

In the Easter 2002 issue – 115

<i>Laetare Vehementer</i> – Editorial	2
Spring Meeting – full details	2
AGM at Leicester – October 2002	4
Retreat at Pluscarden in 2004	4
Martin Lynch – Notice of Requiem Mass	5
– Obituary by Bernard Marriott	5
– Personal Memoir by Christopher Francis	6
The Latin Liturgical Tradition – <i>by Mgr Arthur Calkins</i>	8
<i>New Missale Romanum</i> – <i>by the Editor</i>	24
<i>Veterum Sapientia</i> – 40 years on	27
Salesian’s Latin Course – <i>on Internet</i>	28

LAETARE VEHEMENTER

Editorial

It would be easy enough to focus on situations to be lamented or on struggles still to be fought. There is however a case for looking for something over which to rejoice. We need scarcely look further than the editor’s own doorstep where, thanks to a happy accident of location, he and his neighbours in Central London enjoy perhaps better access to good Latin liturgy than may be found elsewhere in Christendom.

This is a humbling thought, but consider: within fifteen minutes travel, there is a choice on every weekday of at least two full Latin said Masses plus a largely Latin sung Mass. On Holydays the choice widens. Every Sunday, no less than twelve full Latin Masses are available in comfortable range, plus as many part-Latin Masses for the less fastidious. There is easy access to Latin Vespers on Sundays and most weekdays. Needless to say, an admirable standard of liturgical music is maintained in most of the above.

This demonstrates what is possible, that suffering under an all enveloping vernacular is neither inevitable nor unchangeable. Let us hasten to add that we do not see ourselves as an elite, or eccentric or particularly adventurous or rebellious. We are ordinary people, our priests are normal priests. Our missals are the official books of the Church, our music is genuine liturgical music. We have no wish to be boastful or smug. It would be splendid if we could share our

good fortune more widely. In the meantime we must not cease to provide an example and inspiration. *Laetare Londinium!*

If that were not rejoicing enough for the moment, there comes from Rome news of the new Latin *Missale Romanum*, of the Pope's commendation of the great document *Veterum Sapientia* and of the Salesians' notable initiative to promote the teaching and use of Latin. All are dealt with in this Newsletter. *Laetare Ecclesia!*

SPRING MEETING Members and friends are cordially invited to this event which will take place on Saturday 27th April. The programme is as follows:

12.00 noon Solemn Sung Latin Mass
at St Wulstan's, Little Malvern, Worcs.

1.30 p.m. Lunch at Malvern Hills Hotel
followed by a talk about Sir Edward Elgar

3.15 p.m. depart for Worcester

4.00 p.m. Vespers and Benediction
at St George's, 1 Sansome Place, Worcester

For those coming by Train

A minibus will be available to transport members to and from the station(s) and between churches.

It will meet these trains at **Great Malvern** station:

8.48 from London Paddington arriving at 11.27

9.43 from Birmingham New Street arriving at 10.54

after the meeting there are trains as follows:

from **Worcester Foregate Street** for Birmingham at 17.39

from **Worcester Shrub Hill** for Paddington at 17.57

Members are advised to check train times nearer the date. Please indicate on the lunch form if you wish to travel in the minibus. We would be glad of a donation of £ 15.00 to help defray the cost

For those coming by Car

St Wulstan's is on the A449 at Little Malvern, just north of the junction with the A4104 (follow signs to 'Elgar Grave')

Limited parking is available by the Pine Shop opposite and on the road if care is taken. Safer parking is available at the Malvern Hills Hotel (15 minutes walk away) by the junction with the B4232.

St George's is in Sansome Place, Worcester off Sansome Walk, by the railway bridge

Parking should be available in the church car park

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 2002

This will take place on **Saturday 19th October**, at the Holy Cross Priory, Leicester, beginning with Solemn Latin Mass at 11.30 a.m. After lunch, there will be a full programme as usual, including a speaker, tea, business meeting and Benediction.

One of our members, Fr Richard Conrad, OP, was recently elected Prior at Holy Cross, and he has readily agreed to our having the AGM there, on our Chairman's home patch. Leicester is readily accessible, being 'right at the centre' as its slogan says. Holy Cross is near the railway station, with through trains from Cambridge, Sheffield, Liverpool, Crewe and Coventry (all hourly), London (four per hour), and Birmingham (two per hour).

RETREAT AT PLUSCARDEN IN 2004

It is proposed to hold a retreat for members at Pluscarden Abbey at Eastertide 2004. This is open to both ladies and gentlemen, and depending on numbers we could have the exclusive use of both guesthouses. We would supply our own spiritual director, but participants would be free to follow as much of the monastic routine as they wished (services are conducted in the new rite in Latin). Because of the distance involved, and the experience we should wish to create, a stay of some five days is envisaged.

Although Easter 2004 is a long way off, and few of us can plan with any certainty so far ahead, it is important to supply the Abbey with an "earnest of intent", particularly since we may well be taking up all their available accommodation.

Easter is their busiest time and people book up to a year in advance so we need to get ahead. The Guestmaster has advised us that the end of Easter week 2004 – to include Low Sunday- would be a good time, and we should like to give him an idea of participants for that date as soon as possible. At this stage we are just asking for provisional numbers.

REQUIEM MASS FOR MARTIN LYNCH

A Sung Latin Requiem Mass is to be celebrated in memory of our former Chairman at The Church of the Immaculate Conception – Farm Street London W1 on **Saturday, 15th June at 12.00 noon**

OBITUARY

by Bernard Marriott

Martin joined the ALL in 1972, and was elected to the Council in 1973. He became the Association's second Chairman in 1976, a position he held until 1988, and he remained on the Council as Secretary until 1991.

After service with the RAF during the War, Martin joined the Civil Service, rising in due course to the rank of Under Secretary in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Following his retirement in 1983, he moved to the College of Optometrists, becoming Assistant to the General Optical Council in 1989, and an Honorary Member in 1997. He was the author of *The College of Optometrists: a History 1980-98*.

Martin succeeded Dr Dick Richens as Chairman of the ALL. Dick had been the prime mover behind our publishing the *Ordo Missae* and *Missa de Angelis* sheets. By 1976 he was heavily involved in the compilation of the texts for our Missal and had also spent two years in correspondence with the Liturgy Commission. Martin took over these negotiations and eventually secured the Commission's approval so that the Missal could receive the *Imprimatur*.

Further years of his time and energy were taken up in attempting to find a publisher, which in the climate of that time proved fruitless, at which stage the Association decided to publish the work itself, finally doing so at the end of 1982. Martin's frustrations were not over. He approached the hierarchies of the United States and Canada, seeking support from them for our selling the Missal in those countries which, alas, was not forthcoming.

A bald statement now about these activities does nothing to convey the amount of work involved, the skills of a senior civil servant which Martin applied to the job, and the sheer persistence and patience in the face of continual setbacks. Amidst all this, Martin led successful visits to seminaries: Ushaw in 1977 and 1982, and Womersley in 1981. He made a valiant attempt to have a Mass in Latin as an integral part of the National Pastoral Congress, held in Liverpool in 1980, and he had the depressing business of corresponding with bishops in a number of dioceses where members had complained about Masses in Latin being dropped from their parishes.

Martin's skills lay not simply in those of a diplomat. He took on the role of Secretary from Ruth Richens in 1983. Whilst Chairman, not only did he run Council meetings conscientiously and with unflinching charm and patience, he also took notes and wrote the minutes. He even took on the work of despatching most of our publications himself for a period, together with the tedious burden of paperwork that went with it, and maintained an active role in this capacity until after his retirement from Council in 1991.

Any account of Martin's work on behalf of the Association must include mention of the support from his wife Anne. Although not a member of the Association, Anne's help was invaluable, and we are greatly in her debt. She may be assured of Martin's lasting place in the affection of members of the ALL which owes so much to his dedicated chairmanship.

Iustorum autem animae in manu Dei sunt et non tanget illos tormentum mortis.

MARTIN LYNCH

A Personal Memoir by Christopher Francis

A few times in one's life one meets a person who not only becomes an exceptional friend but also passes on wisdom and experience which could never have been gained from books. Such a friend was Martin. Of all the good things which working in the Association brought me over the years, Martin's friendship was the best.

To begin with I was, as a young man, frankly in awe of him. The immense skill with which he guided the deliberations of the Council at those Farm Street meetings during his long chairmanship was a complete model of how it should be done, and in all of the time I have served on various committees I have

never seen it done better. Martin's dry and penetrating wit led to many highly amusing passages during what would otherwise have been deeply tedious business. Often a wry grimace or sudden expression of mock alarm would express his feelings even more succinctly. I felt we were benefiting, as indeed we were, from his early training in the Civil Service during its heyday of literacy. Collaboration with him over publications, which in one way or another took up a great deal of our time, was also enlightening. He had an amazing grasp of detail and a fine judgement, and I learned a huge amount from him in both respects.

Away from the Council table Martin was an illuminating and amusing friend, though also quite a shy one. Often the warmth of his affection was only momentarily revealed: his formation had been in an earlier school, and there was always a degree of formality and old-fashioned courtesy about him of a kind which has now virtually disappeared from England. Anecdotes, sometimes cheerfully indiscreet, of life in the upper echelons of the Civil Service were occasionally dispensed, as were, though more sparingly and more alarmingly, tales of life as a young navigator in Lancasters of Bomber Command in the latter years of the War.

Martin's reading was wide, in French and German as well as in English, his erudition profound. His knowledge and understanding of modern British history and of its protagonists were very extensive, and he assimilated it all into a coherent view of the last couple of hundred years of British history: I could always go to him with a query and come away enlightened. And his interest went back further: when I sounded him out about the Council's wish to make a presentation to him on his retirement he asked if he could have a copy of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*. It gave me great pleasure, having scoured the antiquarian bookshops of the west, to find him a fine contemporary edition in several volumes, with which he was delighted.

I have many happy memories of Martin; lunching with him at his club, the Reform, of which he was very fond; more modest but equally enjoyable lunches in pubs in his adopted Somerset and days at home with Anne; but the occasion I remember with the greatest pleasure is a sunny day in London when my wife and I toured the Cabinet War Rooms in Whitehall with him. Martin's huge enjoyment of those remarkable chambers and his brilliant flow of stories about the personages associated with them will always stay with me. I have a photograph I took of him at a café table, in one hand the characteristic cigarette

and in the other a dry martini, talking, on his face that shy, wry smile. Despite the possible lack of dry martinis in the Celestial regions, my prayer is, with St Thomas More, ‘that we may all meet together merrily in heaven’.

THE LATIN LITURGICAL TRADITION:

“Extending and solidifying the continuity” by Monsignor Arthur Calkins

Address delivered to the LLA of the USA at its Convention in Chicago 2001

I. The Immaculate Heart of Mary

I find it very significant that I have been asked to present this conference on the day which is designated on the present Roman calendar as the Memorial of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the last feast in the liturgical year whose reckoning is based on the Easter cycle. It seems very appropriate to me not only because I rejoice that the last feast determined by the date of Easter should focus on the mystery of our redemption through the prism of Mary’s Immaculate Heart, but also because I am convinced that penetrating into this mystery can shed light on the delicate and complex matters involved in my topic and help to put them into perspective.

The Heart of Mary is mentioned twice in the Gospel of St Luke in chapter 2, verses 19 and 51, both of which emphasize how Mary pondered the events which she experienced and the words which she heard in her heart. Indeed, Mary’s meditating in her heart is cited in the Second Vatican Council’s Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation in its discussion on the development of doctrine. Let us listen to that text for a moment:

The Tradition that comes from the apostles makes progress in the Church, with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth in insight into the realities that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts (cf. Lk. 2:19 and 15). It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities, which they experience. And it comes from the preaching of those who have received, along with their right of succession in the episcopate, the sure charism of truth. Thus, as centuries go by, the Church is always advancing towards the plenitude of divine truth until eventually the words of God are fulfilled in her.¹

Now there are probably not a few of us who are concerned that much “development” which has taken place since the Council has obscured the

Church's liturgical tradition and is not an organic development such as envisaged in the text which I just cited. In many ways we need to appropriate Our Lady's dispositions: to step back, to ponder, to reflect, to weigh in our hearts the matters which concern us in this regard, even as she had to ponder during the earthly life of Jesus. We need the serenity and wisdom of Mary's Heart in order to discern the movements of the Spirit and legitimate developments in doctrine which are taking place even in this difficult, but glorious season of the Church's life in which we live. Most of all, we need her intercession so that we may ever be her loyal children, loving sons and daughters of our Holy Mother the Church who is inseparable from Mary herself.ⁱⁱ

II. The Present Complicated Situation

It is from within the mystery of the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary that I now invite you to reflect with me over the present situation of the Latin liturgical tradition as it is maintained in the United States. First of all, I am aware that there are many different reasons for being drawn to the celebration of the Mass in Latin: a love for the language itself, an appreciation for the role of the Roman Rite in the transmission of the Church's Tradition (with a capital t) and traditions (with a small t), an affinity for Gregorian chant and classical polyphony, a comfortable familiarity with the Church's Latin liturgical heritage which seems to have disappeared in so many places almost overnight, but which can still be a powerful conductor of the sense of the sacred. It must also be admitted that for not a negligible number the attraction to the Latin Mass also provides a refuge from seemingly endless liturgical experimentation and novelty, desacralization and "dumbing down".

Having worked in the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* for over twelve years, I am very well aware of these many factors. The situation is seen to be more complex, however, when one begins to take into consideration the English-language propaganda for the traditional Latin Mass which comes from various groups not in full communion with the Church, but identifying themselves as the real bearers of the Catholic Tradition and from pressure groups within the Church. Most of this material is written in what I call "attack mode". A lengthy article by Michael Davies in the most recent number of *The Latin Mass*, for instance, contains this comment about Mgr Camille Perl and myself who have worked in *Ecclesia Dei* for many years:

Its permanent bureaucrats do not have the least idea of what motivates the traditional Catholics in their insistence upon Mass according to the 1962

Missal. They consider traditionalists to be ignorant, narrow-minded, and rigid. They do not believe that it is in any way their task to persuade bishops to guarantee respect for what the Holy Father terms the rightful aspirations of traditionalists.ⁱⁱⁱ

I am quite prepared to justify the difficult work that the Commission has been attempting to do under trying circumstances during these pioneer years with no clear road map, but I do not think that this is the appropriate moment to do so. What I wish to point out is that such exercises in misrepresentation do not serve to build up the Body of Christ in love (cf. I Cor. 12:25; Eph. 4:12), but continue to lacerate it, to pierce the Hearts of Jesus and Mary.

Unfortunately, a great deal of the available English-language literature in favour of maintaining the Latin liturgical tradition comes from sources which assail the validity, legitimacy and doctrinal exactitude of the Roman Missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970^{iv} or at least strongly imply that “real” Catholics will only settle for Mass according to the 1962 Roman Missal in its pure and “unadulterated” form.

The situation is rendered even more complicated by bishops, priests’ senates and diocesan liturgical commissions who tell their people that the Second Vatican Council mandated the Mass in the vernacular and, since they are obedient to the Council and the magisterium, that is the only form of the Mass that will be permitted in their dioceses. Flying in the face of canon 928 of the 1983 Code of Canon Law which states that “The Eucharist is to be celebrated in the Latin language or in another language provided the liturgical texts have been legitimately approved”, there is also synodal legislation in the United States stating that no Mass with a congregation may be celebrated in Latin without the prior approval of the bishop or his delegate. But there are also other serious complicating factors to be taken into consideration. Some dioceses do not have sufficient priests to meet the immediate pastoral needs of their existing parishes; there are a good number of priests ordained in the past generation who do not know Latin and, finally, there is a large majority of the faithful who prefer to have the liturgy celebrated in their own language. For this reason we should all applaud the most recent document of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, *Liturgiam Authenticam*, which deals with the need for more faithful translations of liturgical texts.

III. The “Traditionalist” Phenomenon

Having barely touched upon some of the major and complex factors on the Latin liturgical landscape, I must now address myself to the phenomenon known as “traditionalism” since it largely dominates the Latin Mass scene. I use the word in quotation marks and as a matter of convenience. It covers a range from Catholics loyal to the Holy See and attached to the classical Roman liturgy to those “linked in various ways to the Fraternity founded by Archbishop Lefebvre”^v to those who are “sedevacantists” and who believe that there is presently no legitimate Pope occupying the See of Peter. There are even those who identify themselves as “traditionalist” Catholics as if this designates a particular species of Catholics not to be confused with “garden variety” Roman Catholics. Please note that when I use the word “traditionalist” in this presentation I am not referring to serious Catholics who love the Church, are docile to her teaching and “are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition”^{vi}; I am speaking, rather, of ideologists who have no concern for the care of souls (cf. Jn. 10:12-13) and who are totally committed to a crusade for the restoration of the 1962 Roman Missal.

Where does this phenomenon come from? It might be seen as a backlash to much over-hasty liturgical innovation and poor application of the reforms called for by the Second Vatican Council. Indeed, from being a justified reaction to so much havoc wreaked in the name of the Council by pseudo-experts in every phase of the Church’s life, much accepted “traditionalist” doctrine has passed into being a rejection of the Council itself. A standard “traditionalist” argument is that the Council was not convoked to deal with doctrinal matters, but was merely “pastoral” and so can be conveniently ignored. This kind of superficial reasoning completely overlooks the fact that two of the Council’s documents are entitled “dogmatic constitutions” and that in a number of significant areas the Council made advances in the development of Catholic doctrine.

IV. “Traditionalist” Postulates

“Traditionalist” doctrine is not strictly codified because there are so many shades of “traditionalism”. Nonetheless certain recurring postulates can be formulated even though they may not be applicable to every person or group which identifies itself as “traditionalist”.

1. The Second Vatican Council was a mistake or should not have been summoned or was an anti-council. This is quite a separate matter from dealing with individual conciliar texts which, Pope John Paul II tells us, should always be interpreted in the light of the Church's great tradition. Interestingly, both ultra-liberals and "traditionalists" interpret the Council as a major break from all that went before it. The first group, of course, exulting about it while "traditionalists" wring their hands in anguish. The second spring, which the Pope confidently speaks of, will only come about when the Council is interpreted *ad mentem Ecclesiae*.

2. The conciliar popes beginning with Blessed John XXIII or Paul VI taught manifestly false doctrine and so, having lapsed into heresy, forfeited being successors of Peter and should not be considered legitimate popes (this is sedevacantism) or their teaching is so consistently confused that it can no longer be accepted as a sure guide for the faithful who must decide for themselves about what ought to be maintained and what ought to be rejected (this is Protestantism). Last year, for instance, a group of American "traditionalists" published a manifesto addressed directly to the Holy Father and entitled "We Resist You to the Face"^{vii} while another prominent American "traditionalist" who admitted that he had "no formal theological training" presented a list of 64 questions to Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, requesting further clarifications on the Congregation's declaration *Dominus Iesus* seemingly because of perceived lack of clarity in its presentation of Catholic doctrine.^{viii}

"Traditionalists" are extremely critical of the Catholic Church's ecumenical outreach. While I believe that a loyal Catholic may legitimately question what has often passed as Catholic ecumenism since the Council^{ix}, "traditionalists" tend to dismiss any openness to other Christian bodies at all. Another neuralgic issue for them is the question of religious liberty: do other Christians have a right to freedom of worship and to proselytize? Their answer is "no". Fr Basile Valuet OSB, a monk of the Abbey of Sainte-Madeleine du Barroux, in his monumental six-volume work, *La Liberté Religieuse et La Tradition Catholique: Un cas de développement doctrinal monogène dans le magistère authentique* (Le Barroux: Abbaye Sainte-Madeleine, 1998) has dealt authoritatively and exhaustively with the question of religious liberty, showing that not only is there no contradiction between the earlier and more recent magisterium on this topic, but also that there is a development of doctrine. Doctrinaire "traditionalists", however, are not to be deterred by such a scholarly study; they simply ignore it.

3. The so-called “Tridentine” Mass or Mass according to the 1962 Roman Missal has become the centerpiece of the “traditionalist” struggle for doctrinal purity; it represents for them the most perfect form of worship ever to be devised. It is sometimes referred to by French “traditionalists” as la *Messe de toujours*, the Mass of all times, literally “the Mass of forever”. Aside from being a gross misrepresentation, this kind of language absolutizes this venerable form of the Roman Rite of the Mass, which, in fact, underwent many developments in the course of history, and implicitly ignores all the Church’s other venerable rites for the celebration of the Eucharist. Conversely, the Mass promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970 is criticized by “traditionalists” as a departure from the tradition. Some hold that it is invalid and others that it is an “abomination” which destroys the faith. The standard objections to the so-called *Novus Ordo Missæ* were masterfully dealt with over twenty years ago by James Likoudis and Kenneth D Whitehead in their book, *The Pope, The Council and The Mass*^x. Their research is still valid as the same charges are still being made today, but unfortunately the book is now out-of-print and should be updated in terms of *Quattuor abhinc annos* and *Ecclesia Dei*.

In treating of this “traditionalist” mentality, I am reminded of a reflection which the late Cardinal de Lubac made in his book, *The Splendour of the Church*, sketching what constitutes being a real “man of the Church”, a person who thinks with the Church (*sentire cum Ecclesia*):

He will take great care that some generalized idea does not gradually come to take the place of the Person of Christ; careful though he is concerning doctrinal purity and theological precision, he will be equally careful not to let the mystery of faith be degraded into an ideology; his total and unconditional faith will not come down to the level of a sort of ecclesial nationalism.^{xi}

Let us be quite clear that in dealing with “traditionalism” we are dealing with an ideology.

V. An Evaluation of “Traditionalist” Criticisms

I have thus far presented the hardline “traditionalist” ideology as I have frequently met it in publications that come from groups both inside and outside of the Church, in English as well as in other languages, and in personal contacts over these past twelve years. I do not believe that the “traditionalist” critique is without substance nor do I believe that it cannot be met. Unfortunately, so much of the

propaganda is presented as a matter of black or white, night or day, life or death, all or nothing. There are no shades of grey and “traditionalist” apologists tend only to entertain distinctions in favour of their own position. Anyone who opposes them is simply caricatured and dismissed.

Let us note well that there is much in the postconciliar Church that is worthy of criticism and each of us, if we wish, can probably relate our own particular liturgical “horror stories” and tales of doctrinal aberrations. It is almost always easier to tear down than to build up. If we must criticize, let us do so as loving children of our Mother, the Church. As a colleague of mine recently remarked, it is easy to criticize and to make sweeping condemnations whereas it takes much more time to make careful, balanced responses that respect the complexity of the situations with which we are dealing. I would now like to make some initial responses to the “traditionalist” critiques.

1. We must make a clear distinction between the Second Vatican Council and the abuses that came immediately in its wake. It is easy enough to say that the Council caused all of the destruction in the Church; everything was fine before it took place. This is a *post hoc ergo propter hoc* argument. The reality is far more complicated. In so many cases those who gained dominance in interpreting and implementing the Council in every area of the Church’s life had their own agenda and used their position to advance it. The history of this complex process has yet to be written. What is most important to note, however, is that our present Holy Father has spent his pontificate giving us a sound and correct interpretation of the great lines of the Council beginning with the address which he gave to the College of Cardinals the day after his election.

2. We need to trust the Church as our Mother and we need to listen with docility to the sound teaching given us by our Holy Father and the Bishops in union with him. The crisis through which the Church is passing will not be solved by rebellion. Of course, it is easy to complain that the teaching is often not translated into action. I concede, but let us be clear that the Pope is not teaching us false doctrine and that the Lord will not allow his Church to lapse into error. Those who contest papal and magisterial teaching are following a very dangerous course. I have been studying the Holy Father’s teaching, especially on Christological and Marian logical themes, for over twenty years. I have published a doctoral study on his teaching on Marian consecration and numerous monographs. Even in his ordinary magisterium I find an extraordinary richness and believe that he has advanced the development of doctrine on a number of issues. It is understandable

that in any given discourse or document he cannot be expected to provide an exhaustive treatment on every topic which he touches upon, but I say this: woe to those who misrepresent his doctrine and undermine the faith of others (cf. Mk. 9:42). The burden of proof rests entirely upon them.

3. There is another principle of capital importance which I cannot sufficiently stress: The Mass is the Mass. It is the sacrifice of Jesus; it is the sacrifice of His Church. In any celebration of the Eucharistic liturgy according to any of the liturgical books recognized by the Church celebrated by a validly ordained priest with the intention to do what the Church does (*facere quod facit Ecclesia*), the sacrifice of Christ is made present on the altar. It cannot be made more present or less present depending on the rite followed; it is either made present or it is not. The Church recognizes a preference with regard to the rite followed as legitimate, but it is wrong to absolutize the rite over the mystery of faith itself and can do immense harm to souls.

4. The classical Roman Rite of the Mass represents a great treasure for the Church and we should be grateful that our Holy Father has restored it to us once again. On the pastoral and psychological level, I believe that it was a serious mistake to suppress it virtually overnight. For those who were less accustomed to using a hand missal in assisting at Mass and less formed in certain forms of liturgical piety, the changes in the celebration of the Mass and the introduction of the vernacular were fairly readily received. For those whose piety had long been nourished by the solemn celebration of the Roman liturgy, there was more trauma. In my opinion this was primarily an error in judgment; it did not touch doctrine, but it is understandable that it caused uneasiness, discomfort and at times disorientation. This was often exacerbated by appalling attempts on the part of celebrants and liturgical teams to achieve a sense of familiarity and relevancy which often proved to be artificial and counterproductive. More than once I heard Cardinal Augustin Mayer, first President of the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, comment that the classical form of the Mass should have been allowed to continue when the new *Ordo Missæ* was promulgated and to coexist with it. Only God knows how much unnecessary harm could have been avoided. Unfortunately, this is now the wisdom of hindsight.

VI. Continuity with our Catholic Heritage

Many modern liturgists since the Council have spent a great deal of time telling us that “it’s a whole new ball game” and emphasizing as much as possible the difference between the traditional Latin Mass and the postconciliar Mass. Certainly, the most profound impact was made by the reorientation of the altar in our churches. This was done on the basis of what now seems to be highly questionable historical evidence^{xii}, but, as Cardinal Ratzinger points out:

These arguments seemed in the end so persuasive that after the Council (which says nothing about “turning toward the people”) new altars were set up everywhere, and today celebration *versus populum* really does look like the characteristic fruit of Vatican II’s liturgical renewal.^{xiii}

Many admit that, probably more than anything else, this has brought about a psychological orientation which has altered the focus on worship for many, priests and people. With due respect for the valuable historical research of Mgr Klaus Gamber, I do not share with him and others the conviction that the Roman Rite has been destroyed^{xiv} or that the promulgation of the new Order of the Mass has caused an irremediable rupture with the previous Western liturgical tradition. I do not deny that abuses abound in many situations, that liturgical apparatchiks are often anxious to promote as great a rupture between the past and present as possible and that not a few priests, consciously or not, celebrate in a way that obfuscates continuity with the tradition.

I think that it is of capital importance, however, to insist that the continuity between our liturgical past and the present is far greater than any discontinuity. I am fundamentally convinced that this is so, because, despite the caprice of men, the Holy Spirit will not allow the Church’s worship to lose its moorings. I am further convinced of this because of the texts themselves which we find in the new liturgical books, despite their often poor vernacular translations. Few are aware, for example, of the scholarly studies on the sources of the present Roman Missal published by Abbot Cuthbert Johnson OSB and Father Anthony Ward SM^{xv} and continued by the latter in *Notitiæ*, the official organ of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments.

“Traditionalist” polemicists never seem more exultant than when contrasting the two forms of the Roman Rite, often choosing abuses to illustrate the new and insisting on the perfection of the older form and the imperfection of the new. *Abusus non tollit usum* says the Latin adage; abuse does not take away the legitimate use of a thing. I am certainly not here to defend liturgical abuses, but it is necessary to distinguish the liturgy as it has been given to us by the Church

from abuses which have entered in. Such carping is not a Catholic attitude and remains closed to the treasures which remain to be discovered in the reformed liturgy. On the one hand, I readily grant that the classical Roman liturgy should be seen as a normative point of reference in interpreting and understanding the new.^{xvi} This is illustrated by Dom Gérard Calvet OSB, Abbot of Le Barroux, who points out that the priests who come to the abbey to learn how to celebrate the traditional Mass tell him that it improves the way in which they celebrate the new Mass. On the other hand, I believe that there are many riches which the postconciliar liturgical reform has given the Church such as the orations (which must be distinguished from the often banal English translations), prefaces and lectionary, which, according to the desire of the Council Fathers, has opened up the treasures of the Bible “so that a richer fare may be provided for the faithful at the table of God’s word”^{xvii}.

VII. Continuity with the Second Vatican Council

As all of us are aware, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger has been a strenuous defender of the pastoral provision of the Mass according to the 1962 Roman Missal and “traditionalists” are always willing to cite him about this, but since they are often masters of selective quotation, they often omit many of the important clarifications which he offered in his address on 24 October 1998 on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the *motu proprio Ecclesia Dei*. For instance, he singled out paragraphs 34-36 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and pointedly stated that these paragraphs provide the criteria by which celebrations of the Mass according to the both 1962 Roman Missal and the Missal of Pope Paul VI should be judged. In fact the Cardinal went so far as to say that if one wished to hold these essential rules in disdain and to set to one side the general norms found in paragraphs 34-36 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, one would be violating the obedience due to the Council!

Further, the Cardinal highlighted a number of the general norms provided by the Constitution on the Liturgy and offered two specific instances from para 36. The first section states that “The use of the Latin language, with due respect to particular law, is to be preserved in the Latin rites.” This is something that “traditionalists” of all shades will vigorously applaud and, indeed, it is lamentable, as I’ve already stated, that Latin disappeared virtually overnight from the Roman Rite. There are a few notable exceptions like St Agnes Church in Saint Paul and St John Cantius in Chicago, but these are notable precisely because they are exceptions.

However, the Cardinal also cited the second section of that paragraph to the effect that since the use of the vernacular "... may frequently be of great advantage to the people, a wider use may be made of it, especially in the readings, directives and in some of the prayers and chants." To hardline "traditionalists", of course, such an idea is anathema, but the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith points out what many of the Council Fathers were particularly concerned about: that the celebration of the old liturgy had slipped too much into the domain of the individual and the private, and that the communion between priests and faithful was insufficient. This should be seen particularly as a comment on the ordinary way in which the Low Mass was celebrated, which could be done with very little reference to the people on the other side of the communion rail. Indeed, it should be noted that the great majority of the bishops at the council, including the late Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, were convinced that a certain reform of the liturgy was highly desirable and willingly signed the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. The matter of its implementation is a separate question.

VIII. The Need for Wise Pastoral Provision and Integration

I firmly believe that the most pressing need in this entire area today is for a pastoral vision which sees and expounds the value of the celebration of the Mass according to the normative Roman Missal of 1970 and that of 1962 -- without polemics. I stress that this is a pressing need which very largely has not been met. There have been a few Roman documents and a few references in others, but no comprehensive approach that really deals with the issues head-on and in an integrated way. One may, of course, point to *Dominicæ Cenæ* of 24 February 1980 and to a less known, but truly remarkable, discourse which the Holy Father addressed to the Bishops of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana and Alaska on 9 October 1998. Among other notable things in this rich miniature treatise on the liturgy the Pope said:

The use of the vernacular has certainly opened up the treasures of the liturgy to all who take part, but this does not mean that the Latin language, and especially the chants which are so superbly adapted to the genius of the Roman rite, should be wholly abandoned. If subconscious experience is ignored in worship, an affective and devotional vacuum is created and the liturgy can become not only too verbal but also too cerebral. Yet the Roman rite is again distinctive in the balance it strikes between a spareness and a richness of emotion: it feeds the heart and the mind, the body and the soul.^{xviii}

One must ask oneself, however, whether this outstanding address has had any impact on the celebration of the liturgy in any of these states or in our country as a whole, not to mention the universal Church.

Another very important point needs to be made here. We must see the Latin Mass movement in the broader context of the need to re-sacralize our celebration of the liturgy. In his address of 24 October 1998 Cardinal Ratzinger said:

One can see evidence of a return to mystery, to adoration, to the sacred and to the cosmic and eschatological character of the liturgy, as evidenced in the 1996 Oxford Declaration on Liturgy.

Here he was referring to a Liturgy Forum held in Oxford, England in 1996 in which participants called for a renewal of the liturgical movement in line with the intentions of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* “which have in large part been frustrated by powerful contrary forces, which could be described as bureaucratic, philistine and secularist”. The proceedings of that forum together with the declaration are presented in Stratford Caldecott (ed.), “Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement”^{xix}. It is a fascinating study well worth reading which helps to put the traditional Mass movement in the broader context.

This leads to another observation. Up to now the leaders of the “traditionalist” movement have been emphatic that they want nothing to do with any other movement that has to do with the renewal of the Roman liturgy. They don’t want to be seen as part of any broader movement for the restoration of the sacred in the liturgy and aren’t interested in working with others on common objectives. Their philosophy is strictly “exclusivist”: they want nothing but the 1962 Missal and act as if the influence of the Holy Spirit in the Church definitively ceased in that year. Any development or pastoral adaptation is considered strictly inadmissible. Ironically, they are happy to quote Mgr Gamber on the “destruction of the Roman liturgy”, but choose to ignore whatever he wrote in favour of the 1965 Roman Missal.^{xx}

Not only is “traditionalist” theory “exclusivist”, but so is its practice. Priests who celebrate both forms of the Roman Rite are to be tolerated until such time as those who celebrate the 1962 Rite exclusively can be found. These should never celebrate the new Mass because they would, in effect, become contaminated or “ritually impure”. Even yearly concelebration with the Bishop at the Chrism Mass is to be eschewed. There can be no question here about the pastoral need of souls. That does not seem to enter into the considerations of “traditionalist” ideologues.

Michael Davies strenuously objects to the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission's description of its task of "integrating the traditionalist faithful into the reality of the Church". "The reality of the Church in the Western world today," he informs us is that "it is disintegrating. To take Europe as an example, the Church there is facing extinction, as Cardinal Daneels expressed it. This is not a matter of opinion but of fact. Why should traditionalists wish to be "integrated" into a disintegrating Church?"^{xxi}

In response to this sad lack of sound ecclesiology, of confidence in the providence of God and of filial piety, I would like to quote the late Cardinal de Lubac once again:

The Church which we call our Mother is not some ideal and unreal Church but this hierarchical Church herself; not the Church as we might dream her but the Church as she exists in fact, here and now. Thus the obedience which we pledge her in the persons of those who rule her cannot be anything else but a filial obedience. ... And every true Catholic will have a feeling of tender piety towards her. He will love to call her "mother" -- the title that sprang from the hearts of her first children, as the texts of Christian antiquity bear witness on so many occasions. He will say with St Cyprian and St Augustine: "He who has not the Church for mother cannot have God for Father"^{xxii}

IX. What can be done to facilitate Pastoral Integration?

I am genuinely grateful to the Latin Liturgy Association for having invited me to make this presentation. I believe that you perform a valuable function in promoting the celebration of the Mass in Latin according to both versions of the Roman Missal. I regret that most my talk was taken up with the celebration of the Mass according to the 1962 Missal. This was the case of necessity because this is the most problematic area and the one that I have had to deal with for the past twelve years. At the same time **I sincerely want to encourage the celebration of the Latin Mass according to the present normative Roman Missal.** For about three years I lived at the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music where daily the so-called new Mass was celebrated in Latin with Gregorian chant with the readings in the vernacular. Such celebrations need to be promoted by bishops and pastors. Your association should be a helpful source of information for those who want to inaugurate them.

What are some other proposals that I would make to you as a group and as individuals? I would encourage you to develop literature which will not pit the two forms of the Roman Missal against one another, but that will help to situate both forms of celebration in the wider context of the Church who is our Mother. Polemicism does harm to souls; the truth presented with love for the Church helps them to grow in the same way. Do not support publications, no matter how seemingly intelligent, which are written in “attack mode”. Do not be supporters of narrow liturgical polemics or “exclusivism”. In this regard Mgr Gamber made a prophetic remark that is more necessary than ever today:

We cannot and must not leave the fight for the preservation and re-establishment of the traditional liturgy of the Mass to a small group of fanatics who reject outright even those liturgical reforms demanded by the last Council, reforms which are justified, such as the use of the local vernacular in some situations.^{xxiii}

Even if I do not share his critique entirely, I believe that his words serve as a very timely and important admonition. The promotion of the Latin Mass in both its forms puts the Roman Rite back in touch with its roots, constitutes a good for the whole Church and thus is too important to be left to fanatics.

In this setting I am very happy to be able to single out Fr Frank Philips and the Society of St John Cantius. They are incarnate evidence that the two forms of the Roman Missal do not exclude one another, but complement each other. They give a very important witness and deserve our prayers and support. I would also propose that the Latin Liturgy Association might consider undertaking the revision and republication of Likoudis and Whitehead’s book, *The Pope, The Council and The Mass* with the original authors. I believe it would constitute a great service to those who have become mired down in the polemics of hardline “traditionalist” propaganda.

Finally, I want to conclude where I began -- with Mary. I have asked you to reflect with me over the complex situation which we have been considering through the prism of Mary’s Immaculate Heart. The more fully we are consecrated to her Heart, the more we belong to her, the more we will also love the Church as our Mother, even in all of the imperfect manifestations of the Church which we find here below. Listen to these beautiful words of our Holy Father, spoken on 13 August 1997:

Mary’s spiritual motherhood supports and increases the Church’s concrete practice of her own motherhood. The two mothers, the Church and Mary,

are both essential to Christian life. It could be said that the one is a more objective motherhood and the other more interior. The Church becomes a mother in preaching God's Word and administering the sacraments, particularly Baptism, in celebrating the Eucharist and in forgiving sins. Mary's motherhood is expressed in all the areas where grace is distributed, particularly within the framework of personal relations. They are two inseparable forms of motherhood: indeed both enable us to recognize the same divine love which seeks to share itself with mankind.^{xxiv}

ⁱ *Dei Verbum* #8.

ⁱⁱ Cf. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium* #63.

ⁱⁱⁱ Michael Davies, "The Missal of 1962: A Rock of Stability," *The Latin Mass*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Spring 2001) 12.

^{iv} Cf. *Quattuor abhinc annos* (3 October 1984).

^v *Motu Proprio "Ecclesia Dei"* 6, a.

^{vi} *Ecclesia Dei* 6. c-

^{vii} *The Remnant* Vol. 33, No. 7 (30 April 2000) 1-11.

^{viii} Christopher A. Ferrara, "The Remnant Presents 64 Questions to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger," *The Remnant*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (31 January 2001) 1-11.

^{ix} Cf. Brunero Gherardini, *Una sola Fede - una sola Chiesa. La Chiesa Cattolica dinanzi all'ecumenismo* (Castelpetroso, IS: Casa Mariana Editrice, 2000).

^x (W. Hanover, MA: The Christopher Publishing House, 1981).

^{xi} Henri de Lubac, SJ, *The Splendour of the Church* (Glen Rock, NJ: Paulist Press "Deus Books", 1963) 152.

^{xii} Cf. Mgr Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background* trans. Klaus D. Grimm (San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press and Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993) 77-89; 117-179; Aidan Nichols OP, *Looking at the Liturgy: A Critical View of its Contemporary Form* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996) 90-97.

^{xiii} Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy* trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000) 77.

^{xiv} Gamber 97-104.

^{xv} Cf. *The sources of the Roman Missal, I: Advent-Christmas* in *Notitiae* 240-241-242 (July-August-September 1986); *The Prefaces of the Roman Missal: A Source Compendium with Concordance and Indices* (Rome, 1989).

^{xvi} Cf. Gamber 114.

^{xvii} Cf. Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* #51.

^{xviii} *L'Osservatore Romano* (English edition) 14 October 1998, No. 41 (1562) p. 3. Henceforth referred to by cumulative number and page number: *ORE* 1562:3.

^{xix} (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998).

^{xx} Cf. Gamber 33, 46-48.

^{xxi} Michael Davies, "The Missal of 1962: A Rock of Stability," *The Latin Mass*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Spring 2001) 12-13.

^{xxii} de Lubac 161.

^{xxiii} Gamber 113.

^{xxiv} *ORE* 1505:9.

NEW *MISSALE ROMANUM*

by the Editor

Pope John Paul II has received the new edition of the Roman Missal, the third *editio typica* which has been ten years in preparation and replaces the editions of 1970 and 1975. Cardinal Medina Estevez, prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship, presented the new Missal to the Pope at a private audience. The main text of the Missal had been approved by the Pope in April 2000 and the new *Institutio Generalis*, which is incorporated in the Missal, in January 2001. Archbishop Tamburrino, secretary of the Congregation said in a statement to Vatican Radio at the end of the presentation ceremony. "It is a text that is in continuity with the Missal that was reformed following Vatican Council II and promulgated by Paul VI". The 1,320-page volume is already on sale in Rome.

The new Missal was presented to the media at a news conference in Rome on the 22nd March by Cardinal Medina Estevez. He pointed out that with its promulgation, this Roman Missal is now in force as the official standard for the liturgy in Latin. He said the most noteworthy changes in the new Roman Missal were the "expansion of the possibility for the faithful to receive the Eucharist under both species" (suggesting that the indiscriminate offering of the chalice hitherto has been a widespread abuse); the inclusion of prayers honouring the saints who have been canonized since the promulgation of the last edition; and the addition of some new prayers, including Eucharistic Prayers for Reconciliation, for Children and for different needs, which had been permitted in some national missals and were now integrated in the Ordinary of the Missal. The Cardinal also observed that the new Roman Missal allows for some adaptation to the circumstances of different countries, at the discretion of the bishops' conferences.

During the 25 years since the last official edition, the Cardinal pointed out, there have been 300 new saints added to the canon. In some cases, these saints take on special importance for the Church in particular areas. He cited the Chinese martyrs and, among others, Saints Edith Stein, Brigitte of Sweden, and Catherine of Siena, who are now honoured as patrons of Europe.

Interestingly, at the press conference, the Cardinal was asked by reporters about the relationship between the new liturgical standard and the desires of the

traditionalist groups. The Cardinal responded that the new Missal "does everything possible to preserve the use of Latin and Gregorian chant," thus satisfying some of the traditionalists' wishes. On the other hand, he said, "it is ridiculous that some of them do not recognize the validity of the Missal that most of the Catholics in the world are using today."

More details about the Missal came to light in the Italian language presentation. It contains new Masses in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary with prefaces mostly taken from the rich Collection of Marian Masses. Other additions include a new preface for Martyrs, a Mass for the remission of sins, a Mass to request continence (both of these taken from the 1962 Missal), and three votive Masses of the Mercy of God. Each weekday of Advent and Easter now has distinct prayers; there is an option to recite the Apostles Creed. Finally and happily, there is an "extraordinary wealth" of Gregorian chant in the Missal, no longer relegated to an appendix, but in the Ordinary of the Mass.

Bishop Mark Jabalé OSB, Chairman of the Department of Christian Life and Worship of the Bishops' Conference of England & Wales, was presented with a copy of the new Missal in the course of an official visit to Cardinal Medina Estevez. In a statement Bishop Jabalé warmly welcomed the publication adding *inter alia*: "the Missal offers much more than prayers alone. Indeed perhaps the most important single contribution it makes is in its revision of the General Introduction. These introductory pages guide the ministers of the Church in the art of celebration. There is much here for our parishes to reflect on, much for us all to learn from. It is important that we do so, so that our worship may be faithful to the tradition of the Church, that the fundamental truths of faith are not obscured. In the learning that has taken place over the past years, sometimes we have picked up bad habits too. Study of the General Introduction by bishops, priests, deacons and laity will help ensure that the richness of authentic celebration is not compromised by practices which do not best serve the needs of the Church.

"But before the new Missal reaches the parishes of the world there is much work to be done. There is obviously the work of translation in accordance with Instructions of the Holy See, such as *Liturgiam authenticam*. Once it has been completed, and there is a text which meets the needs of the Church in England and Wales, the Bishops' Conference will submit it to Rome for its formal recognition. The day of the granting of that formal *recognitio* will not be very

soon - it is likely to be as much as two years away - but on that day as on this there will be much thanksgiving for work well done.”

VETERUM SAPIENTIA

Forty Years On

On the 22nd February, a congress took place at Rome’s Salesian University to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of *Veterum Sapientia*, the powerful apostolic constitution in which Pope John XXIII wrote of Latin as an important part of "the patrimony of human civilization" and stressed its vital place in the liturgy. Back in 1962, many believed that the impact of this document would effectively discourage and perhaps silence the relatively small but vociferous elements who were calling for a vernacular liturgy. Pope John was of course no longer reigning by the time the reforms of Vatican II were taking shape. In the years that followed, *Veterum Sapientia* became apparently a dead letter, unlikely to be heard of again, rarely if ever quoted, even by ourselves to whom it offered a guiding light.

Now according to reports, Pope John Paul II has commended that document in the warmest terms and recommended greater use of Latin in the Roman liturgy and in seminary training. In a message to the conference he emphasized that Latin remains the official language of the Catholic Church and expressed his desire that "the love of that language would grow ever stronger among candidates for the priesthood." The use of Latin he continued “is an indispensable condition for a proper relationship between modernity and antiquity, for dialogue among different cultures, and for reaffirming the identity of the Catholic priesthood”, echoing the words of his predecessor.

The Pope's message was itself written in Latin, and was read to the conference by Cardinal Angelo Sodano, the Vatican Secretary of State. Another report suggests it was translated into Italian and read by the rector, Fr Michele Pellerey. Both may have happened at different times. In any case, the Salesian authorities are now of the same mind and are encouraging Latin most strongly among their seminarians. Furthermore, they are providing a Latin course on the Internet, details of which are given in our next article.

For those unfamiliar with *Veterum Sapientia*, we might briefly mention here that it builds upon and quotes liberally from the much earlier document, *Officiorum omnium* issued by Pope Pius XI in 1922. It begins by examining

the contribution of Latin and Greek to learning and civilization. Pope John goes on to extol the value of Latin for promoting culture among peoples. "It does not favour any one nation and is equally acceptable to all. Its concise, varied and harmonious style, full of majesty and dignity, makes for singular clarity and impressiveness of expression." However, it is important "not so much on cultural grounds, as for religious reasons. For the Church, precisely because it embraces all nations and is destined to endure until the end of time, of its very nature requires a language which is universal, immutable and non-vernacular" [quoting Pius XI]. The document continues in elegant language, to emphasize the value of Latin in the liturgy, and in the education of secular and religious clergy. Pope John declared: "We also, impelled by the weightiest of reasons, are fully determined to restore this language to its position of honour and to do all we can to promote its study and use".

SALESIAN UNIVERSITY'S LATIN COURSE

At the congress organized to celebrate *Veterum Sapientia* described above, the Salesian University of Rome announced the introduction of a course in Latin on the Internet, open to all who wish to register. Fr Biagio Amata, dean of the school of Christian and Classical Literature at the University, who organized the congress, said that today, more than ever, "it cannot be permitted that future priests do not know Latin". He described Latin as "a patrimony of humanity entrusted in a particular way to the Catholic Church".

The Holy See continues to publish documents of a legal nature in Latin, and it is needed to allow access to many writings of the Fathers of the Church and other classical authors of Christianity, who have not been translated. "It is important that, in the framework of five years of theological studies, a reasonable if not good knowledge of the classical languages can be acquired," Fr Amata said. He proposed the reform of the *ratio studiorum* of the seminaries. "Vocations are increasingly awakened at an adult age," he added, "and not all seminarians have studied literature."

The University's School of Classical Literature will offer the courses through its website: <http://www.geocities.com/blas3/> from which further information may be obtained.