



LATIN LITURGY

The Journal of the Association for Latin Liturgy
No 160 – Advent 2021



Contents

Corpus Christi at Walsingham	2
St Augustine at Aldershot	4
Consultation in lieu of Annual General Meeting	5
Some thoughts on <i>Traditionis Custodes</i>	8
David Jones and the Roman Liturgy	14
Beyond Translation	21
Book review: Ceremonies of the Sarum Missal	29
Appendix: Accounts 2020 – 2021	35

Cover pictures: Mass and Benediction at St Joseph's Aldershot 28th August 2021. Photo credits: (i) Jane Krish (ii) the Editor.

The ALL at Walsingham: live-streamed Mass and Vespers for the feast of Corpus Christi 6th June 2021

Mass began with the Introit *Cibavit eos* while the sanctuary party entered – crucifer, thurifer and celebrant – Mgr Philip Moger, Rector of the Shrine. It was heartening that in the opening rites, from *In nomine Patris* onwards and in many other parts of the liturgy, Mgr Moger had all the Latin from memory. The *Kyrie* and *Gloria* were sung, as was the rest of the ordinary, to the setting *Lux et Origo*, followed by the collect *Deus qui nobis sub sacramento*. The first two readings were given by a young layman, in English, but they concluded with *Verbum Domini*, as did the Gospel, which was preceded by the prefatory dialogue in Latin. Interspersed were the Gradual and Alleluia created by Fr Guy Nicholls according to the *Graduale Parvum* model with the sequence *Lauda Sion* between them. The Introit and Communion were already existing *GP* chants.

Mgr Moger prefaced his homily on the essence and meaning of the feast of Corpus Christi by welcoming the ALL and

explaining the purpose of our mission. Credo III followed, and here almost more than anywhere the persistent ban on congregational singing was keenly felt. The bidding prayers each ended with the petition *Dominum deprecemur: te rogamus audi nos*. During the Offertory the choir sang Byrd's four-part *Ave Verum Corpus*, which was followed by the *oratio super oblata* and the Preface dialogue, all in Latin, as was Eucharistic Prayer III. Inevitably, Covid restrictions prevented the congregation from joining in the sung *Pater noster*, and there was of course no *Offerte vobis pacem*. After the Communion antiphon the choir sang César Franck's *Panis Angelicus*, succeeded by the Postcommunion, blessing and dismissal. The choir was that of Our Lady of Refuge, Cromer, directed by Paul Henriksen, and augmented by ALL members Bernard Marriott and Frank Leahy.

After a break of about 45 minutes, Vespers were sung and Benediction celebrated. As there had been at Mass, there were problems with the sound quality as heard over the live-stream, with some acoustic interruptions, fading and distortion. The singing itself, though, was excellent. The hymn *Pange lingua* was followed by the psalms *Dixit Dominus domino meo* and *Credidi, propter quod locutus sum* and the NT canticle *Salus et gloria et virtus Deo nostro*.

Vespers were entirely in Latin, including the reading – on the Institution of the Eucharist – and the orations, as was Benediction, except that the Divine Praises were said in English. *Tantum ergo*, *Panem de caelo* and *Adoremus* were all sung to familiar chants which, in better times, will be ideal for participation by all. After the Blessed Sacrament had been returned to the tabernacle in the lateral wall of the sanctuary, priest and servers processed to the nearby statue of Our Lady of Walsingham, when they and the choir sang the simple *Salve Regina*.

The Association wishes to thank Paul Henriksen for all his work in making this event possible, and we are most grateful

to Mgr Moger for his warm welcome and hospitality, fine Latin and excellent singing.

CF

Mass and meeting at St Joseph's Aldershot

28th August 2021

Our first meeting since the 50th AGM at Corpus Christi, Maiden Lane – a gap of very nearly two years – took place at a new venue for the Association: St Joseph's Church, Aldershot, a fine building dating from 1913. We began with a practice for Mass, in which Fr Guy Nicholls took us through the Proper, from the *Graduale Parvum*, for the day (the feast of St Augustine) and the Ordinary *Cum Iubilo*. Mass was celebrated by Fr Anton Webb, assisted by Deacon Craig Aburn, who also preached on St Augustine.

After lunch in a nearby restaurant, Mgr Bruce Harbert's paper 'Beyond Translation' was read. This was an abridged version only: the full text is printed in this edition. A short discussion followed, taking in many aspects of the current liturgical situation, including the reaction to *Traditionis Custodes*. The day concluded with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, sung entirely to Gregorian chants.

Our thanks go to Fr Anthony Glaysher and to Deacon Craig for their hospitality and helpfulness with every aspect of the day; to Fr Anton for celebrating our Mass, to Fr Guy for his inspiring leadership of the chant, to Paul Henriksen for his sterling work in transporting our publications all the way from Norfolk and selling them most effectively on the day, and to Graeme Jolly for his preparation for our visit to St Joseph's.

Attendance by members was frankly disappointing: including six members of Council there were only about two dozen people there. This very poor response might have been due in part to continued nervousness about Covid, but we really

must aspire to a better response in 2022 because – as I’m sure members will realise – a very large amount of work goes into organising these meetings, which is only worthwhile if it is shared in active participation with our members, our friends, and with other Catholics who value our liturgical inheritance.

CF

Consultation in lieu of Annual General Meeting

For the second, and what we fervently hope will be the last, time we have not been able to hold an AGM. Like every other organisation we have been badly hit by Covid, but we do fully intend to hold an AGM in 2022. For this year, however, we are repeating what we did in 2020. The formal elements of the AGM are reports from the Chairman and Treasurer and the elections to Council.

This year, because we are not able to meet physically, the following arrangement will apply: we print here the two reports and the names of those standing for election or re-election to Council. If any members wish to query, or to raise objections to, any statement or candidate, they should communicate with the Chairman (contact details at the end of this edition) as soon as possible. If by 1st January 2022 no objections have been received, the consent of the membership will be deemed to have been given.

1 Chairman’s Annual report 2020 – 2021: Hampered and restricted by Covid, like every other organisation, the ALL has nonetheless got through the worst of it, and kept the torch lit in the most difficult of circumstances. Very probably members have lost to the pandemic people close to them: *Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine*. Priest members of the ALL have offered Requiem Masses for the eternal rest of members and all who have died as a direct, or indirect, result of the coronavirus. Sung Mass in Latin was live-streamed on the internet from the Church of Our Lady of the Annunciation, King’s Lynn, on Saturday 7th November last

year and from St Joseph's, Sheringham, on Saturday 21st November. Then on 6th June this year Sung Mass and Vespers for the feast of Corpus Christi were live-streamed from Walsingham.

For the first time in our fifty-year history we were not at liberty to arrange an open meeting or public liturgy, but this omission was remedied on 28th August this year, when a day consisting of Sung Mass, lunch, talk, discussion and Benediction was held at St Joseph's Church, Aldershot. Behind the scenes there has been continued activity (see the Treasurer's Report immediately following this) and more recently the Council has been monitoring the situation within the Church following the *motu proprio Traditionis Custodes*.

As to the future, we are cautiously optimistic, and information about the place and date of our 2022 open meeting and AGM will follow in the next edition of *Latin Liturgy*. Meanwhile Council thanks you for your continued support for the Association, the role and influence of which, in the inevitably complicated evolution of the liturgy in the next few years, will certainly be of importance.

Christopher Francis

2 Treasurer's Annual report 2020 – 2021: Most of the year has been spent in the preparation of the Communion antiphons for the *Graduale Parvum*. After the chants are composed by Fr Guy Nicholls, they have to be set using a specialist chant program, and then assembled into one computer file ready for publication. The bulk of this year's expenditure on the *Graduale Parvum* is in connection with the last stage of this process. The psalm translations we are required to use by our Bishops' Conference are those of the Revised Grail psalms, but some delay to using translations was caused by the United States Bishops' Conference making minor modifications to the Revised Grail Psalms

when taking over the copyright and publishing *Abbey Psalms and Canticles* which we must now use.

Sales of the *Graduale Parvum* Introits were down compared with 2019/20, and this must be attributed to the severe restrictions on singing in church for most of the year. There can be no doubt that almost all parishes will have suffered a major loss of income as a result of the pandemic, and it remains to be seen how long it will take for choirs and music to recover once normality returns.

We were unable to hold any meetings in person, but Paul Henriksen, our Diocesan Representative for the Diocese of East Anglia, organised two streamed Requiem Masses in November, one at King's Lynn and the other in Sheringham. The cost of meetings was thus substantially down on 2019/20, especially notable as 2019/20 included considerable expense for our 50th anniversary AGM.

Overall, expenditure exceeded income by £829, but we have paid around two-thirds of the preparatory cost of the Communion antiphons and are in a good position to publish by 2022. The closing balance of over £13,500 gives us the resources to continue work on the remaining parts of the *Graduale Parvum*.

Bernard Marriott

3. Elections to Council: The Constitution provides for a Council with a maximum of twelve members, three of whom hold the offices of Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Treasurer, with the others being Ordinary Members. The three Officers retire annually; Ordinary Members serve for periods of two years. All are eligible for immediate re-election. The Council has the power to co-opt Ordinary Members to serve for two years, provided that the maximum number of Council members is not exceeded.

Accordingly, Christopher Francis (Chairman), Fr Guy Nicholls (Vice-Chairman) and Bernard Marriott (Treasurer)

retire, but all three are willing to offer themselves for re-election. The two-year term of the following Ordinary Members expires: Brendan Daintith, Laura Dance, Mgr Bruce Harbert, Graeme Jolly and Ben Whitworth. Brendan, Laura and Mgr Bruce offer themselves for re-election.; Ben is not standing for re-election, and neither is Graeme, but he will continue to manage our Facebook page, and both he and Ben will continue to assist with the ongoing work on the *Graduale Parvum*.

There are therefore two vacancies on Council, and members of the Association are invited to make nominations for these positions. The names of nominees, whose prior consent must be obtained, and those of proposer and seconder, must be received by the Chairman by 31st December. According to our Constitution, if no nominations are received from members, Council's nominees will be deemed elected without a vote being taken. Membership of Council is of course not the only way you can help the Association in its work: please contact the Chairman if you would like to make a contribution in some other way.

4. General discussion. This has again not been possible, but if you wish to propose a formal motion, please notify the Chairman in writing or by email within four weeks of receiving this notification, giving the name and address of a member who has agreed to second it. It is of course open to any member to raise topics informally, which in the current situation will have to be done by email or letter to the Chairman. But next year, *Deo volente*, we shall return to live discussion.

Some thoughts on *Traditionis Custodes*

A torrent of commentary and invective followed the promulgation of ***Traditionis Custodes*** on 16th July 2021. Of the countless pieces published in print and online, we would particularly recommend 'The custodians of tradition' by Bishop Erik Varden in *The Tablet* of 18th September.

Members of the ALL Council, it will be no surprise for readers to hear, have also had intensive discussions about this, and we here offer a small selection of the many things that were said and written during the fortnight after the Letter was issued. It will be understood that Council members speak here as individuals, and it will be seen that their views vary widely. We should make it clear that what is said does not in any way amount to an ALL ‘policy’ on the subject, something which will remain under discussion for some time to come, as we await the long-term effect of the Pope’s letter:

- “I have to say I agree completely with Pope Francis’ evaluation of the effects of *Summorum Pontificem*. I’ve thought it was a mistake on Pope Benedict’s part from the beginning, but I do accept that my particular experience has been an unusual one and wondered whether in a wider context it might have good effects. If it has I haven’t experienced them. I do wonder, though, if the current document is the wisest way of dealing with the fallout from *SP*.”

- “Though this does not impinge directly on New Rite Latin Masses, it is hardly a cause for rejoicing and I don’t think it will do the Association any good. As a parallel I can recall, when I was teaching, certain modern language teachers who supported the removal of Latin from the timetable imagining that this would lead to more people studying modern languages. They were mistaken – and if anything it had the opposite effect by devaluing languages as a whole even further. I fear that this will lead not to unity but to even more division.”

- “It will certainly affect us, though exactly how, it’s too early to say. Quite apart from anything else, we must remember that some of our priest members celebrate in both Forms, and this will impinge on them directly. It’s impossible to deny that Pope Francis has acted harshly and peremptorily, without even the briefest of lead-in periods for the measures to be assimilated by those whom they most

affect. None of us have any illusions about the extreme elements in the ‘Traditionalist’ movement, and there’s no doubt that they have angered the Pope but I have my doubts as to whether the ironically named *Traditionis Custodes* will prove to be the best or the wisest way in dealing with the problem.”

- “No doubt everyone’s experience is different, but in my time in Orkney I saw no sign that *Summorum Pontificum* was divisive – quite the reverse. The Transalpine Redemptorists and their lay followers came back into full communion and canonical regularity, explicitly citing *SP* as the reason they decided to do so. Meanwhile on another of the islands, a priest was excommunicated for schism, and he said exclusively the *novus ordo*!

“To avoid gloom, we could note the Pope’s pointing out the value of the Roman Canon in his accompanying letter, and the passage that reads, ‘I ask you to be vigilant in ensuring that every liturgy be celebrated with decorum and fidelity to the liturgical books promulgated after Vatican Council II, without the eccentricities that can easily degenerate into abuses.’ However the absurdity of claiming St Pius V as a precedent for what he’s doing rather undermines the credibility of the whole letter in my opinion. We also now have the interesting situation that it is licit to chant the lections in Latin in the *novus ordo*, but not in the old rite!”

- “This last point, about the lections, is funny as well as accurate, and demonstrates a palpable absurdity. On many occasions the ALL has often done that – while providing printed translations, of course! I agree that it would be excellent if bishops were ‘vigilant in ensuring that every liturgy be celebrated with decorum and fidelity’ etc. The only trouble is – with a few exceptions – that they’re not. I’m with you on the mostly benign effects of *Summorum Pontificum*. The exceptions, when it’s been used as a vehicle for an attack on the current papacy and on Vatican II, have mostly been in the United States. I visited those Transalpine

Redemptorists on Papa Stronsay, and was most impressed by their hardiness and their dedication to the religious life.”

- “My principal complaint about both *Summorum Pontificum* and *Traditionis Custodes* is that neither makes it totally clear that the Church’s liturgical, linguistic and musical patrimony can be maintained and fostered in the new rite – and should be. Francis’ comment that ‘Whoever wishes to celebrate with devotion according to earlier forms of the liturgy can find in the reformed Roman Missal according to Vatican Council II all the elements of the Roman Rite, in particular the Roman Canon which constitutes one of its more distinctive elements’ does not push the point with anything even approaching the necessary vigour.”

- “On the so-called ‘Traditional Latin Mass’ (TLM) my view has changed considerably over the years. As an Anglican, desiring full communion with Rome I was passionately committed to the Missal of Paul VI even to the point of wanting any liturgy I was involved with to be ‘more Roman than Rome’, including those things I now know to be wrong (guitars, pot plants on the altar etc.). At that time (I was received into the Catholic Church in 1994) the ‘Old Mass’ seemed to be the preserve of those stuck in the past and denying the Church’s right to regulate the liturgy and for it to develop. My lack of historical knowledge led me to accuse them of being stuck in the time of Pius V, as I failed to appreciate the Gregorian roots of the Roman Rite as it was until 1970.

“An Oratorian priest friend of mine back in 2007 said he thought that with *Summorum Pontificum* Pope Benedict had it in mind to liberate the TLM and ‘let it find its own level’ in the Church; to liberate it from the shackle of being perceived as something ‘under the counter’ but not to be an active promoter of it. What SP said and provided for seemed to me to be inspired and a great tool for achieving the greater ecclesial communion which Pope Francis says he is striving for.”

- “I would like to think that the ALL’s stand on the importance of the Latin language ought to help us not just weather this storm but make it work in favour of real liturgy. Without roots in the tradition there can be no authentic development. When *Summorum Pontificum* came out, I felt it ought to be just the beginning of enabling the tradition to have roots and to grow. But then we had nothing, until the very recent prefaces, etc. to be inserted into the old Missal. In my opinion, we needed a new publication of the older books to give a fresh authority to the extraordinary form of Mass. There were rumours that Cardinal Sarah had something of this in mind.

“And now we have this new document, which, if it was required, as claimed, was only required because nothing really constructive had been done after *Summorum Pontificum* to foster the symbiosis between the two forms. There is no Latin ‘original’ of this document which might or might not help decide how to interpret words like ‘should’ and ‘must’. Canonically, it has to be interpreted strictly, because it is restricting rights. There are so many problems with this document.”

- “How many bishops, etc., have really engaged positively with *Summorum Pontificum*? I think we need to accept that over its 13 years it failed to encourage the use of Latin in the new rite. It meant that it remained much easier to arrange an old rite Mass than a new rite Mass in Latin. There was never encouragement to make the new rite in Latin as splendid as the old, let alone more splendid.

“The new rite is, I think, theoretically able to achieve a greater splendour, if I can put it that way. Having both ‘rites’ side by side was said to be a way of fostering mutual enrichment, but from the first, it was always a matter of enriching the old by just pushing back into the past for more ‘tradition’. This was culminating in the desire to go back to the old Holy Week liturgy, broad stoles and folded chasubles, etc. I can well understand official irritation at quite a lot of

this, although I would admit that there could be a reasonable, instructive, and constructive debate about what was thrown out in the process of the reforms, going back to Leo XIII!

“My point is this: the old rite movement has demonstrated beyond doubt that it is in actual fact, if not theoretically, unable to incorporate back into itself elements of the tradition. To use an analogy: the graft is rejected, because, as Bouyer pointed out, there are people who want the liturgy to be a corpse, and grafts only take on something that is alive. Despite protestations to the contrary, we are dealing here with immobilism, people who won’t take ‘yes’ for an answer, liturgical Bourbons perhaps. On the other hand, the new rite is capable of receiving back elements of the tradition which might now seem to have been baby rather than bathwater. In a small way this has happened in the most recent editions of the reformed missal.

“I believe that Cardinal Sarah had intended something of this kind to continue. But of course, the ‘new’ only has this ability if its roots are (in) the tradition, and if those at the highest levels possess liturgical wisdom, patience, and an intellectualist understanding rather than a conceptualist understanding of Thomas Aquinas.”

- “If we look specifically at the use of Latin in the mainstream rite, nobody has yet mentioned any evidence of a benefit. Previously existing Latin Masses have been replaced with old rite Masses, which is no cause for celebration. Many traditionalists don’t see OF Latin Masses as a good, they see them as a rival to the old rite, and in this they are probably correct. Where modifications to the OF are seen, they are usually destructive. Omission of one of the readings, loss of the bidding prayers or sign of peace; these are pure impoverishment. As a slight digression, I note that the whole paradigm of enrichment assumes that problems associated with the reformed liturgy are due to excessive change in relation to the previous rites, and that reversing this process

will necessarily result in an improvement. I'd accept that some changes were over enthusiastic, but this cannot be the whole story.

“Dissatisfaction with the state of the Roman Rite dates at least from the Council of Trent, and the old rite is part of the problem; as such it cannot be the solution, or at least, not the whole solution. Many current problems are inherited from the old rite. Cardinal Heenan's well-known response to the *Missa Normativa* is an example; as you will recall he said that English Catholics were attached mainly to low masses and didn't want to chant psalms. This attitude ensured the persistence of the hymn sandwich, boring and second rate. The cause of this is the wretched low mass attitude, and the cure is replacing the defective old ideas, not reinforcing them.”

‘In the quiet apses where it's very still’:

The Roman liturgy in the work of David Jones

In the 1948 postscript to his remarkable and important book *Catholicism in England: The Portrait of a Minority, its Culture and Tradition*, David Mathew names three Catholics, all converts, who are in the first rank of creative writers: they are Evelyn Waugh, Graham Greene and David Jones. The first two have long been universally admired, but I am often surprised to hear people saying that they have never even heard of David Jones. The reality is that, as well as being a painter and calligrapher of genius, he is also as great a writer, though of an entirely different kind, as Waugh and Greene; and whereas Catholicism was, at the very least, always of importance for those two writers, to David Jones it is absolutely central.

Throughout the texture of all his work, verbal and visual, runs the thread of the Roman liturgy, above all that of the Mass. Because he frequently goes into great detail, some of it quite abstruse, literary and art critics often fail to detect the resonances in his allusions. In this paper I will attempt to

illustrate how DJ uses liturgical quotations and references to give deeper meaning to his writing. His sensitivity to ritual is so acute that he often applies it to situations that have no connection at all to religious observance. There is an example in *Middle-Sea and Lear-Sea* (part II of the *Anathemata*) when, ‘close-cowled in his mast-head stall, the solitary cantor’ says his versicle: ‘land before the beam to starboard. And as the ritual is, the respond is: ‘ – but the respond is the same as the versicle, which seems odd, when we think, for example, of

V. Dirigatur Domine oratio mea

R. Sicut incensum in conspectus tuo.

But then we remember that in a short responsory e.g. *Benedicam Dominum in omni tempore* the words sung in response by all are the same as those intoned by the cantor.

What is – to the contemporary secular mind – obscurity, is undoubtedly responsible for the lack of understanding and appreciation of Jones’ work among general readers in a post-Christian age. The very opening of the *Anathemata*, his greatest work, is a case in point: ‘We already and first of all discern him making this thing other’. Unless you know that this is the moment before the Consecration, you will be baffled, and to proceed further you will need to have it explained to you. There is a book that does that, René Hague’s *A Commentary on the Anathemata of David Jones*, but most non-academic readers prefer to read a book straight through (as they would Waugh and Greene) not constantly to have one eye on notes and commentary.

It is significant that the most accessible and widely admired of DJ’s works is *In Parenthesis*. The Great War (especially since its general commemoration in this country between 2014 and 2018) is firmly lodged in the minds of a great many people. DJ’s evocation of that conflict is unique, entirely different from those of Robert Graves, Edmund Blunden, Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon, wholly estimable

though those are. This makes *In Parenthesis* a good place to start our survey. Parts 1 and 2 take us swiftly and directly into the overarching military world that our hero (or rather anti-hero) Private John Ball, is entering. Then Part 3 opens a new dimension, because it begins: 'Proceed...without lights...prostrate before it...he begins without title, silently, immediately...in a low voice, omitting all that is usually said'. Our readers will recognise from these fragments of rubric that it is Good Friday, and that DJ is introducing us to the correspondence between the sufferings of Christ and that of these soldiers, who are also going to suffer and die. This is characteristic of DJ: it is not that we are lifted from the material into the spiritual, but that the supernatural world is brought before us in parallel with the material. And incidentally, this is not only about the British soldiers, for the dedication of *In Parenthesis* concludes: 'and to the enemy front-fighters who shared our pains, against whom we found ourselves by misadventure'.

On a more mundane level, there is a little detail, which must have been puzzling at the time to non-Catholic readers, and is intelligible now only to Catholics of advanced age, when, 'on Sunday they fell out the fancy religions'. The three Jews 'were told off for fatigue at the latrines'. The Roman Catholics are marched to Mass in the next village 'because of Father Larkin being up at the Aid Post, with his Washbourne *Rituale* and the saving Oils'.

Like Part 5, the final and climactic section, Part 7, opens with another Good Friday reference, this time in Latin. Part of it is a quotation from Lamentations, read at Tenebrae that day: *Matribus suis dixerunt: ubi est tricitum et vinum?* We rapidly approach the crux, as the troops rise out of their trench and walk into the fire of the German machine-guns, while at the same time the artillery barrage continues from both sides. 'You drop apprehensively – the sun gone out, /strange airs smite your body /and muck rains down from heaven/ and everlasting doors lift up for '02 Weavel'. The power of that reference to Psalm 24, to the feast of the

Ascension and perhaps even to *Lift Up Your Heads, O Ye Gates* from Handel's *Messiah*, is extraordinarily powerful and moving. As Private Weaval is instantly removed from the battle – and indeed from this world – we are made aware of his arrival into another sphere of existence altogether.

On the final page, after the notes, there are six lines from scripture, of which the first is *Et vidi...agnum stantem tamquam occisum*. (Apocalypse v, 6.) Here again is the parallel of the ordinary infantryman caught in that terrible war and slain in his innocence, as was Christ. The fourth is *Non est ei species neque decor et vidimus eum et non erat aspectus*. This comes from the prophecy of the passion of Christ in Isaiah liii, 2, read on Good Friday at Tenebrae: 'there is no form nor comeliness in him; and when we saw him there was no beauty'. I don't know if DJ had ever heard Purcell's anthem *Who hath believed our report?* but there we find the most eloquent setting of those words. In the most delicate and circumspect way possible (and we have to be alert to spot it) DJ is showing us the horrors with which we are now familiar from black and white photographs and filmed 'reconstructions' (ironic word!) of the dead, maimed and mutilated. Finally we come to: 'This is my beloved and this is my friend' (Song of Songs v, 16). Here we leave all liturgical allusions behind: this is utterly personal, as the author speaks of that friend, of all those friends and companions, who fell before the indifferent guns.

Our next subject, DJ's illustrations to *The Ancient Mariner*, is hardly a cheerful one either, but unlike *In Parenthesis*, there is hope here. Jones' artistic genius is as great as his literary one, and several commentators have pointed out that only Blake is his equal in this respect. Ironically, because of the high financial value his paintings and engravings have now attained in the art market (DJ himself was never rich – he had only enough to live on) he is now widely known as an artist, while esteemed by comparatively few as a poet. I am not competent to comment on the technical detail of the copper engravings he made for *The Ancient Mariner*, but do

look at them (there is a good edition by Thomas Dilworth) and you will be struck by many things, not least by the priest incensing the altar in Engraving 8 and by the tailpiece representing the *pie pellicane*, with the superscription *Accendat in nobis Dominus ignem sui amoris et flammam aeternae charitatis*, words spoken by the celebrant as he hands the thurible back to the Deacon after censuring the altar at a solemn Mass.

In the long and highly detailed introduction DJ provided for the engravings, he says: ‘I chance to be writing this on the Feast of Corpus Christi, 1963, a day with which one has long associated, and once looked forward to hearing sung, the words *nova mentis nostrae oculis lux tuae claritatis infulsit*. They are part of the Preface to the Canon of the Mass for Christmas, which was used with poetic and doctrinal appropriateness for Corpus Christi too, until some years back when the authorities precluded it from the latter Feast.’ In a footnote he explains why it was appropriate: ‘By this Preface the correspondence of what was present under the *signum* of actual substantial, mortal flesh, of the flesh of the *puella*, the *Fiat*-giver, was given liturgic expression’. After referring to the shepherds hearing the words ‘this shall be a sign unto you’, and the ‘patient animals’ evoking that ‘untranslatable Respond’ *O magnum mysterium et admirabile sacramentum ut animalia viderunt Dominum natum*, he goes on: ‘this was neither more nor less of that “order of signs” than is the sign indicated in the Sequence *Lauda Sion*:

Dogma datur Christianis quod in carnem transit panis.’

This is pure Jones, this is the way he sees things, a way in which, when one has lived with it, becomes compelling. And we cannot disguise the fact that the liturgical changes that were introduced with such insensitivity, even brutality, in the wake of the Council caused Jones the deepest pain, and cast a dark shadow over his practice as a Catholic for the remainder of his life. So when we read him we do need, to understand him properly, to have the old liturgical books to

hand, and that includes the pre-1955 rites for Holy Week, the abrogation of which DJ regarded as a grave impoverishment, culturally and spiritually.

Jones died in 1974, and in 1981 Harman Grisewood (whom some will remember as a member of the ALL) and René Hague published *The Roman Quarry and other sequences*. This was compiled from the many manuscripts found after DJ's death, writings which revealed that he was planning a long poem centred on Jerusalem at the time of the Passion, to have at its centre 'the constant re-enactment of the historical fact of the Passion in the Roman Mass' (Harman Grisewood). From this large and rich collection I would like to draw the reader's attention to *The Kensington Mass*, which, though fragmentary and unfinished, sums up DJ's profound and meditative investigation into the nature and meaning of the Rite. Jones himself wrote: 'Quite apart from the truth or untruth of it, only by becoming a Catholic can one establish continuity with Antiquity'. The way that the first existing fragment of *The Kensington Mass* opens takes us directly *in medias res*:

clara voce dicit: OREMVS
et ascendens ad altare
dicit secreto: AVFER A NOBIS...
and in lowly accents
he says the rest
should you be elbow-close him
you may catch his
soft-breathed out
PER CHRISTVM DOMINVM NOSTRVM.

That little detail of 'elbow-close [to] him' is very telling: only someone who was there could have written that. And there is another such, in the allusion to the relics in the altar-stone, referred to in the prayer before the Introit *Oramus te Domine, per merita Sanctorum tuorum, quorum reliquiae hic sunt*, of which DJ writes: 'but in especial he asks the adjuvance of these athletes of God/tokens of whom are cisted immediately

beneath/and central to the Stone of oblation/at which he now stands.’ Here, the almost routine presence of these relics is transmuted into language in which, while there is certainly poetry, there is also physicality, one of the chief marks of everything that DJ wrote. He is not a romantic, he is a realist.

Turning again to DJ’s visual creative work, its riches are myriad. There is one painting in particular that is central to this discussion: *A Latere Dextro*. Colour reproductions in print are hard to find, but there is one in Thomas Dilworth’s *David Jones Engraver, Soldier, Painter, Poet* (Lund Humphries 2015) a book which I would recommend. Reproductions, of varying accuracy, can also be found (with some difficulty) online. It is too Catholic a work ever to be properly understood by the average art aficionado, but it will repay the closest examination if you get the chance to see it. It is a torrential, tumultuous representation of a priest elevating the chalice at Mass. A mighty, Pentecostal wind appears to tear through the scene, making the candles flare and gutter, pulling at the vestments of the priest and at the servers’ surplices, even perhaps at the veil of the tabernacle. It is a more animated scene than we ever see at Mass ourselves these days. The priest, one notes, is a very young man. The servers (seven of them) though small, look quite tough (one of them is wearing hob-nailed boots) and they are utterly intent on what they are doing, to the exclusion of all else. There is a lesson here.

Finally, returning to DJ’s masterpiece the *Anathemata*, let us consider the seventh and last part *Sherthursday and Venus Day*, from which the title of this paper is taken. It is the summit of the poem and is almost impossibly densely packed. We encounter again the oneness of the Crucifixion and the Mass, for example here: ‘at the division of the spoils’ (the Roman soldiers sharing out Christ’s clothing as an image of the sharing of the first-fruits of the Redemption) ‘with his hands stretched out’ (both Christ’s and the priest’s).

And at the very end ‘He’ (Christ) and ‘he’ (the priest at the altar) become one:

He does what is done in many places
what he does other
 he does after the mode
of what has always been done.
What did he do other
 recumbent at the garnished supper?
What did he do yet other
 riding the Axile Tree?

I hope I’ve said enough here to encourage our readers to explore the work of this great Catholic poet and artist. With a little patience and perseverance, there will be great rewards.

Christopher Francis

In Parenthesis, *The Anathemata* and several other works by David Jones, are published by Faber. On DJ as an artist, printmaker and calligrapher I would recommend *The Art of David Jones: Vision and Memory* by Ariane Banks and Paul Hills, and *David Jones: A map of the Artist’s Mind* by Merlin James (both published by Lund Humphries). The illustrated *Ancient Mariner* is published by Enitharmon Editions.

Beyond Translation

A paper delivered to the Oxford University
Newman Association on 2nd December 2021

What kind of community is the Church? That is the question I wish to address this evening. Any human group reveals much about itself through the words its members use when they assemble. The Church is no exception, and so I shall be reflecting with you on words we use when we gather for our most characteristic act, the celebration of Mass. The first words we hear from the Priest-Celebrant are *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*. There is no verb in that sentence. So what does it mean? We can shed light on that question by going back to the source of those words. At the end of Matthew’s Gospel, Jesus commands his eleven companions

to ‘baptize all nations’.ⁱ At this point there is a divergence among English translations. Most say ‘in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit’, but a few follow the original Greek more closely, and say ‘baptizing them *into* the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit’. To baptize someone into a name means to give them a new name, and to make them members of a new family, which is the Church.

This led Saint Paul to speak of baptism as ‘adoption’. Adoption was a common practice in the Roman Empire. Rome’s first emperor was called Augustus Caesar because Julius Caesar had adopted him as a son. Augustus in turn adopted his successor Tiberius, who accordingly was called Tiberius Caesar, and so on. Being baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is like being adopted, becoming a member of their family. Any assembly of the baptized, then, is a meeting of God’s adopted family, of those who bear God’s name. And Christian tradition restricts full membership of the eucharistic assembly to the baptized.

What is that name? We do not know. Moses at the Burning Bush learnt of the mystery of God’s name: I AM WHO I AM.ⁱⁱ Saint Paul speaks of our adoption as incomplete: ‘we groan inwardly’ he says, ‘as we wait for our adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies’.ⁱⁱⁱ Our eucharistic assembly is one stage on a journey that we still have to complete. Not before then will we be fully able to know the name of God. To receive a new name is to receive a new task. When God revealed to Abram that he was to be the father of many nations, beginning with Isaac, he changed his name to Abraham, and the name of his wife, Isaac’s mother, from Sarai to Sarah. When Jesus told Simon Bar-Jona that he was to be the rock on which the Church was to be built, he named him Peter. At Mass we are reminded of the new

ⁱ Matt 28,19 RSV

ⁱⁱ Ex 3,14

ⁱⁱⁱ Rom 8,23

identity and task that baptism gave us when the celebrant says in the Third Eucharistic prayer:

That we might live no longer for ourselves but for him who died and rose again for us, he sent the Holy Spirit.

We remind ourselves of the same reality by making the Sign of the Cross at the beginning of Mass, as we recall our baptism into the family of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Dominus vobiscum

Then the Celebrant greets the assembly with *Dominus vobiscum*, words that we hear often in the liturgy. But, like the words we have just considered, they have no verb, so what do they mean? Are they a wish ('may the Lord be with you') or a statement ('the Lord is with you')? Sometimes they are interpreted as a statement. For instance, one official Anglican translation of this greeting from the 1960s read: 'The Lord is here' and the response was 'His Spirit is with us'. The greeting occurs once in Scripture, when Boaz first glimpses Ruth, his future wife, in a group of reapers. 'The Lord be with you' he cries.^{iv} Eventually he and Ruth were to become the parents of Obed, the father of Jesse, the ancestor of King David, who was to be the ancestor of Our Lord Jesus Christ. So you never know what is going to happen when you say 'The Lord be with you'. That is the form with which we are familiar, interpreting the greeting as a wish, but in the Roman Rite there is a subtlety that is not always noticed. When a priest speaks this greeting, he extends his hands. But when a deacon does so, for instance before the Gospel or during the *Exsultet*, he keeps his hands joined. Does this difference of gesture imply a difference of meaning? Is the deacon saying 'The Lord is with you'? Perhaps he is. A Latin Mass allows us to keep both meanings in our minds.

^{iv} Ruth 2,4

Gratia Domini nostri Iesu Christi

Another greeting is *Gratia Domini nostri Iesu Christi, et caritas Dei, et communicatio Sancti Spiritus Sancti sit cum omnibus vobis*.^v *Communicatio* here translates a Greek word often translated into English as ‘communion’. The Communion of the Holy Spirit is the Spirit’s relationship with us as individuals and the power that binds the Church in unity.

Gratia vobis et pax

In another form of greeting *Gratia vobis et pax*, the order of words is slightly surprising. Would it not be more natural to keep the two nouns together – *gratia et pax (sit) vobis a Deo Patre . . .* ? Perhaps it would, but it is remarkable that the word-order given in the Liturgy is found no less than ten times in the epistles of Saint Paul and twice in those of Saint Peter. This suggests that here we have a standard formula of greeting among early Christians, a password. If somebody greeted you with the same words in a different order, you would know that they were an imposter. The Greek word-order was preserved in the Latin Vulgate and has been preserved in the current English translation. So our use of this salutation links us to the earliest days of Christianity.

Et cum spiritu tuo

Our reply to the celebrant’s greeting is *Et cum spiritu tuo*. This has sometimes been misunderstood as implying a dualistic view of human nature, separating its material and immaterial components and regarding only the latter as worthy of a greeting in church. The words are better understood if we recall the contrast that Saint Paul makes between the spirit and the flesh. In his letter to the Romans he says ‘you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, if the Spirit of God really dwells in you’.^{vi} In his letter to the

^v 2 Cor 13,14

^{vi} Rom 8,9

Galatians he lists the works of the flesh and contrasts them with the works of the Spirit, which are seen in those who have ‘crucified the flesh’.^{vii} When we address a cardinal as ‘Your Eminence’, we are not envisaging his eminence as something he carries around with him, but as an integral aspect of his personality. The same is true when we say to a minister of the Church ‘and with your spirit’.

So much for the words with which priest and people begin a celebration of Mass in the Roman Rite. Let me emphasize that the formulae we have considered so far allude to what Priest and people have in common, rather than to any distinction between them.

Preparation of the Gifts

Between the Liturgy of the Word and that of the Eucharist comes what used to be known as the Offertory, and is now called the Preparation of the Gifts. There was some controversy during the liturgical reform about whether or not sacrificial language should appear at this point. Much was removed, but some survived, including a part of the beautiful Song of the Three Holy Children ^{viii} who, when facing death in King Nebuchadnezzar’s Burning Fiery Furnace, far from the Jerusalem Temple, offered all they had, that is, their very selves, in sacrifice to God. The absence of priests and of the normal apparatus of sacrifice make this a lay prayer *par excellence*, although our Mass puts it on the lips of the Priest.

There is only one point in the Mass where the Priest tells the people what to do. That is when the bread and wine are ready and he says *Orate, fratres, ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum Patrem omnipotentem*. Unlike the words we have been considering so far, these are not from the oldest known elements of the Roman Rite, but found their way into the rite towards the

^{vii} Gal 5, 16-24

^{viii} Daniel 3, 16-17

end of the first Christian millennium. Originally, it seems, they were addressed to the nearby clergy, and only later to the congregation as a whole. This was part of a process of separation of the priest from the people at Mass.

The Preface dialogue is a very ancient part of the Rite of Mass, already attested in writing from the Third Century, much of which is found also in the Greek Orthodox Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom. In 1995 a new official translation of that liturgy was published with the approval of the Ecumenical Patriarch, Bartholomew. It was the work of some fine scholars, who were untroubled, of course, by many of the pressures that afflict those who translate Latin liturgy into English. They also published some very useful ancillary material, which I have used in preparing these remarks.

Sursum Corda

The Preface Dialogue begins with *Dominus vobiscum* and *Et cum spiritu tuo*, which we have already considered. The priest then continues *Sursum corda*. Again, there is no verb. Is this an invitation or a command? Back in the sixteenth century, when this dialogue was translated into English for Thomas Cranmer's new Book of Common Prayer, it was understood to be a command, 'Lift up your hearts', and this has been adopted by Catholics. However, as we have already noticed, dialogue between Priest and People in our Mass tends to emphasize what unites rather than what divides them. Commands tend to be issued by the Deacon. Moreover, *sursum*, which in classical Latin means 'upwards', in later centuries often means 'above' or 'on high' with no connotation of motion. Consequently, when the current translation was being prepared, it was suggested that *sursum corda* be rendered 'Let our hearts be on high'. This would have been close to the version used among the Greeks, but 'Lift up your hearts' was ultimately preferred because of its familiarity. But if you attend Mass in Latin, you are free to

understand the Celebrant as inviting you to hold your hearts on high, rather than telling you what to do.

Habemus ad Dominum

Habemus ad Dominum, we reply. The Latin verb *habeo*, meaning ‘to have’ developed in the post-classical period into an auxiliary verb denoting the past tense. So when a sixth-century author wrote *habeo invitatum episcopum* he meant ‘I have invited the bishop’. And this usage spread to several European vernaculars, including French, Italian and English. ‘Have’ can also stand alone without a verb if the verb has already been used as in ‘Have you paid the bill? Yes, I have.’ English translators since the sixteenth century appear to have understood *habemus* in that way. But the Greek verb for ‘to have’ does not behave like the other languages I have mentioned. So the Orthodox English translation of this response is ‘We have them with the Lord’. When the new English translation of the Roman Rite was being prepared, it was proposed that at this point we say ‘We hold them before the Lord’. This would be an almost cheeky reply from the people, as if they were saying ‘We are already doing what you suggest’!

Gratias agamus

On the next element, *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro*, the Greeks, the Latins and English-speaking Catholics are more or less in agreement. And you will know that the people’s third response has been changed to accord more precisely with the Greek and Latin: ‘It is right and just’. This is a great improvement, because now the priest picks up the cue offered to him by the people as he begins the Preface ‘It is truly right and just . . .’

If we consider the Preface Dialogue as a whole, we can see that the Latin and Greek put Priest and People on a more level playing-field than the English, even in its revised form. The English is for a Priest who dominates his People, the Latin for one who shares his prayer with the People. To

attend Latin Mass is often thought and spoken about as showing a conservative, even reactionary, stance. But here as in the opening dialogue of the Mass, we can see that the Latin reflects the Church as envisaged by the Second Vatican Council rather better than the English.

The process of clericalisation of the Mass is visible in the Roman Canon (the First Eucharistic Prayer) where *qui tibi offerunt*, indicating that all present offer the sacrifice of praise, was expanded to *pro quibus tibi offerimus vel qui tibi offerunt*, which suggests that priests and people have different modes of offering. The Council reaffirmed the older understanding in a beautiful passage of its document on the Priesthood: ‘By the ministry of Presbyters, the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful is completed in union with the sacrifice of Christ, the one mediator, which is offered in an unbloody and sacramental manner by their hands in the name of the entire Church, until the coming of the Lord.’^{ix}

However, the post-conciliar liturgical reformers missed some opportunities to reinstate this way of seeing the Eucharist. The Second Vatican Council sought to revive a model of church in which the clergy would be less separate from the people. It found this model in early Christian texts, including the earliest liturgical texts, such as those we have been considering. It mandated a reform of the liturgy that would reinstate this model, emphasizing that the Mass is a sacrifice offered by the whole Church.

You may have noticed that the texts I have been discussing, when they are not from Sacred Scripture, are found in both the Ordinary form of the Mass and the Extraordinary form, which comes from before the Council. There is a tendency in current discussion to contrast these two forms of the rite, whereas I have wished to emphasise what they have in

^{ix} *Per Presbyterorum autem ministerium sacrificium spirituale fidelium consummatur in unione cum sacrificio Christi, unici mediatoris, quod per manus eorum, nomine totius Ecclesiae, in Eucharistia incruente et sacramentaliter offertur, donec Ipse Dominus veniat* [cf, 1 Cor 11,26] PO2.

common. The Extraordinary Form is sometimes referred to as the 'Traditional Latin Mass' (TLM), whereas in fact it is no more traditional than the Ordinary Form. The Ordinary Form contains much material that was unknown or inaccessible in the centuries during which the Extraordinary Form was developing. The Missal of today has Collects, Prayers over the Gifts, Prefaces, Prayers after Communion and Solemn Blessings that were unknown or ignored in the sixteenth century, but have been brought back from early liturgical manuscripts into use in our own time.

Perhaps the most eloquent symptom of the post-conciliar liturgical changes is what has happened to the *Pater Noster*. Before the Council, all but the final petition was said or sung by the priest, but now the people join in from the beginning. Their united calling on God as Father show them to be members of a single family, united in a single name, as the opening words of the Mass have already indicated. In a family, children do not call their parents by the family name – I never called my father 'Mr Harbert' – but by more intimate forms of address. Similarly, Jesus has taught us to call on God as Our Father as we prepare to share the Eucharistic food of God's family.

God himself remains unnamed.

Mgr Bruce Harbert

Review: R J Urquhart, Ceremonies of the Sarum Missal:

A Careful Conjecture. T & T Clark xxv + 302 pp £72.00

Of all social scientists in the public square in the United Kingdom, the superstars of sociology are the least regarded. In France matters are different. When Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) died, the French Prime Minister led tributes and *Le Monde* devoted much of its front page to reflections on his passing. With his many works widely translated, Bourdieu

was a truly interdisciplinary scholar with interests ranging from education, culture, art, politics, to economics, literature, law and philosophy. Voltairian in regard to religion, nevertheless, his writings are rich in Catholic metaphors, but it is in his intimidatingly erudite lectures on Manet that an unexpectedly significant point arises that relates to this review.

In a subsection of the work, entitled 'from the familiar to the scandalous', Bourdieu reflected on a book he found by chance when walking down the rue Saint Sulpice. This work was by a preacher at Notre-Dame, Maurice Lelong. Entitled *Le Livre blanc et noir de la communion solennelle* (1972) it was composed of indignant letters received from his flock at the scandalous outcomes of the liturgical reforms of Vatican II. What fascinated Bourdieu was the breakdown in the symbolic order of Catholicism. This led him to conclude that the crisis so ensuing drew parallels with the symbolic revolution wrought by Manet.

Something similar had happened after Vatican II, that the laity lost the capacity to say what was liturgy. In its case, it suffers a crisis of disconnection where many facets pertaining to liturgy exist in isolation. Thus, choral music operates apart from studies of manuscripts of texts used, and more pertinently, archaeological and architectural interest in ruins and cathedrals seldom make reference to what actually went on in these buildings.

Attitudes to liturgical scholarship are shifting, however, from treating it as a realm of the arcane to realisations of the cultural and textual significance of past rites. Taken with the increased growth of interest in cathedrals, the issue of rite and its performance has become of increasing importance. Salisbury's *Worship in Medieval England* (2018) well illustrates this shift in appraisal.

Contrary to images of sociology as obsessed with class, gender and race, it is ritual of late that has emerged as its

crucial area of interest, hence the fascination with this unexpectedly absorbing work. In the preface, Urquhart refers to himself as a rural school master (he teaches classics at Oakham School) and produces a magnificent understatement apologising for his 'limited access to books and even more limited access to the society of true specialists' (xviii). Doubtless, more material could have been brought in but the range of sources used can only be described as awesome in a work rightly claimed to be the first study of the Sarum rite in the past 500 years, though Baxter's *Sarum Use: The ancient customs of Salisbury* (3rd edition 2018) deserves mention.

Urquhart derives his interests in medieval liturgy from his father. The occasion generating the study arose from a request for guidance on the form of the Requiem Mass, Sarum Use, when the body of Richard III was being reinterred. In his work, *Comparative Liturgy* (1958), Baumstark noted the oscillations of liturgical form from the simple to the complex. After the liturgical gruel of Vatican II rites, it might be that another swing is commencing. Though not widespread, there is a growing interest in the Sarum rite, not least with the efforts to recognise facets of Anglican rites in the Ordinariate suggesting reconnections back to the past, perhaps the dreams of the Camden society and the visions of Pugin for a deeper and richer English liturgical identity.

The unexpected value of Urquhart's work lies in the way it draws attention to the massive discrepancy between the imaginings of millions of tourists to English cathedrals and the issue of the symbolic orders they were built to enact in the late medieval period. If nothing else, the study will disabuse deans of Anglican cathedrals that their naves can be used as five-a side football pitches (at Gloucester), exhibitions of science (at Ely), a fashion show (in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey) and a new BMW car launch (at Peterborough) with smoke – though, whether this was incense or not is unclear. Forgetting that cathedrals had infirmaries, some take pride in turning their naves into vaccination centres. Urquhart's study amply illustrates how

the sacred spaces of these cathedrals were all set for liturgical use and not for such vacuous profanations.

The subtitle of this work might give pause for thought. His disclaimers in the preface, of not constructing an imaginary 'authentic', liturgy, but of filling in gaps where the sources are unclear, reflects the property of conjecture of the subtitle. This accords with his aim to strengthen the case for its authorisation of use. The primary concern of the study is with preparations for the rite and the rubrics for ceremonial use, hence little on the texts used. The format of the work follows that of Fortescue and O'Connell.

The study is divided into books, seven in all, covering the treasurer's purview, books, vessels, instruments, vestments and their colour. Book II is on liturgical gesture, covering abasements, genuflections and hands. Books III-VII start with low and high Masses, and then on to special forms as in weddings and funerals, Missa cantata, processions and blessings and the last substantial one on the ritual year, moving from Advent to All Souls. The sections dealing with the Triduum are of especial interest. A Mass with simple rubrics and its text appears as an appendix. Also useful are his reflections on the history of what he terms a 'Most Extraordinary Form of the Roman Rite' which he claims was never quite suppressed, even in 1534.

There are so many cross currents in this work that attract attention, not least the comparisons he makes with Dominican rites, though Anglican roots show through with his odd use of the term 'Evensong' and 'vestry' at points in the study. The index is very serviceable and is well constructed. Also helpful are the floor plans and mappings, as in Fortescue, which greatly help to visualise the rite in its various stages and forms. The *nihil obstat*, next to the publishers' details is unusual to find in a scholarly work on late medieval rites, but, nevertheless, signifies the direction the author wishes to take with his study.

Perhaps the most astonishing facet of the study are the footnotes. These are plentiful but awesome in scale. In a small font, the most minute details are covered on bells, candles, colours of vestments, and thuribles, to name a few, each of which is treated with loving detail on origin and use. The attention to unexpected detail is well illustrated in his accounts of the blessing of the ring at weddings (pp 165-6 n. 27). Other treats are to be found, as for instance, in relation to the Easter candle used on Holy Saturday. Apparently it stood at 36 feet in Salisbury cathedral. Urquhart wonders whether this refers to the candle itself or the candle stand. Lighting and inserting incense are matters of fascinated speculation (p 247 n. 32).

Book VI, sections 1-2, on processions draws out well one of the exemplary strengths of the Sarum rite. But the most striking aspect of the study, and one that might hinder its revival, is the virtual army of parts required for its enactment. Eight different parts symbolised in the text are listed, but these are as nothing compared to the requirements for the Palm Sunday high Mass which needed celebrant, deacon, subdeacon, the acolyte, thurifer, two taperers, water and book boys, torchbearers, three deacons for the Passion, second crucifer for the Sacrament procession, bearer of the lantern, two banner-bearers, two clerks in major orders to carry the feretrum, canopy bearers, further clerk, if possible, a deacon, the prophet (a junior clerk), three cantors to sing at the first and third station, seven boys in surplices to sing at the second, choir, vergers and a sacristan (215). It must have required a veritable laundry to keep all the surplices clean. The most minute detail the rite required, such as the preparation (or making) of the chalice, draws out the power and dedication the Sarum rite demands to realise a sense of the sacredness of what is to be used.

At the risk of seeming ungrateful, the study should have had a glossary of terms which will be unfamiliar, such as doubles, the pax-bredes and the flabellum (discussed in

minute detail at p 15, n. 34). If there were to be a second edition, as the study well deserves, some sort of table marking the main differences between Sarum, Tridentine and Vatican II rites would be enormously helpful. More detailed guidance on the format of a Sarum *Missa cantata* appear in Book V, section 25.

As is often the case, handbooks covering liturgical enactments become less challenging in actual practice when rubrics are translated into ritual habits developed with practice. Nevertheless, the requirements for a deacon and a thurifer for a high Mass, as covered here from collects to the sequence (Book IV, section 17, pp 107-116) are truly demanding. O'Connell's instructions on the number of beats (swings) of the thurible find an echo in this account of the Sarum rite. These were highly complex. The duties for the thurifer for incensing at the Gospel and the incensation of the altar would require a young man of considerable performative ability and memory. In rites as complex as these, it is only to be expected that what emerges is a sort of liturgical choreography, a requirement to be expected in any ceremony dealing in matters of ultimate sacerdotal concern.

Despite its enormous erudition and imaginative conjecture, the hopes of restoration of this rite are likely to be forlorn. The spiritual capital to enact these is long depleted, the army to fill the roles are long dispersed and as those in the Victorian era saw these lost medieval rites stand as antidotes long lost to modernity, but now beyond resuscitation. Urquhart supplies a work of uncanny depth that conveys a sense that the rituals of the late medieval Gothic cathedral were as complex, as beautiful and as awesome in witness as the buildings designated for their realisation.

Uncannily, and perhaps never again, the symbolic order of rite refracted the pointed style of these edifices where all was irrelevant save directing matters to the heavenly. The ground clearing of the study is not in vain, for what emerges is a sense of ritual foundations so constructed, so elaborate, so

reflecting the genius of the late medieval mind to build edifices not only in stone but also in the realm of the social. By providing such a wealth of material, possibly a lifetime's work, Urquhart has made his own legacy for students of liturgy.

Kieran Flanagan

Kieran Flanagan is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Bristol. His first work was *Sociology and Liturgy: Re-presentations of the Holy*, London: Macmillan, 1991. Since then, he has written extensively on sociology and theology, Catholic and otherwise. Dr Flanagan is a long-standing member of the ALL, and delivered a paper on 'Sociological Errors in Liturgical Thinking' to a meeting of the Association in London some years ago, under the chairmanship of Martin Lynch.

APPENDIX – ACCOUNTS 2020-21

Association for Latin Liturgy Cash Receipts & Payments for the year 6 April 2020 to 5 April 2021

Receipts		Payments	
2019/20	£	2019/20	£
1,758 Subscriptions	2,335	2,780 <i>Graduale Parvum</i>	2,648
0 Donations	148	32 Other publications/stock purchase	209
982 <i>Graduale Parvum</i> (Books and CDs)	307	92 P & P on publications	67
372 Other Publications/Compact discs	421	110 Internet costs/software	172
583 Meetings	0	798 <i>Latin Liturgy</i> (inc postage)	710
18 Bank Interest	4	1,713 Meetings	200
301 Income Tax Repayments	267	0 Miscellaneous	304
0 Miscellaneous	0	0 Travel	
4,014 Total receipts	3,482	5,525 Total payments	4,310
		-1,511 Difference between receipts & payments	-828
<u>4,014</u>	<u>3,482</u>	<u>4,014</u>	<u>3,482</u>
Cash capital			
	£		
Opening balance at 6 April 2020	<u>14,497</u>		
Surplus (-Deficit) for the year	-829		
Closing balance at 5 April 2021	<u>13,668</u>		

Report by the Treasurer:

I certify that the above Cash Receipts & Payments Account and Cash Capital Balance Sheet have both been prepared in accordance with the books and vouchers of the Association.

Bernard Marriott (Treasurer)



Benediction, St Joseph's Aldershot 28th August 2021.

ASSOCIATION FOR LATIN LITURGY

Founded in 1969 to encourage and extend the use of Latin in the liturgy of the Catholic Church

Under the patronage of the Bishops' Conference of England & Wales

Chairman	Christopher Francis, 16 Brean down Avenue, Bristol BS9 4JF
Vice-Chairman	Fr Guy Nicholls Cong Orat
Treasurer	Bernard Marriott
Membership	Brendan Daintith, 173 Davidson Road, Croydon CR0 6DP
Secretary	<i>Brendan.Daintith@Latin-Liturgy.org</i>
Website	www.Latin-Liturgy.org
Facebook	www.facebook.com/latinliturgy

Publications may be ordered and subscriptions renewed at latin-liturgy.org

**Latin Liturgy No 160 copyright © 2021 Association for Latin Liturgy,
except where otherwise acknowledged.**

Reproduction, by whatever means, requires written permission.