Grant this through our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever and ever.” *Ibid.*, 1308.

the regular schema of readings for “holy pastors.”⁴³ As to the short readings on Saint Lawrence both at lauds and at vespers, there is no difference between texts foreseen on the feasts of one martyr.⁴⁴

In the office of readings on Saint Lawrence, the second reading is taken from a sermon of Saint Augustine, in which the bishop of Hippo explicitly refers to Saint Lawrence and explains the meaning of martyrdom. He exhorts his listeners to take Saint Lawrence as an example, arguing that what he did comes so close to what Christ himself did.⁴⁵ On Saint Martin, an excerpt is read from a letter by Sulpicius Severus, the saint’s hagiographer. It recounts the story of his death at Candes,⁴⁶ where Martin, dying, would have expressed the hope that, once dead, he would be welcomed by Abraham in heaven. Words from this letter—“he neither feared to die nor refused to live”⁴⁷—are reiterated in the responsory of the office, and by the way also in the antiphons of lauds. Clearly, a systematic heortological study of the feast of Saint Martin, relying on a synchronic reading of the liturgical material, can lay bare an intriguing intertextuality, which in its turn sheds light on the major themes of the feast.

Table synthesizing the data from the Liturgy of the Hours

		Saint Lawrence	Saint Martin
Invitatory	Antiphon	c 1m	P
Office of readings	Psalm antiphons	c 1m	c 1p
	1st reading	P (Acts 6)	c 1p
	Responsory	P	c 1p
	2nd reading	P (Aug.)	P (Sulp. Sev.)
	Responsory	P + name	P
	Prayer	P (= lauds)	P (= lauds)

43. Whereas the common of one pastor has Hebrews 13:7-9a at lauds, on Saint Martin only Hebrews 13:7-8 is read. As to the short reading at vespers, Saint Martin’s feast takes over all the verses foreseen, i.e. 1 Peter 5:1-4, but they are printed separately.

44. They are 2 Corinthians 1:3-5 and 1 Peter 4:13-14, respectively. As in the case of Saint Martin, these texts are printed separately on the pages pertaining to the forms of the individual saint.

45. *The Liturgy of the Hours*, Vol. IV, 1305–7.

46. This is a village in Western France at the confluence of the rivers Loire and Vienne, somewhere between Poitiers in the south and Angers in the north.

47. *The Liturgy of the Hours*, Vol. IV, 1553.

Morning prayer (lauds)	Psalm antiphon 1	P	P + name
	Psalm antiphon 2	P	P + name
	Psalm antiphon 3	P + name	P + name
	Reading	= c1m	< c1p
	Responsory	P	= c1p
	Benedictus anti- phon	P	P
	Intercessions	c1m	c1p
	Prayer	P + name	P + name
Evening prayer II (vespers)	Psalm antiphon 1	P + name	P
	Psalm antiphon 2	P + name	P
	Psalm antiphon 3	P	P + name
	Reading	= c1m	= c1p
	Responsory	P	= c1p
	Magnificat anti- phon	P + name	P
	Intercessions	c1m	c1p
	Prayer	P (= lauds)	P (= lauds)

Explanation of the codes:

- c1m = from the common of one martyr (St. Lawrence)
- c1p = from the common of one confessor (St. Martin)
- P = proper

What, now, did this systematic-theological exercise, this analysis of the unique liturgical material of the feasts of Saint Lawrence and Saint Martin produce? I limit myself to two mutually building insights. First, there is not a single doubt that the feasts of both saints are significant feasts in the Roman rite, far more important than many other feasts of saints, even of more famous saints. The feasts demonstrate that liturgy, through its multifaceted euchology,⁴⁸ finds a uniquely distinctive way of adding its own emphases, complementary to historical research or pastoral perspectives on the veneration of the saints. Unfortunately, however, this unique contribution of liturgical sources is systematically neglected in mainstream theology. Second, faith in the communion of saints can be enriched powerfully by a thorough study of the *proprium de sanctis*. Through systematic-heortological detailed analyses, its ecclesiological, Christological, doxological, and eschatological dimensions can be

48. In addition, there are also para- and extra-liturgical elements, not to mention popular devotions and local customs, which could easily underline the importance of both feasts. All of this is not to deny that the importance of saints' feasts is always also dependent on historical contingencies and cultural factors. These, however, did not constitute the focus of the above analysis of liturgical sources. In this respect, it probably needs to be repeated that a systematic heortology should align itself with the outcomes of historical research and the critical insights gained through it.

further scrutinized and made fruitful for the life of the churches. Moreover, the work carried out here can—and should—be meaningfully repeated and extended based on a study of other, both similar and different, liturgical sources. One could think, e.g., of local martyrologies, breviaries, sacramentaries, and missals from the past. They would modify the conclusion that the communion of saints is built mainly on the worship practices of the ancient Roman church.

Reaching out to the Visual Arts: Engaging the Work of Frère Yves

A final building block for a systematic heortology that I want to touch on briefly is the constructive contribution that can be made by the visual arts. Indeed, theology, in my view, does not ‘happen’ merely through words, concepts, discourses, and theories, whether written down and transmitted through texts or not, but also through images and colors.⁴⁹ The history of painting and iconography offers an immense resource of images of the liturgical year’s major feasts, including Easter and Christmas, but also feasts such as the Exaltation of the Cross and the Transfiguration, thereby offering food for theological thought. In fact, a brilliant example of how this is concretely possible can be observed in the finely crafted paintings of Frère Yves, Pierre Vitry. Indeed, a not insignificant part of Frère Yves’ pictorial oeuvre concerns the liturgical year.⁵⁰ One could say—and I claim—that he designed a systematic heortology in image and color, and that in this way he not only captured the deep meaning of the Christian mysteries himself but that he captured them in such a way as to make others, children and adults, partakers of them.

Frère Yves Pitry (°1923—†2023) lived to be one hundred years old. He was a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Sainte Marie de la Pierre-qui-Vire, located in the forests of the Morvan in Burgundy, France, where he entered in 1946. His talent for drawing and aptitude for art were noticed and, among other things, he was enlisted in the abbey’s gigantic work of documenting Romanesque and Gothic art in various countries (France, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Switzerland, Germany, etc.) in series of dozens of books. The Abbey of La Pierre-qui-Vire is indeed known internationally for its *Zodiaque* editions. The thorough familiarity with early and medieval Christian art that Frère Yves gained in this way, together with his regular life as a monk, inspired him to reflect deeply on the meaning of Scripture and the liturgy.⁵¹ The repercussions of that repeated reading and rumination can be found in his paintings. Because his images abstract from context and detail, and thus

49. Theology equally ‘happens’ through sounds and tones, by the way, so a systematic heortology could also benefit greatly from an exchange with the music.

50. *L’année liturgique de frère Yves*, La Pierre-qui-Vire.

51. A very regrettable incident in the life of Frère Yves occurred in connection with the illustrations he had made for a children’s Bible in the mid-1950s. The reactions to his style by church officials hurt him deeply, which reportedly caused him to stay silent for many years. However, his community and superiors have always continued to support him, and in old age he has even been surprisingly productive, including an impressive twenty-piece work depicting the mysteries of the rosary commissioned by the monastic community of Sainte Odile in Alsace, France.

have something timeless in their deceptive simplicity, it is natural to compare Frère Yves' paintings to icons from the Byzantine tradition. These, too, as far as their depiction of the mysteries of Christ in the liturgical year is concerned, are characterized by a certain hieraticism and a rendition of what is written in Scripture and what tradition has handed down.

In the abbey where Brother Yves lived and where he is also buried, in the visitors center where they explain their life, prayer, and work, near the monastery store, his fellow brothers set up a whole room dedicated to his cycle on the liturgical year. This is not only a tribute, but also an invitation to initiation into the displayed mysteries themselves. For each mystery or feast, a brief explanation is given based on a quotation from the Bible. Anyone entering the space is immediately struck by the sobriety and the clarity of the colors with which Frère Yves works: vermillion, ochre, and blue, not coincidentally the primary colors, complemented by white for the figures. Wonderful, for example, are the ways in which Easter and the Resurrection are depicted, with the testimony of the women who intended to embalm Jesus' body but discovered the empty tomb; or the Last Supper or Maundy Thursday, with the emphatically empty chair of Judas having already left the premises; or the Assumption of Mary, eternally asleep without being tainted by the decay of the body; or Christmas, with the shepherds' visit of the newborn and the angels' song of praise. The point is: a systematic heortological analysis can be made of all these Christian feasts, the conclusion of which can be no other than that it can only support Frère Yves' imagery, and vice versa.

Conclusion: On a Desideratum of Liturgical Theology

To propose a program of systematic heortology amounts to formulating a major desideratum for contemporary liturgical theology. Instead of losing oneself in science-theoretical speculations, it is better to put one's hand on the plow. That is what was tried above. I have shown how liturgical theology, in the guise of a systematic heortology, can play a significant role in contemporary theology, combining serious and thorough academic work with prompts for spiritual deepening, constantly moving between the exteriority of celebrations, feasts, and texts and the interiority of the life of the mind, between tradition and community on the one hand and the human person on the other. In doing so, liturgical theology cannot fail to operate in an intrinsically interdisciplinary fashion, that is, through a vast multiplicity of unrelenting conversations with all manner of knowing and wisdom, from detailed textual investigations to an exchange with the arts, as indeed with its older sisters, history and pastoral liturgy. The program for a systematic heortology of the future will be able to play a role in untangling the deepest human knots, in better understanding and being able to explain what the Christian faith stands for, and in the study of Christian worship of course. The reason why this is so has to do with the fact that it does not reserve a small field of expertise or separate niche for itself, to the detriment of other disciplines, methods, and approaches, but because it works fundamentally, truly synthetically, *ad maiorem Dei gloriam* ...

Comparing euchological material from the Roman Missal

Die 10 augusti—S. LAURENTII MARTYRIS

	MR 1570	MR 1962	MR 2008
<i>Ant. ad introitum</i>	Confessio et pulchritudo in conspecto eius: sanctitas et magnificentia in sanctificatione eius. Psal. Cantate Domino canticum novum: cantate Domino, omnis terra. V. Gloria Patri.	Ps. 95, 6 Confessio et pulchritudo in conspecto eius: sanctitas et magnificentia in sanctificatione eius. Ps. ibid., 1 Cantate Domino canticum novum: cantate Domino, omnis terra. V. Gloria Patri.	Hic est beatus Laurentius, qui pro ope Ecclesiae semetipsum tradidit: propterea meruit martyrium passionem, ut laetus ascenderet ad Dominum Iesum Christum.
<i>Oratio/Collecta</i>	Da nobis, quaesumus, omnipotens Deus: vitiorum nostrorum flammam extinguere; qui beato Laurentio tribuisti tormentorum suorum incendia superare. Per Dominum.	Da nobis, quaesumus, omnipotens Deus: vitiorum nostrorum flammam extinguere; qui beato Laurentio tribuisti tormentorum suorum incendia superare. Per Dominum.	Deus, cuius caritas ardore beatus Laurentius servitio claruit fidelis et martyro gloriosus, fac nos amare quod amavit, et opere exercere quod docuit. Per Dominum.
<i>Ant. ad offertorium</i>	Confessio et pulchritudo in conspecto eius: sanctitas et magnificentia in sanctificatione eius.	Ps. 95, 6 Confessio et pulchritudo in conspecto eius: sanctitas et magnificentia in sanctificatione eius.	/
<i>Secreta/Super oblata</i>	Accipe, quaesumus domine, munera dignanter oblata: et, beati Laurentii suffragantibus meritis, ad nostrae salutis auxilium provenire concedere. Per Domnum nostrum.	Accipe, quaesumus, Domine, munera dignanter oblata: et, beati Laurentii suffragantibus meritis, ad nostrae salutis auxilium provenire concedere. Per Domnum nostrum.	Suscipe propitius, Domine, munera in beati Laurentii celebritate laetanter oblata, et ad nostrae salutis auxilium provenire concede.
<i>Ant. ad communionem</i>	Qui mihi ministrat, me sequatur: et ubi ego sum, illic et minister meus erit.	Io. 12, 26 Qui mihi ministrat, me sequatur: et ubi ego sum, illic et minister meus erit.	Cf. Io 12, 26 Qui mihi ministrat, me sequatur; et ubi ego sum, illic et minister meus erit.

<i>Postcommunio/Post communionem</i>	Sacro munere satiati, supplices te, Domine, deprecamur: ut, quod debitate servitutis celebramus officio, intercedente beato Laurentio martyre tuo, salvationis tuae sentiamus augmentum. Per Dominum nostrum Christum filium tuum.	Sacro munere satiati, supplices te, Domine, deprecamur: ut, quod debitate servitutis celebramus officio, intercedente beato Laurentio Martyre tuo, salvationis tuae sentiamus augmentum. Per Dominum.	Sacro munere satiati, supplices te, Domine, deprecamur, ut, quod in festivitate beati Laurentii debitae servitutis praestamus obsequium, salvationis tuae sentiamus augmentum. Per Christum.
--------------------------------------	--	---	--

Die 11 novembris—S. Martini Ep.et Conf.

	MR 1570	MR 1962	MR 2008
<i>Ant. ad introitum</i>	Statuit ei Dominus testamentum pacis, et principem fecit eum: ut sit illi sacerdotii dignitas in aeternum. Ps. Memento, Domine, David: et omnis mansuetudinis eius. V. Gloria Patri et filio.	Eccli. 45, 30 Statuit ei Dominus testamentum pacis, et principem fecit eum: ut sit illi sacerdotii dignitas in aeternum. Ps. 131, 1 Memento, Domine, David: et omnis mansuetudinis eius. V. Gloria Patri.	Cf. 1 Sam 2, 35 Suscitabo mihi sacerdotem fidelem, qui iuxta cor meum et animam meam faciet, dicit Dominus.
<i>Oratio/Collecta</i>	Deus, qui conspicias, quia ex nulla nostra virtute subsistimus: concede propitius; ut, intercessione beai Martini Confessoris tui atque Pontificis, contra omnia adversa muniamur. Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, Filium tuum.	Deus, qui conspicias, quia ex nulla nostra virtute subsistimus: concede propitius; ut, intercessione beai Martini Confessoris tui atque Pontificis, contra omnia adversa muniamur. Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, Filium tuum: Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate.	Deus, qui in beato Martino episcopo sive per vitam sive per mortem magnificatus es, innova gratiae tuae mirabilia in cordibus nostris, ut neque mors neque vita separare nos possit a caritate tua. Per Dominum.
<i>Ant. ad offertorium</i>	Veritas mea et misericordia mea cum ipso: et in nomine meo exaltabitur cornu eius.	Ps. 88, 25 Veritas mea et misericordia mea cum ipso: et in nomine meo exaltabitur cornu eius.	/

<i>Secreta/Super oblata</i>	Da, misericors Deus: ut haec nos salutaris oblatio, et a propriis reatibus indesinenter expediat, et ab omnibus tueatur adversis. Per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum filium tuum.	Sanctifica, quaesumus, Domine Deus, haec munera, quae in solemnitate sancti Antistitis tui Martini offerimus: ut per ea vita nostra inter adversa et prospera ubique dirigatur. Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, Filium tuum: Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate.	Sanctifica, quaesumus, Domine Deus, haec munera, quae in honorem sancti Martini offerimus, ut per ea vita nostra inter adversa et prospera semper dirigatur. Per Christum.
<i>Ant. ad communionem</i>	Beatus servus, quem, cum venerit dominus, invenerit vigilantem: amen dico vobis, super omnia bona sua constituet eum.	Mt. 24, 46-47 Beatus servus, quem, cum venerit dominus, invenerit vigilantem: amen dico vobis, super omnia bona sua constituet eum.	Cf. Mt 25, 40 Amen dico vobis, quamdiu fecistis uni ex his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis, dicit Dominus.
<i>Postcommunio/Post communionem</i>	Praesta, quaesumus, Domine Deus noster: ut, quorum festivitate votiva sunt sacramenta, eorum intercessione salutaria nobis reddantur. Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum.	Praesta, quaesumus, Domine Deus noster: ut, quorum festivitate votiva sunt sacramenta, eorum intercessione salutaria nobis reddantur. Per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, Filium tuum: Qui tecum vitit et regnat in unitate.	Da nobis, Domine, unitatis sacramento refectis, perfectam in omnibus cum tua voluntate concordiam, ut, sicut beatus Martinus totum se tibi subiecit, ita et nos esse veraciter gloriemur. Per Christum.