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President’s Message

by Joseph Shaw

The timing of this Summer edition of Gregorius Magnus is such that many readers will want to know about the Rescriptum ex audientia, and I hope they will not be disappointed. There is much about the situation that remains unclear, particularly about documents rumoured to be still to come, but we aim not only to inform members and supporters of the Federation about important events, but also to give them access to analysis of some of the deeper background issues which inform these events.

On the Rescript, I commend to readers the first articles in this edition; on the background issues, let me draw attention to the book review section, and in particular to two short books: Disputed Questions on Papal Infallibility by John Joy, and Does Traditionis Custodes Pass the Juridical Rationality Test? by Fr Réginald-Marie Rivoire, FSVF. One need not agree with all their conclusions to benefit from their elucidation of these topics.

The Rescript is a painful document to read, as it underlines two tensions within the 2021 Apostolic Letter Traditionis Custodes. The first tension involves the role of bishops. Traditionis Custodes claims (and this is also emphasised in the accompanying Letter to Bishops) to give greater authority to local bishops. Article 2 tells us that ‘[i]t belongs to the diocesan bishop, as moderator, promoter, and guardian of the whole liturgical life of the particular Church entrusted to him, to regulate the liturgical celebrations of his diocese’. On the other hand, the actual effect of the document is to restrict the discretion of bishops in liturgical matters.

No longer may bishops establish ‘personal parishes’, permit newly ordained priests to celebrate the Traditional Mass, allow the celebration of the Traditional Mass in parish churches, and so on. Bishops had been doing these things over many years for pastoral reasons. These restrictions will make it more difficult for them to feed their flocks with the liturgy and sacraments in what they judge to be the most fruitful way.

The second tension is about the integration or marginalisation of Catholics attached to the Traditional Mass. Traditionis Custodes informs us that permissions for wider celebration of the Traditional Mass under Popes John Paul II and Benedict XVI were given ‘in order to promote the concord and unity of the Church’. It is difficult to see, therefore, how the opposite policy could bring about exactly the same result: as the text goes on to express it, ‘to press on ever more in the constant search for ecclesial communion’.

Particularly emphasised in Traditionis Custodes, in the Responsa ad dubia issued by the Dicastery for Divine Worship shortly afterwards, and now by the Rescript, is the question of the use of parish churches. The Dicastery, it is clear, wants as a matter of some urgency to eliminate the celebration of the Traditional Mass in parish churches, though perhaps in stages. Many, if not all, of the regular Masses affected will move to other locations. The Responsa ad dubia tells us that ‘the exclusion of the parish church is intended to affirm that the celebration of the Eucharist according to the previous rite, being a concession limited to these groups, is not part of the ordinary life of the parish community’.

The place of the Traditional priestly institutes, whose work is so far less affected by these documents than that of diocesan clergy, seems similarly to be thought of as somehow outside the limits of the ‘ordinary life of the parish community’, in a kind of twilight world.

In other words, an explicit goal of this policy is to separate the faithful attached to the older Mass from the ‘parish community’. It seems the motivation for this policy is the prevention of anything that would ‘promote the previous rite’. The result, however, can hardly be described as the promotion of unity. If, as one journalist favourable to Traditionis Custodes explained, this is all about preventing the development of a ‘parallel Church’, then this policy would seem strangely counter-productive.

I hope and pray that the spiritual lives of our readers are not disrupted by these documents. It is a hard thing for Catholics to learn that a liturgy that sustains them, and that has been recommended by all the Saints, Doctors, and Popes for fifteen centuries, is somehow now bad, and they, without having committed any canonical crime or fallen into any identifiable heresy, must suffer for it. We commit our cause to God, however: as the FIUV has asked of all Catholics of good will, please offer prayers and penances for this intention, for the liberty of the Traditional Mass. Si Deus pro nobis, quis contra nos? If God is for us, who can be against us? (Romans 8:31)
The Story of the Rescript

by Joseph Shaw

I was in Rome when the Rescript was published, on the day we call in England Shrove Tuesday, from the archaic English word for the Sacrament of Penance, ‘shrift’. It is a day for preparation for Lent, which begins the following day, Ash Wednesday, and in other languages it is named as a day for saying goodbye to meat: carne vale, ‘carnival’. With Monika Rheinschmitt, I was meeting people who might be able to shed light on our situation, or to give us advice about how to deal with it: officials in the Curia, prelates, priests, journalists, and others.

No one mentioned any rumours of the Rescript before it was published, despite the intense speculation which has been going on about other planned documents to regulate the Traditional Latin Mass. Instead, the most plausible explanation of the genesis of this document is focused on a quite separate sequence of events, mainly in the United States of America.

Pope Francis’s Apostolic Letter Traditionis Custodes (TC), published on 16th July 2021, invites bishops to make provision for the Traditional Mass; Article 3.2 states that he ‘is to designate one or more locations where the faithful adherents of these groups may gather for the eucharistic celebration (not however in the parochial churches and without the erection of new personal parishes)’.

This seemed, to many, to be rather impractical, at least for many countries. While Italy, for example, has many non-parochial churches, others, like the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany, have very few. It has been suggested that TC was composed with Italy in mind, and that its severity for other places was accidental. The question was apparently raised by a group of French bishops at an ad limina meeting with Pope Francis soon after TC was published, in September. His response was that they should take a ‘paternal attitude’ towards the faithful attached to the Old Mass.

The next question is what discretion the legislation leaves to bishops. The Code of Canon Law tells us, in Canon 87.1:

A diocesan bishop, whenever he judges that it contributes to their spiritual good, is able to dispense the faithful from universal and particular disciplinary laws issued for his territory or his subjects by the supreme authority of the Church. He is not able to dispense, however, from procedural or penal laws nor from those whose dispensation is specially reserved to the Apostolic See or some other authority.

It seemed clear that this provision of TC, like other legislation, can be dispensed by bishops, and equally clear that where alternatives to parish churches did not exist, dispensation was necessary to secure the stated objective of this article: making reasonable provision for the Traditional Mass.

However, the Dicastery for Divine Worship took a different view. On 21st December the same year, they published a set of questions and answers, the Responda ad dubia, which included one about the use of parish churches. It declared:

This Congregation, exercising the authority of the Holy See in matters within its competence (cf. Traditionis custodes, n. 7), can grant, at the request of the diocesan Bishop, that the parish church be used to celebrate according to the Missale Romanum of 1962 only if it is established that it is impossible to use another church, oratory or chapel. The assessment of this impossibility must be made with the utmost care.

The implication seemed to be that, if bishops thought it necessary for parish churches to be used for the Traditional Mass, they would have to ask the Dicastery. But looking at the text carefully, it does not actually say that: it does not say that bishops may not simply avail themselves of Canon 87.1. Indeed, the Dicastery does not have the authority to take away bishops’ rights in canon law. This particular right was established, in fact, by the Second Vatican Council, which sought to restore to bishops a greater degree of autonomy appropriate to their status as successors of the Apostles.

This was widely pointed out, and bishops continued to allow celebrations of the 1962 Missal in parish churches. Cardinal Roche, on the other hand, sent letters to some of them telling them that to do so they needed to have recourse to him first. One such letter found its way into the public domain, addressed to a bishop in California, in the United States. It refers to Canon 87.1 explicitly. Cardinal Roche notes that the canon makes an exception for matters ‘whose dispensation is specially reserved to the Apostolic See’, and suggests that this is the case here due to the authority given the Dicastery by TC Article 7.

Article 7 states: ‘The Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments and the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life, for matters of their particular competence, exercise the authority of the Holy See with respect to the observance of these provisions’. This is almost identical to the wording of Article 12 of Pope Benedict’s Apostolic Letter Summorum Pontificum. It does not, of course, give the Dicastery the power to legislate on the subject, but only to administer the Pope’s legislation, so it is difficult to see its relevance in this case.

The appearance of this letter led to an escalation in the debate. A well-known American Catholic journalist, who is also trained as a canonist, J. D. Flynn, responded with an article making clear that, in his view, ‘the cardinal is out over his skis’: he simply does not have the authority he is claiming to have. This prompted a response from the inveterate opponent of the Traditional Mass, Mike Lewis of the Where Peter Is blog, who put the problem to Roche, in seeking a quotation from him. It seems plausible that the increasingly wide and intense attention being paid to the matter stimulated Cardinal Roche to have it cleared up formally, to his own satisfaction. Evidently Pope Francis, as Supreme Legislator, agreed to bring this about.
The letter of Cardinal Roche to the Californian bishop began to circulate on about 6th February. Flynn’s argument was published on his website, the Pillar, on the 10th. Mike Lewis published Cardinal Roche’s response on 17th. Roche was received in audience by Pope Francis on 20th, and the Rescript was published on 21st. This would be fast work for the Curia, but it is a short document and, as noted, the Dicastery was aware of the problem much earlier, and must have thought about how it could be dealt with.

If this is indeed the genesis of the document, it is a rare case where there is a relatively clear and simple explanation for the genesis of a Curial document. The significance of this explanation is that it would follow that there is no reason to think that the long-standing and intense rumours about a new document have been fulfilled: in short, we still have another one to look forward to.

As for the original argument about Canon 87.1, clearly, bishops can no longer use this in the matter of parish churches, since this is now reserved to the Holy See. What the Rescript does not say, however, is that all matters touched on by TC are reserved to the Holy See by virtue of Article 7: in other words, it does not vindicate the argument of Cardinal Roche’s letter to the Californian bishop.

Text of the Rescript

RESPSCRIPTUM EX AUDIENTIA SS.MI, 21.02.2023

The Holy Father, in the Audience granted on 20 February to the undersigned Cardinal Prefect of the Dicastery for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, has confirmed the following regarding the implementation of his Motu Proprio Traditionis custodes of 16 July 2021.

These dispensations are reserved in a special way to the Apostolic See (cf. C.I.C. can. 87 §1):

- the use of a parish church or the erection of a personal parish for the celebration of the Eucharist using the Missale Romanum of 1962 (cf. Traditionis custodes art. 3 §2);
- the granting of permission to priests ordained after the publication of Motu proprio Traditionis custodes to celebrate with the Missale Romanum of 1962 (cf. Traditionis custodes art. 4).

As established by Art. 7 of Motu proprio Traditionis custodes, the Dicastery for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments exercises the authority of the Holy See in the above-mentioned cases, supervising the observance of the provisions.

Should a diocesan bishop have granted dispensations in the two cases mentioned above, he is obliged to inform the Dicastery for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, which will assess the individual cases.

Furthermore, the Holy Father confirms – having already expressed his assent in the audience of 18 November 2021 – what was established in the Responsa ad dubia with the annexed Explanatory Notes of 4 December 2021.

The Holy Father has also ordered that this Rescript be published in L’Osservatore Romano and, subsequently, in the official commentary of the Acta Apostolicæ Sedis.

From the Vatican, 20 February 2023

Arthur Card. Roche, Prefect

Press Release from the Latin Mass Society and the FIUV

On Tuesday, 21st February, the Holy See Press Office published a Rescript confirming, for the Dicastery for Divine Worship, certain legal points in relation to the interpretation of Pope Francis’ Apostolic Letter Traditionis Custodes.

The key point is that from now on permission for the use of a parish church for celebrations of the 1962 Missal may only be granted by the Dicastery. The Rescript makes reference to Canon 87.1, which states that bishops may lift the obligations of universal law for the good of souls in their diocese: this no longer applies, as the matter is ‘reserved to the Holy See’.

The effect of this ruling will depend on the degree to which current provision for the celebration of the 1962 Missal depends on the use of parish churches in a particular locality; the willingness of bishops to seek permission from the Dicastery for celebrations in such churches to continue; and the response of the Dicastery to these requests.

If bishops all over the world seek permission for all the celebrations of the 1962 Mass taking place in parish churches in their dioceses, the Dicastery will be faced with many hundreds of cases to consider, raising the question of the practicability of them discharging their role.

The Latin Mass Society and the FIUV would like to express its dismay that authority over a matter of such pastoral sensitivity has been centralised in this way.

Serious pastoral harm will follow if permission is not granted where alternative places of worship are not readily available for the use of communities attached to the older form of the Mass.

Instead of integrating them into parish life, the restriction on the use
of parish churches will marginalise and push to the peripheries faithful Catholics who wish only to worship, in communion with their bishops, with a form of the liturgy permitted by the Church. This desire was described as a ‘rightful aspiration’ by Pope John Paul II, and this liturgy was described as representing ‘riches’ by Pope Benedict XVI.

We call upon all Catholics of good will to offer prayer and penances this Lent for the resolution of this issue and the liberty of the ancient Latin Mass.

Practical points

The Rescript has no automatic effect: previously arranged celebrations will take place unless priests and faithful are otherwise notified by the bishop of the diocese. The Rescript clarifies or modifies the meaning of Traditionis Custodes, which is addressed to bishops, and it is bishops who have the task of implementing it.

It will be licit for celebrations to continue while requests are prepared and processed.

The Rescript will not affect celebrations in places of worship not formally categorised as ‘parish churches’. See below for a full explanation.

Further explanation

The Rescript contains two other points: the reservation to the Holy See of permission for the erection of new personal parishes, and permission for priests ordained after the publication of Traditionis Custodes (16th July 2021) to celebrate the 1962 Missal. These simply confirm the acknowledged meaning of the original legislation.

By contrast, it has been widely pointed out that bishops have the right under Canon 87.1 to lift the obligations of universal law, including on the celebration of the older Mass in parish churches, unless the matter is explicitly reserved to the Holy See, and this has clearly caused some dissatisfaction at the Dicastery.

Parish churches are the principal church of a geographical parish: many parishes contain more than one place of worship, and many do not. Other places of worship include ‘chapels of ease’ (known by various names in different countries), which are secondary churches in a parish served by the clergy of the parish. They also include churches and chapels attached to religious communities and private houses; churches designated as shrines; and churches dedicated to serving a particular group not identified by reference to the geographical boundaries of a parish, i.e., personal parishes and chaplaincies (including ethnic chaplaincies).

The status of a church as a parish church is a matter for the bishop to determine (in accordance with set procedures) in establishing, abolishing, or merging parishes.

Some dioceses have many non-parish churches; others, very few. In some countries there are no parish churches, because the parish structure has not been established. In some cases Cathedrals are parish churches, and in some cases they are not.

The fact that the existence of non-parish churches is so varied for reasons of history and local circumstances makes the focus on the celebration of the 1962 Missal in parish churches puzzling and restrictions on these celebrations potentially very arbitrary and unjust. Restrictions on the use of parish churches will be felt much more keenly in the United States of America, for example, than in Italy.

Personal parishes have been one possible legal structure through which provision could be made formally for the 1962 Missal. In some countries where there is currently widespread provision for the 1962 Mass, such as England and Wales, this structure has been used very little. Alternatives include establishing a shrine for the celebration of this Missal, or its celebration alongside the reformed Mass in a parish or non-parish church.

The legal structure of a personal parish gives the priest in charge many of the duties and privileges of a parish priest, but it does not make the church where it is based a ‘parish church’. A personal parish may be based in a shrine church, a church shared with a geographical parish, or any other place of worship.

22nd February 2023, Ash Wednesday

Other Rumoured Documents

The latest version of the rumours, from a journalist everyone regards as having excellent sources, Diane Montagna, appeared in The Remnant on Saturday, 25th February.

Montagna’s sources say that there are two documents in circulation. One aims at tightening up Traditionis Custodes.

by banning diaconal and priestly ordinations in the Vetus Ordo, prohibiting the administration of the other sacraments to the faithful, and requiring concelebration of all priests, including members of these institutes. A prohibition of Sunday Masses in the Vetus Ordo is also said to be on the table.

The other document takes a very different approach:

It would recount the ‘blessings’ of the liturgical reform of Paul VI and the ‘abundant fruit’ it has born in the Church, and would seek to ‘crown and complete’ it by declaring that, henceforth, the only official rite of the Latin Church is the Roman Missal of Paul VI, the Novus Ordo.

It is hard to judge how this would work in practice, but Montagna’s sources suggest that its effects could be even worse than the first option. It is this second option which is linked to the 54th anniversary of the Novus Ordo, Monday of Holy Week.

It is to be noted that the rumoured documents would affect the Traditional priestly institutes very badly, whereas, particularly in light of the FSSP Decree, they have enjoyed a measure of protection up to now. Contrary to many expectations after the publication of TC, there has been no ‘visitation’ of their seminaries, and the Dicastery for Religious has apparently done little to exercise the authority over them given to it by TC.
Italian Petition of 5th February 1966

by Joseph Shaw

In the Winter 2021 edition of Gregorius Magnus we presented several petitions for the preservation of the Traditional Mass that were presented to the Holy See between 1966 and 2006. The first of these was organised by the remarkable Italian writer Cristina Campo (real name, Vittoria Guerrini), who died in 1977. Although we were able to republish the thirty-seven names attached to this petition, we did not have the text.

Now, however, thanks to diligent archival research by Fr Gabriel Diaz-Patri, the text has been uncovered, and for the sake of completeness we publish it here.

We hope to publish soon in book form a collection of materials on the petitions, placing them in their historical and intellectual context.

The Petition Text

Artists and scholars, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, concerned with preserving in the modern world one of the greatest cultural and spiritual heritages of the West – a heritage that runs the risk, in a short time, of becoming purely archaeological – ask that it be submitted to the benevolent attention of His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, a request that, as it appears, represents by now the desire of ever larger groups, both of the faithful and of non-Catholics, that the Latin-Gregorian liturgy, as practised for fifteen centuries in monastic orders, remain intact and complete at least in those conventual churches that do not have strictly parochial duties; that in this liturgy, including the Mass, there be no parts in other liturgical forms recently adopted in parish churches throughout the world.

Signatories

Wynstan Hugh Auden (W.H. Auden, English poet)
José Bergamin (Spanish writer and playwright)
Robert Bresson (French film director)*
Benjamin Britten (British composer)
Jorge Luis Borges (Argentinian writer)*
Cristina Campo (Italian writer)
Pablo Casals (Spanish/Puerto Rican musician)*
Elena Croce (Italian writer)*
Fedele D’Amico* Luigi Dallariaga
Giorgio De Chirico (Italian artist)
Tamaro De Marinis
Augusto Del Noce (Italian philosopher)*
Salvador De Madariaga (Spanish diplomat and writer)
Carl Theodor Dreyer (Danish film director)
Francesco Gabrieli (Professor of Arabic language and literature in the University of Rome)
Julien Green (French writer and member of L’Académie française)*
Jorge Guillén (Spanish poet)*
Hélène Kazantzaki
Lanza del Vasto (Italian philosopher)
Gertrud von Le Fort (German writer)
Gabriel Marcel (French writer)
Jacques Maritain (French philosopher)
François Mauriac (French writer and member of L’Académie française)
Eugenio Montale (Italian poet and Nobel laureate)*
Victoria Ocampo (Argentinian writer)*
Nino Perrotta*
Goffredo Petrucci (Italian composer)*
Iimestone Pizzetti (Italian composer)
Salvatore Quasimodo (Italian poet)
Elsa Respighi (Italian singer and composer)
Augusto Roncaglin
Wally Toscantini
Philip Toynbee (British writer)*
Evelyn Waugh (British novelist)
Morin Zambrano
Elémir Zolla (Italian philosopher)

Of particular interest are the Argentinian writer Jorge Luis Borges (d. 1986), the English (and non-Catholic) poet W.H. Auden (d. 1973), the French Academician Julien Green (d. 1998), philosophers from Italy (Augusto Del Noce, d. 1989) and France (Gabriel Marcel, d. 1973), the English novelist Evelyn Waugh (d. 1966), the French philosopher so admired by Pope Paul VI, Jacques Maritain (d. 1973), and Philip Toynbee, a well-known communist sympathiser.

About a dozen of these petitioners also added their names to the 1971 Petition, although some (such as Evelyn Waugh) had died: I have marked the double-signatories with an asterisk. These mostly appeared only in the Italian version of the petition with about one hundred names; of the names above, only Philip Toynbee appeared in the version of the petition which was printed in The Times with fifty-seven names.

It seems clear that Pope Paul VI’s 1966 Apostolic Letter Sacrificium Laudis was a direct result of this petition, just as the ‘English Indult’ was a response to the 1971 petition. The focus of the 1966 petition is on having the ancient Mass with Gregorian Chant in the churches of religious communities, and Sacrificium Laudis urges religious superiors to preserve the Latin Choral Office.

It seems Pope Paul thought that the desire of the petitioners for Gregorian Chant could be satisfied by the Chant of the Office, which was the preserve of the religious orders and certain aficionados, rather than of the great majority of Catholics.

It is interesting to observe the 1966 petitioners conceding that, perhaps, the Traditional Mass might be driven out of parish churches, just as under Traditionis Custodes it is being driven out of them today.
Mass of Ages is the magazine of the Latin Mass Society of England and Wales

In this edition of Gregorius Magnus we reprint an article by a regular Mass of Ages columnist, Peter A. Kwasniewski, who remembers Pope Benedict XVI.

In my home library of several thousand volumes, only a few authors enjoy the privileged status of occupying several shelves exclusively their own. No one will be surprised to hear that Aristotle and Aquinas are among them; in the music section, Arvo Pärt and G.F. Handel; and for pleasure, P.G. Wodehouse. Joseph Ratzinger belongs to this limited circle of authors whom I regard so highly that I have acquired nearly everything they wrote.

It would be difficult for me to reconstruct at this point the sequence in which I read his works, but for sure it started with The Ratzinger Report. I remember eagerly awaiting each subsequent sparkling interview—Salt of the Earth, God and the World, Light of the World—much as fiction fans might look forward to the latest release by a favorite novelist. As a professor, I would assign Called to Communion as a text in ecclesiology, and Behold the Pierced One as a text in Christology.

At the International Theological Institute (ITI) in Austria, I enjoyed the privilege of teaching alongside Fr (then Dr) John Saward at the time he was putting the finishing touches to his translation of The Spirit of the Liturgy. Although I had already fallen in love with the classical Roman Rite by experiencing it in its recited and sung forms, it was Ratzinger who first opened my eyes to why I loved it—the theological and spiritual rationale. He made my own mind and heart intelligible to me, gave me the language with which to express what had been an intuition and an attraction.

In discussing The Spirit of the Liturgy with fellow appreciators over the past two decades, especially members of the clergy, I learned that it had had the same powerful effect on many of its readers. At last, we had found a highly literate, sophisticated, rather audacious modern theologian who valued tradition, explained its meaning, rebuked its assailants, and advanced its recovery. That he was the right-hand man of John Paul II and followed him to the Chair of Peter only added to the momentary elation of recovering territory after a series of brutal losses.

Rejoicing there was, and plenty of it, in the small town of Gaming on that day in April of 2005, when the faculty and students of the ITI learned that Ratzinger had been elected Pope. We heard the bells of the town church start ringing like nobody’s business and we knew something was up. My wife and I took a short walk downtown to the apartment of some friends who had a TV, and they shouted to us from their upper-storey window: “It’s Ratzinger! Raaaaatziiingerrrrrr!” The rest of the day and week was passed in a sort of stupor, as the magnitude of the event sank in.

We have seen a steady stream of commentators in recent weeks attempting to pinpoint Benedict XVI’s “greatest work” or “lasting legacy”. When it comes to such a versatile and influential figure, it will not be easy to do that; rarely has anyone in the last hundred years spoken with as commanding a breadth and depth of knowledge as Ratzinger possessed, or with comparable rhetorical finesse. Besides, we are not as well-positioned to make such judgments as men will be twenty-five, fifty, or a hundred years hence. Nevertheless, for me two moments stand out as permanent points of reference. The first was the inaugural homily when Benedict took possession of his episcopal chair at the Cathedral of St John Lateran on 7 May 2005. Here is the key excerpt that should be framed in letters of gold:

Profound and Timeless Truths

Peter A. Kwasniewski remembers Pope Benedict XVI
“The power that Christ conferred upon Peter and his Successors is, in an absolute sense, a mandate to serve. The power of teaching in the Church involves a commitment to the service of obedience to the faith. The Pope is not an absolute monarch whose thoughts and desires are law. On the contrary: the Pope’s ministry is a guarantee of obedience to Christ and to His Word. He must not proclaim his own ideas, but rather constantly bind himself and the Church to obedience to God’s Word, in the face of every attempt to adapt it or water it down, and every form of opportunism....

“The Pope knows that in his important decisions, he is bound to the great community of faith of all times, to the binding interpretations that have developed throughout the Church’s pilgrimage. Thus, his power is not being above, but at the service of, the Word of God. It is incumbent upon him to ensure that this Word continues to be present in its greatness and to resound in its purity, so that it is not torn to pieces by continuous changes in usage.”

For decades, the promulgation of Summorum Pontificum just over two years earlier—and in the teeth of ferocious resistance. We can size up the magnitude of that resistance when we recall that the same conclusions had been reached twenty years earlier, in 1986, by a commission of cardinals appointed by John Paul II, but no action was then taken. Yet here was a Pope—a Pope!—giving voice to the fundamental principle of traditionalism: “What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful. It behooves all of us to preserve the riches which have developed in the Church’s faith and prayer, and to give them their proper place” (Con Grande Fiducia, the letter that accompanied the motu proprio).

Moreover, he acknowledged the feelings that so many of the younger generation had: “In the meantime [since the reform] it has clearly been demonstrated that young persons too have discovered this liturgical form [of the usus antiquior], felt its attraction and found in it a form of encounter with the Mystery of the Most Holy Eucharist, particularly suited to them.” Finally, a Pope who recognized our existence! This “sacred and great principle,” as I call it, is no mere time-bound prudential evaluation, subject to an unceremonious reversal under the next regime. Rather, it enunciates a perennial principle, a truth that flows from the nature of the Catholic Faith in its approved and received historical embodiment, the fruit of Divine Providence.

Respect for the dead does not exclude a rigorous honesty. There were frustrating traits in Ratzinger’s writings and behavior, which, I think, could be summed up as a dialectical tendency, inherited from German philosophy, to bestow with one hand and to take away with the other. The Old Rite should be freely available... but there is nothing really wrong with the New Rite. The traditionalists should be respected... but they also must find their way to embrace the nouvelle théologie’s agenda. Hell really exists... but probably only for the likes of Hitler and Stalin. Ratzinger’s theology contains irreconcilable elements, commitments that clash like dissonant notes. Perhaps we might say that his heart was more traditional than his mind, and that, when he allowed himself sentire cum ecclesia—to think, feel, and perceive with the Church of all ages—he was capable of uttering profound and timeless truths that started like exploding bombs in the midst of the false peace of the post-conciliar Church. These truths, liberated from their dialectical confines, will guide the recovery and reestablishment of tradition for decades, nay, centuries to come.

Put briefly: Ratzinger can awaken us to the theological weight of the question of continuity; but once one sees for oneself the magnitude of rupture that has occurred, one can no longer play along with the “hermeneutic of continuity” or the “reform of the reform.” In short, as with so many other great figures and thinkers in history, Ratzinger has initiated a process that surpasses its founding insights and motivations. Better said, he nourished an already existing movement that benefited from the theological heft and official encouragement he offered it.

The most lasting legacy of Benedict XVI is to have helped mightily in clearing the way for a return of traditional Catholicism—regardless of his own complicated and conflicted relationship to it; regardless of our current weariness and woes under the anti-Ratzinger who succeeded him. Without him, I am quite confident that in far more places we would still be stuck spinning our wheels in the crooning guitar Mass paradigm that has emptied churches everywhere. He mainstreamed the concerns that only the maligned “Lefebvrists” had hitherto dared to speak and act upon.

Should we be disappointed that he never celebrated the traditional Roman Rite as Pope? That he abdicated his office at a time when the prospect of a reversal of his efforts was a real and present danger? That he did not protest his successor’s numerous deviations but allowed himself to be co-opted as acquiescent? Yes, I believe we should be. All the same, the honorable thing for us to do at the present time is to pray God to glorify his soul and to acknowledge with humble gratitude the enormous blessings we have received through his teaching and example, contrary to all human probabilities. For there is no question that the traditional movement experienced its greatest growth under the benign fourteen-year reign of the policies of Summorum Pontificum. The gentle scholar-Pope sparked a “new liturgical movement,” a work of rediscovery and restoration, which even his worst enemies cannot reverse, however much they throw obstacles in its path.

While I too have written lines in criticism of this or that aspect of Ratzinger’s doctrine and governance, I have written vastly more in praise of what he has bestowed on me, on us, on the Church. I would not be a traditionalist writer and speaker today but for him and the inspiration of his liturgical theology. Thank you, Lord Jesus, for the gift of this man’s life and work. We beg You to give us the grace to assimilate all that is good in it and to build upon it wisely.
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UNA VOCE is the magazine of Una Voce France. Here we publish a piece by a former UV France president, the well-known Jacques Dhaussy.

Benedict XVI, an ‘Extraordinary’ Pope!

Our relentless publication schedule caused us to miss the chance to comment immediately after the Pope Emeritus’s call to God on Saturday, 31st December 2022, at the age of 95.

He has left us, serenely, and there is no doubt that we now have an effective intercessor whom we will not fail to invoke in a secularized world, deaf to the truth. We will need him so that the Church may be faithful to her two-thousand-year-old tradition.

This holy pope was often misunderstood, even insulted, but his intellectual stature allowed the great theologian that he was to leave to the Church a teaching of incomparable richness.

Our association had to be present at the Requiem Mass celebrated on 5th January, in a packed St. Peter’s Square. I joined the International Federation and other members of friendly associations. Arriving the day before, we became aware of a number of disturbing facts. At the news of Benedict XVI’s death, no official mourning was declared, either in the Vatican or in nunciatures abroad. No flag at half-mast! No procession during the transport of the remains from the Mater Ecclesiae monastery to St. Peter’s Basilica.

Pope Benedict greets the FIUV: Shaking hands with Monika Rheinschmitt, with (right to left) Leo Darroch, Rodolfo Vargas Rubio, and Jack Oostveen
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He has left us, serenely, and there is no doubt that we now have an effective intercessor whom we will not fail to invoke in a secularized world, deaf to the truth. We will need him so that the Church may be faithful to her two-thousand-year-old tradition.

This holy pope was often misunderstood, even insulted, but his intellectual stature allowed the great theologian that he was to leave to the Church a teaching of incomparable richness.

Our association had to be present at the Requiem Mass celebrated on 5th January, in a packed St. Peter’s Square. I joined the International Federation and other members of friendly associations. Arriving the day before, we became aware of a number of disturbing facts. At the news of Benedict XVI’s death, no official mourning was declared, either in the Vatican or in nunciatures abroad. No flag at half-mast! No procession during the transport of the remains from the Mater Ecclesiae monastery to St. Peter’s Basilica.

A small part of the impressive Bavarian delegation that came to pay their last respects to their dear compatriot
We were in situ at the time of the Mass and our knowledge of the Italian language allowed us to note that the reigning pope did not express a single word about the immense legacy of Benedict XVI in his homily. He mentioned the late pope only briefly, at the end, to say: ‘Benedict, faithful friend of the Bridegroom, may your joy be perfect in hearing his voice definitively and forever!’

On the other hand, we were delighted at the sight of so many young priests who came to bid farewell to Pope Benedict wearing the cassock. St. Peter’s Square was also filled with families with children despite a freezing winter mist: a crowd estimated at more than 60,000 people. And, to speak of figures, let us specify that, on the side of the clergy, the representation was impressive: 130 cardinals, 400 bishops, 3,700 priests!

The booklet that was widely distributed to all participants to follow the Mass was very well done, with the translation of the Latin texts into Italian and English. Yes, Latin, because it is in the language of the Church that this Requiem Mass was celebrated, entirely sung in Gregorian chant and polyphony by an excellent schola.

The death of Benedict XVI has provoked many analyses and comments in friendly periodicals, echoed in our press review. For our part, we will remember the wisdom of this holy pope, his pedagogical gifts, his humility, and his goodness, which was expressed in his luminous gaze.

We thank him for the publication of the motu proprio Summorum Pontificum of 7th July 2007, which confirmed (what we already knew) that the Mass according to the old ordo of 1962 had NEVER been abrogated! His private secretary, Archbishop Georg Gänswein, said that the Pope Emeritus had read the motu proprio Traditionis Custodes ‘with pain in his heart’ or ‘with a broken heart’ (depending on the translations).

We conclude this quick tribute to the late Pontiff in a lighter way with a reminder of his musical talents. He was a knowledgeable pianist and particularly loved Mozart and Bach. He had his beloved instrument transported to the Vatican and he played it regularly. Many concerts were given at the Sacred Palace during his pontificate.

He was, of course, keenly interested in the place of music in the liturgy, calling for respect for the musical tradition of previous centuries. Here is what he said at a concert in 2006: ‘An authentic aggiornamento of liturgical music can only take place in the wake of the great tradition of the past, Gregorian chant and sacred polyphony’. In this struggle that we are waging at Una Voce for the maintenance of the Latin liturgy, Gregorian chant, and sacred chant in the Roman Catholic liturgy, we were happy to be encouraged in this way.

Despite the current tendency to easily canonize contemporary popes, and the placards we saw in Rome on 5th January bearing the inscription Santo subito, we will not go down this path. We will content ourselves with asking you to pray for the eternal rest of his soul and especially on 31st December, his dies natalis. Let us have a special and prayerful thought for him as we sing the Te Deum traditionally performed on this last day of the year in our churches: Tu devícto mortis acúleo, aperuísti credéntibus regna cælorum! (When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers). This hymn of thanksgiving suits him perfectly! Yes, thank you, Most Holy Father! 🙏
Book Recommendation: *Near Missed Masses: Ten Short Stories Based on Actual Events*, by Fr Armand de Malleray, FSSP (Arouca Press, 2021), 204 pages

*from* the Una Voce Scotland Newsletter, July 2021

Hot off the press, *Near Missed Masses* sees Fr de Malleray turn his gift for communicating the truths of the faith to storytelling. In the style of what a far less edifying author once called ‘Faction’, the book presents ten fictional stories based on very real facts. In a thoroughly Catholic fashion that is reminiscent of the novels of Michael D. O’Brien, Fr de Malleray explores the challenges and joys experienced by priests as they overcome obstacles in their ministries. The humorous narratives have at their core the most serious of themes: the dignity of the sacred priesthood, the nature of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the necessity and transforming power of the sacramental life and an insight into the difficulties faced by faithful priests.

Naturally, my interest was immediately piqued by the story set in Scotland: ‘Swine Flu by Loch Lomond’. Featuring a UVS cameo appearance under the pseudonym ‘Sursum Corda’, the tale is presented by a priest, stationed in the highlands, who rediscovered the traditional Latin Mass when gifted an Altar Missal with a very significant connection to his Siamese roots. As the tale unfolds we see the opposition that Father faces when he opposes modernist trends and parishioners of varying degrees of goodwill. Learning the Extraordinary Form on a broken chest of drawers in his attic, hidden from the eyes of the diocesan youth worker-cum-parish busybody, the priest’s diary entries chronicle the introduction of the Latin Mass in his chaplaincy, the subsequent growth of the congregation and solemnity of the liturgy and the impact that it has on his priesthood. Collected in 2023 as part of the beatification process of the bishop of the diocese of ‘Kinlochlour’, we read of the restrictions placed on public worship because of the outbreak of Swine Flu in 2003. Twenty years later, it is hoped by the current bishop of the diocese that his predecessor would be declared the first martyr of COVID-19 after contracting the virus as a result of his pastoral zeal.

The tact with which the Old Rite was introduced, the growth of the congregation (and collection takings!), the family and youth demographic, the opposition faced and the touching vulnerability of a priest with a heart condition and his own insecurities make this ‘factional’ story a familiar allegory for the experience of many who work for the restoration of the tradition of the church. Fr de Malleray’s skilful writing, and no doubt a typological/allegorical/sacramental world view, make for a witty and thought-provoking read. Highly acclaimed by Joseph Pearce, Fr Julian Large (Provost, London Oratory) and others – the perfect summer book.  

---

*Extraordinary Form on a broken chest of drawers in his attic, hidden from the eyes of the diocesan youth worker-cum-parish busybody, the priest’s diary entries chronicle the introduction of the Latin Mass in his chaplaincy, the subsequent growth of the congregation and solemnity of the liturgy and the impact that it has on his priesthood. Collected in 2023 as part of the beatification process of the bishop of the diocese of ‘Kinlochlour’, we read of the restrictions placed on public worship because of the outbreak of Swine Flu in 2003. Twenty years later, it is hoped by the current bishop of the diocese that his predecessor would be declared the first martyr of COVID-19 after contracting the virus as a result of his pastoral zeal.*
A Right to a Rite?

by Michael Davies

We are indebted to Leo Darroch, a past President of the FIUV, for sending us a talk of his predecessor Michael Davies, which seems to date to the beginning of the present century. The talk is entitled ‘True and False Liturgical Reform’; we present here the concluding section.

This brings us to the concluding section of my talk. I have described the Mass of St Pius V as the birthright of every Catholic of the Roman Rite, and if this assertion is accepted it means that no one, the Pope included, was entitled to deprive us of this birthright, to destroy it. This is a claim that lies at the heart of the radical incompatibility between conservative and traditional Catholics. ‘Birthright!’ exclaim the conservatives. ‘What birthright? Only one man in the Church has rights – the Pope, the Bishop of Rome, the Vicar of Christ. He is entitled to change the liturgy in any way he wishes and the other members of the Church, from cardinals to laymen, have a duty to accept the changes with docility. Indeed, if they are true Catholics, loyal Catholics, they will not simply accept these changes but welcome them.

The papal power of jurisdiction is indeed awesome. His prerogatives are listed in detail in two columns of the Catholic Encyclopedia – to give just one example:

He has full authority to interpret, alter, and abrogate both his own laws and those established by his predecessors. He has the same plenitude of power as they enjoyed and stands in the same relation to their laws as those which he himself has decreed.

Does this mean that to speak of the birthright of the faithful in liturgical matters is meaningless? Does only one right exist, that of the Pope to command the faithful to worship in the manner which he sees fit to accord them? In other words, which should take precedence – the will of the legislator or the good of those for whom he is legislating? During the past two centuries there has evolved among many of the most loyal and most orthodox Catholics, a totally untraditional and uncatholic concept of the papacy in which, to all intents and purposes, the Pope is envisaged as an absolute monarch whose merest whim is law, and whose subjects can have a genuine right only to what he sees fit to accord them.

On the contrary, where there is a question of rights, it is the rights of the subject rather than those of the legislator that must take precedence. St Thomas accepts the classical definition of justice as rendering to each one what is his right or due, and explains that a man is said to be just because he respects the rights of others. Every legislator in Church and State has an absolute obligation to rule justly, and this obligation is not simply binding upon the Pope, but it is clear that in his capacity as the Vicar, the earthly representative of Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the source of all justice, this obligation binds the Pope more than any other ruler. He is the supreme shepherd charged with guiding his flock to heaven, and if, through harsh or unjust treatment on his part, even one of them should be driven from the fold he would bear a heavy responsibility. He has the duty to emulate his divine master and guide his flock to the green pastures and clear refreshing waters to which Psalm 22 refers.

What appears to be the virtually unlimited juridical authority possessed by the Pope is restricted by moral considerations. What is legally valid is not necessarily morally licit. An evident example of legally valid but morally illicit papal legislation was the all too frequent practice of nepotism in which benefices established for the salvation of souls were used by popes as no more than a source of income for their relations. Karl Rahner, who was most certainly not a Traditional Catholic, wrote an interesting study in 1965 on the distinction between legally valid but morally illicit papal legislation, and used the liturgy to illustrate his thesis. The Pope, he explained, is legally entitled to impose the Roman rite upon the eastern rites, but to do so would be a totally immoral act which would inevitably result in a schism for which the Pope would be responsible. Msgr Gamber goes even further and poses the question as to whether a pope has even the legal authority to abolish the Traditional Mass:

Since there is no document that specifically assigns to the Apostolic See the authority to change, let alone abolish the traditional liturgical rite; and since, furthermore, it can be shown that not a single predecessor of Pope Paul VI has ever introduced major changes into the Roman liturgy, the assertion that the Holy See has the authority to change the liturgical rite would appear to be debatable to say the least.

During the debate on infallibility during the First Vatican Council, fears were expressed that the Pope was to be given absolute or arbitrary power. It was made clear that this was not to be the case, and that the plenitude of papal power (plenitudo potestatis) was subject to a number of limitations, the most important of which is the obligation to use it only to build up the Mystical Body:

Therefore, Peter has as much power as the Lord has given him not for the destruction, but for the building up of the Body of Christ, that is, the Church.

I have already cited the article in the Catholic Encyclopedia listing the awesome powers of jurisdiction possessed by the Pope. But after listing them it states:

Though the power of the pope, as we have described it, is very great, it does not follow that it is arbitrary and unrestricted. The Pope, as cardinal Hergenröther well says, is 'circumscribed by the consciousness of the necessity of making a righteous and beneficent use of the duties attached to his privileges... He is also circumscribed by the spirit and practice of the Church, by the respect due to General Councils and to ancient statutes and customs, by the rights of bishops, by his relation with civil powers, by the traditional mild tone of government indicated the aim of the institution of the papacy – to feed...’

In his book L’Eglise du Verbe Incarné, Cardinal Journet quotes Cajetan as follows:

All this power is given to the Pope for no other end than the service of the Church. She is greater than he, not in authority but in worth and nobility. The papacy is for the Church, not the Church for the papacy; the end is always nobler than the means. Hence the Pope calls himself the ‘Servant of the servants of God’ and, so doing, he stands in the truth, et sic est in veritate.

Liturgical laws, although coming within the category of ecclesiastical law, must be governed by the same principles by which any human law can be judged. The prayers in the Mass and the rubrics governing its celebration are, as has been explained, generally the codification of practices already established by custom. ‘Liturgies are not made, they grow in the devotion of centuries’, notes Professor Owen Chadwick in his history of the Reformation.

St Thomas defines a law as ‘an ordinance of reason for the common good, made by him who has care of the community, and promulgated.’ The consensus of Catholic authorities agrees with St Thomas in his exposition of the nature of human law, namely, that whether civil or ecclesiastical, it is an act of public authority having the right to demand obedience, but which itself must conform to the demands of reason and be seen to have an effect that is both good and to the benefit to those for whom it is intended. St Thomas, followed by other authorities, warns that any change in existing legislation must be made only with extreme caution, particularly where it might involve changes in any longstanding customs. In support of this contention, he cites the Decretals: ‘It is absurd, and a detestable shame, that we should suffer those traditions to be changed which we have received from the fathers of old.’ He adds that the very fact of changing a law, even for a better one, ‘is of itself prejudicial to the common good: because custom avails much for the observance of laws, seeing that what is done contrary to general custom even in slight matters is looked upon as grave.

In discussing the question of the mutation of laws, St Thomas lays down the premise that there are two remote reasons which can lead to a just change in the laws. The first resides in the nature of man, who, being a rational being, is gradually led by his reason from what is less perfect to what is more perfect. The second reason must be found in the actions which are being subjected to the regulation of law, and which can change according to the various circumstances in which men find themselves and in which they must work. Every change in law must be determined by an evident necessity of the common good since law is rightly changed only insofar as this change manifestly contributes to the welfare of the community. The principle was echoed in the Liturgy Constitution of the Second Vatican Council, which commanded that ‘there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them’ (Article 23).

Even where a change in the law carries an evident benefit, it will be accompanied by some harm to the common good as any change in the law abandons a custom, and custom is always a great help and support in the observance of laws. Any change in an individual law diminishes the force and respect paid to law because a custom is taken away. Reference has already been made to the importance attached by St Thomas Aquinas to maintaining existing customs unless changing them is demanded by some overwhelming necessity. With profound psychological insight, he adds that this is true even when the innovations contrary to custom are minor ones, for, even though minor in themselves, they may appear important in the common estimation.

From this he draws a general conclusion: law must never be changed unless it is certain that the common good will find in the modification at least adequate compensation for the harm done by way of derogating a custom.

Suarez, another great authority, insists that for his law to be considered reasonable, a legislator must not simply refrain from demanding something his subjects will find impossible to carry out, but that the law must not even be too difficult, distressing, or disagreeable, taking account of human frailty. On no account should it contradict any reasonable custom because custom is a kind of ‘second nature’ and what it finds abhorrent ‘is considered to be morally impossible’. He also lays great stress on the necessity for laws to be permanent – not in the sense that they can never be abrogated, but that this shall only occur if changing circumstances make it quite clear that they are no longer just. If legislation is to work in the common interest, it must aim at stability and uniformity within the community.

Where there is the least doubt that the benefits of a change in the laws are likely to outweigh considerably the harm that will result from a change of custom, then it is better to conserve the existing legislation rather than change it. Being the accepted practice, it has, so to speak, the right of possession and, in a case of doubt, it is the right of possession which is the stronger.

The history of the various Christian denominations is replete with instances of disruption and even schisms concerning changes in established customs, changes which many modern commentators might regard as trivial matters. The secession of the Old Believers from the Russian Orthodox Church is a typical example.

What such incidents prove is the accuracy of St Thomas’s insight into the harmful

9 ST, II, I, Q. 90, art. 4.
10 ST, II, I, Q. 97, art. 2.
11 Ibid.
12 Ibid., art. 1.
13 Ibid., art. 2.
14 Ibid.
15 De Legibus, t.5 & 6.
16 In the seventeenth century the Patriarch Nikon of Moscow changed the spelling of the name of Jesus and how many fingers were to be joined when making the sign of the cross. A schism resulted and about 12 million Old Believers (Raskolnik) left the Russian Church.
The End of a Mass in Leeds
Diocese, England

by Rosalind Crow

The Mass at St Ignatius’ Church in Leeds Diocese was relatively new but grew quickly. While the Novus Ordo parishioners stayed at home after the lockdowns, we grew in strength, an unwelcome surprise to be discovered at their hesitant return. ‘Who do these people think they are?’ an elderly parishioner loudly whispered as we left the parish centre one Sunday. It was very much them against us. As a congregation, we worked hard to improve relations with the existing parish, removing the fear of the unknown, replacing it with mutual respect and understanding.

Located in the south of the diocese, we attracted many escaping the liturgical wasteland of Hallam Diocese and others from even further afield. St Ignatius was regularly used as a safe haven for travellers, stopping in for a singular Mass at the convenient crossroad of the M1 and M62. We introduced a sung Mass once a month, taught two boys to serve, helped in the discernment of a parishioner now at the Wigratzbad seminary of the Priestly Fraternity of St Peter, and reached fifty in the congregation, which was no mean feat for a small suburban church. The community spirit was thriving in the parish centre afterwards; the children formed friendships, bringing games to sit and play while the adults discussed theology and family life.

Sunday, 26th February, witnessed the last Mass as decreed by the Bishop of Leeds, Cardinal Roche’s successor.

The Mass provided familiar, unwavering stability to calm us. Following Mass, groups discussed their next move with a mixture of sobriety and zeal. We have all experienced the Novus Ordo Mass and sought the Traditional Latin Mass for a reason, leaving behind previous parishes, friendships, and routines, and embarking on a new chapter for the good of our souls. As a community we are always on the move, like refugees forced to flee our spiritual home, so this is nothing new to us. All were determined to continue attending the Traditional Mass wherever possible, and many were willing to travel great distances to do so. When the time came to leave for home, there was a common understanding that our small parish would simply pick up and move elsewhere.

We stayed behind to say farewell to the Novus Ordo parishioners who, embracing us as friends, expressed their shock and upset along with statements of ‘it’s as though you’re being persecuted’.

Taking inspiration from our nation’s history of religious oppression and the great English Martyrs, we must not fall into the sin of despair, but remain faithful that God will see us through these times of hardship.  

Effects of changing the status quo without overwhelming reasons for doing so. Professor Johannes Wagner, Director of the Liturgical Institute of Trier, evoked this principle when he wrote:

History has proved a thousand times that there is nothing more dangerous for a religion, nothing is more likely to result in discontent, incertitude, division, and apostasy than interference with the liturgy and consequently with religious sensibility.17

Salus animarum suprema est lex – The good of souls is the supreme law. It is a law which binds all Christians and binds above all the Holy Father, who, we can be sure, wishes to be bound by it. Did he not decree in his Apostolic Constitution Ecclesia Dei that by virtue of his apostolic authority ‘respect must everywhere be shown for the feelings of all those who are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition’? We have a right to what is essential for the good of our souls, and we therefore have a right to the traditional Mass of the Roman rite, ‘the most beautiful thing this side of heaven’. Let me conclude by quoting Msgr Gamber once more:

In the final analysis, this means that in the future the traditional rite of Mass must be retained in the Roman Catholic Church – as the primary liturgical form for the celebration of Mass. It must become once more the norm of our faith and the symbol of Catholic unity throughout the world, a rock of stability in a period of upheaval and never-ending change.18

Some of the sources referred to in the notes have been abbreviated as follows:

ESR – F. Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (Devon, 1980)
ST – Summa Theologiae
As is now customary, every year since 2012 the Summorum Pontificum people have gathered in Rome from all over the world at the end of October for a pilgrimage designed to show their love for the Traditional liturgy and, in a procession ad sedem Petri in the city centre, their fidelity to the Holy Roman Catholic Church. The event unfolds in a series of religious rites based on liturgical books prior to Vatican II, and most recently took place from Friday to Sunday, 28th to 30th October 2022. The last day always coincides with the last Sunday in October, the feast of Christ the King according to the pre-conciliar calendar.

For some years now, the official opening of the pilgrimage has been preceded in the first part of Friday by a meeting in which issues and problems relating to the international predicament of the Traditional liturgy are discussed. Whereas this is an event of a secular character, for the rest of Friday and in the following two days a multiplicity of religious ceremonies take place, including Friday evening Vespers, which officially opens the pilgrimage. The other two religious highlights are the Solemn Pontifical Mass in San Pietro on Saturday morning at the end of the procession, presided over in 2022 by Msgr Dominique Rey, bishop of Fréjus-Toulon, and then the Pontifical Mass for the feast of Christ the King on Sunday at the church of Santissima Trinità dei Pellegrini (Holy Trinity of the Pilgrims).

The meeting was held in the great hall of the Augustinianum Patristic Institute adjacent to St. Peter’s Square on the initiative of Christian Marquant, president of Oremus-Paix Liturgique and with the coordination of Prof Rubén Peretó Rivas, president of CIEL (International Centre for Liturgical Studies). Among the speakers were Fr Claude Barthe, official chaplain of the Coetus Internationalis Summorum Pontificum, organizer of the pilgrimage; Don Nicola Bux, theologian and former Vatican consultant; liturgy scholar and writer Peter Kwasniewski; Vaticanist Aldo Maria Valli; and Trinidad Dufourq, a French translator at the University of Buenos Aires specializing in religious texts. The gist of the event and its lectures was aptly captured by Don Nicola Bux when he proclaimed with convincing optimism that ‘the future is ours’.

Those wishing to know more about the interventions may consult the various dedicated sites and blogs that have dealt with the topic. Here, however, we intend to explore a particular aspect of the event, which until the last moment this writer feared could be cancelled. Given the ongoing offensive against the Traditional liturgy in the ancient rite, especially after the publication of the motu proprio Traditionis Custodes (Guardians of Tradition), this writer seriously feared that the pilgrimage could be cancelled at the last moment, and therefore we were pleasantly surprised that everything went smoothly in the end.
But we must say that the surprise was even greater when we learned of the involvement of Cardinal Matteo Zuppi of Bologna, who presided over the solemn inaugural Vespers of the pilgrimage in the church of Santa Maria dei Martiri at the Pantheon. Perhaps few noticed, but for the first time the pilgrimage was joined by a senior prelate who is a personal friend of the Pope, who is not only still in office but even president of the Italian bishops’ conference. For those who know the situation well, this development is incredible if we consider the religious, cultural, and ideological background of the cardinal, of whom the British Vaticanist Edward Pentin provides an accurate portrait in the National Catholic Register.

Pentin speaks of Cardinal Zuppi as a prelate ‘known for social activism and his closeness to Italian leftist politics’, ‘with close connections to the Sant’Egidio lay community but who is also friendly to adherents of the ancient liturgy’. His closeness to Italian leftist politics could not have been more evident on the occasion of the religious service he led on 10th December 2013 in memory of and as a tribute to the anti-apartheid leader Nelson Mandela, who had just passed away five days before. The event was arranged by the Sant’Egidio community and took place in the church of Sant’Egidio Rome, which can be regarded as a sort of religious headquarters of this charity. Being there for work reasons, this writer was struck by the words of the then auxiliary bishop of Rome Zuppi, who extolled Mandela by saying, more or less verbatim, that ‘he is a saint and is already in Heaven’ – which therefore means, as a logical consequence, that he does not need our prayers. Besides not even being Catholic, Mandela never made a mystery of his revolutionary Marxist ideology. The senior prelate had met and teamed up with him in the early 2000s for peace initiatives between Tutsis and Hutus in Burundi.

On the other hand, ‘despite this, Cardinal Zuppi has kept the channels of dialogue open with those who favour the Church’s tradition, and has celebrated the traditional Latin Mass on at least two occasions in the past’ in Rome, Pentin continued. The first Pontifical Mass was celebrated on 30th March 2014 in the church of Santissima Trinità dei Pellegrini, a personal parish church created by Pope Benedict XVI to specifically provide for the needs of traditional-minded faithful, and the second was on Pentecost Sunday, 8th June 2014, in the church of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary in via del Corso, another church where the ancient rite is regularly celebrated on Sundays.

In this regard, an interesting observation needs to be made, because at a certain point it seemed that this Mass was about to be suppressed. Instead, after a meeting on 27th November 2012 (incidentally or providentially the feast of the Miraculous Medal) with the Discalced Augustinians to whom the church is entrusted, the priests of the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest who celebrate Mass there, and representatives of the faithful who attend regularly, the then vicar general of His Holiness for the diocese of Rome, Cardinal Agostino Vallini, and the auxiliary bishop, Mgr Zuppi, confirmed that the Traditional rite would continue to be celebrated. Therefore, also with the contribution of Mgr Zuppi, the Traditional Mass in the ancient rite, celebrated for about thirty years in that church, was not discontinued as had been feared.

At that time, his decision to celebrate the Old Rite was reported to have been motivated by the need to get acquainted and familiarise himself with all the various Catholic entities under his jurisdiction as auxiliary bishop of Rome for the city centre sector, and traditional Catholicism was precisely one of these. Is there anything more ordinary than a bishop who wishes to visit one of his parishes and even say Mass there? In this case, however, the event was extraordinary because he was the first bishop engaged in the pastoral care of the city of Rome to celebrate according to the Traditional Catholic rite since time immemorial.

Pentin’s article, ‘Cardinal Zuppi Is an Unlikely Ally of the Ancient Liturgy Given His Background Which Places Social Activism above Liturgical Concerns’, goes on to say: ‘He has also become known in recent years for some distinctly heterodox positions, especially regarding homosexuality’. He also took part in many ecumenical and interreligious dialogue activities.

Cardinal Zuppi was known for many years in his native Rome as a ‘street priest’ because of his efforts to help the disadvantaged in conjunction with the Sant’Egidio community. His activities ranged from helping marginalised children in Roman slums and the elderly, to helping immigrants, the homeless, the terminally ill, the disabled, drug addicts, prisoners, and victims of conflicts.

But we cannot end this article without a final and appropriate observation: given that His Eminence Cardinal Zuppi owes so much to Pope Francis for his promotions, is it credible that he light-heartedly took the decision to preside over the opening Vespers of the pilgrimage with the risk of displeasing or irritating the Holy Father? Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that he consulted with His Holiness on the matter and that he received the go-ahead. The national and global repercussions of such a pilgrimage risk making the goal of erasing the Old Rite as set forth by the motu proprio Traditionis Custodes increasingly unattainable, all the more so if we consider the success of the 2022 pilgrimage, which, with about 1,700 attendees, according to the organisers, almost doubled the previous year’s turnout at the Pontifical Mass at St Peter’s. Could it be a sign that the Pope is somehow softening his position against the ancient liturgy in Latin?
Despite having some of the finest Victorian Gothic churches in the world, the product of gold and wool prosperity, Australia has never been a very religious country and is now so less than ever. Its most recent census, in August 2021, showed that all the mainstream Christian communions are declining in one way or another. The Catholic Church is more or less holding its numbers at just over 5 million, or about 22 percent of the population, but that is partly due to recent immigration from southern Asian countries, and is not reflected in Mass attendance, which has fallen from an estimated 74 percent in the mid-1950s to under 14 percent in 2006, which for some reason is the last year for which figures have been published. It will certainly have diminished further since then. Falling numbers at Mass demonstrate that, when it comes to staying away from church, Australia’s Anglo-Celtic Catholics, most of whom have attended Catholic schools, have nothing to learn from Catholics in Britain and Ireland.

But, just as in Britain and Ireland, one expression of Catholicism that is going against the trend is the Traditional Latin Mass, the ‘Extraordinary Form’, as it was until recently known. There are about sixty churches and chapels in Australia where the Latin Mass is regularly celebrated, among them the vast Gothic cathedrals of Sydney and Melbourne. Traditio...
and toast, and on Sunday bacon and scrambled eggs. Lunch the first day on the 2022 pilgrimage consisted of vast plates of hefty sandwiches with old-fashioned fillings such as egg and lettuce, cheese and gherkin; the second day it was paella from a van, the third sausages and salad in bread rolls. Dinner is meat (except on Friday) and vegetables, with a simple pudding. In addition to all this, there is morning and afternoon tea.

In the evenings, in Chaucerian spirit, many pilgrims make for the pub in one of the two townships where the pilgrimage stops for the night, Smeaton and Newstead. These are tiny hamlets, with pubs that are not much more than a public bar. Both record their busiest evening of the year when the pilgrims turn up. There is friendly give-and-take with the handful of regulars who are the mainstay of the pub at other times, and last year there were songs around the piano, led by the pilgrims’ choir. A couple of beers is as good a way as any to soften the prospect of the cold, hard bed on the buffalo grass of the local recreation reserve. Sleeping arrangements apart, compared with 1991, the pilgrimage is markedly more comfortable. The early pilgrims carried everything they needed with them – and disappeared into the bush if they had to. Today there are portaloos stationed every two or three miles.

It is unfortunate but perhaps unsurprising that the although the pilgrimage is now an established event, it has not been blessed with much episcopal enthusiasm in the two dioceses through which it passes. The bishops of both are proponents of the ‘spirit of Vatican II’. Shane McKinley, the Bishop of Sandhurst, as the Bendigo diocese is known, published a welcome to the pilgrims on his website, but neither he nor Paul Bird, the Redemptorist who is Bishop of Ballarat, attended the opening or closing Mass, though, to give them credit, they allowed the Masses to be celebrated in their cathedrals.

The early organisers chose Ballarat and Bendigo because they wanted two cathedrals far enough apart for a three-day walk, and it helped that Bendigo Cathedral, a soaring Gothic church with a spire that rises above the city like that of a French hilltop cathedral, is one of the finest churches in Australia, an astonishing building to have been completed in the twentieth century. But Australians are a bush-loving people, and as the colossal organ thundered to welcome the pilgrims at journey’s end, some may have felt that it was among the trees and hills of the countryside they had passed through that they were most at home in their worship, where the kurrajongs echoed the sanctuary bells and the scent of wet eucalyptus mingled with the incense.
At a distance of 1,300 years away from the time when St Isidore of Seville composed his Etymologies and more than nine centuries since St Thomas Aquinas wrote Summa Theologiae, we know that, besides the invaluable lights projected by the work of eternal wisdom through these Christian geniuses, in a certain point they were wrong: the lost paradise cannot be found geographically here on earth – protected by an inaccessible height or surrounded by a huge wall of fire. Christopher Columbus himself, convinced that he would have crossed the region in the vicinity of the garden of eternal life, was the victim of an 'optical error' that was corrected by the complete, exhaustive exploration of the entire earth.

But to all those who will rush to conclude that the story told in the first chapters of Genesis is just a 'myth', we promptly answer back: the establishing of the non-existence of the hypothetical earthly locations of paradise does not imply, in any form, the denying of its historical, real existence. Certainly, Adam and Eve have existed just as both the tree of knowledge and the tempting snake. But the ontological nature of their existence or, more properly said, the condition of their lives before their original sin, was much different from what we, their descendants, are living now. To get the complete and correct answers to all the key questions regarding that period of the world’s history before the original sin is not an easy task. To fulfill it, we have access to all the writings of those saints, doctors, and mystics of the Christian Tradition, who have left us as an invaluable treasure some interpretations that elucidate, as far as possible, the mystery of the real existence of Eden. Before reading and analysing these texts, let us list all those questions whose answers will allow us to obtain a clear picture of the mysterious origins of man:

(1) What are the trees of life and of the knowledge of good and evil? (2) What is the nature of original sin? (3) Who or what is the serpent who tempted Eve? (4) What are those 'garments of skins' with which God clothed Adam and Eve after their transgression? (5) What are those cherubim who prevent our access to heaven? (6) What is that 'flaming sword, turning every way'?

From the list proposed above we will address the first two questions, with the help of one of the most profound speculative thinkers belonging to the Patristic era, St Gregory of Nyssa. In order to eliminate, from the beginning, certain erroneous interpretations, we will point out that the biblical account does not match the famous fairy tale recorded by the brothers Grimm, 'Snow White': Adam and Eve did not bite from an apple...

Through his deep spiritual interpretation, St Gregory of Nyssa establishes the lines of a vast philosophical-metaphysical frame inspired by the biblical text, from which we learn that 'the Lord God brought forth of the ground all manner of trees, fair to behold, and pleasant to eat of: the tree of life also in the midst of paradise: and the tree of knowledge of good and evil' (Genesis 2, 9). In his commentary to the Canticle of Canticles, he emphasizes an 'anomaly' that is the basis of an extraordinary interpretation:

[T]he tree from which it was prohibited to eat was not the fig tree as some have maintained, nor any other fruit trees. If the fig was then deadly, neither would it be edible now. At the same time, we have learned from our Lord, 'it is not what goes into the mouth which can defile a man' [Mt 15.11]. But we seek another meaning in this statement which is worthy of the lawgiver’s majesty.

If we hear that paradise was planted by God and that the tree of life is in the centre of paradise, we seek to learn from The One who reveals the hidden mysteries of which plants is the Father both the husbandman and the vine dresser, and how it is possible that there are two trees in the middle of paradise, one of salvation and the other of destruction. For the exact center as in the drawing of a circle has only one point. However, if another center is somehow placed beside or added to that first one, it is necessary that another circle be added for that center so that the former one is no longer in the middle.

There was only one paradise. How, then, does the text say that each tree is to be considered separately while both are in the middle? And the text, which reveals that all of God’s works are exceedingly beautiful, implies that the deadly tree is different from God’s [Gen 1:31]. How is this so? Unless a person contemplates the truth through love of Wisdom, what the text says here will be either inconsistent or a fable.

The idea implied by the commentator is crystal-clear. Even though in the biblical text we learn about two distinct trees, the fact that they are placed simultaneously in the centre of Paradise shows that there is a unique reality represented through both of them. As we will see later on, this reality is accessible through two distinct, radically opposite ways.

In his extended commentary on Genesis titled On the Making of Man (Lat. De opificio hominis), St Gregory of Nyssa explains the nature of these two trees. The 'tree of life' is the Divine Wisdom itself. This definition is based on the famous saying of Solomon from his Book of Proverbs (3, 18): 'She [i.e., the Divine Wisdom] is a tree of life to them that lay hold on her: and he that shall retain her is blessed'. To this St Gregory of Nyssa adds that through Divine Wisdom we, as believers, have to understand God Himself. Regarding the 'tree of knowledge of good and evil', St Gregory shows that it is related to the very notion of knowledge.
St Gregory of Nyssa, St Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Two Trees in Paradise

The famous legend of the Phrygian king Midas can help us to get a better understanding of this interpretation. As many ancient Greek histories tell us, this king was possessed by greed. Having his mind completely blinded by this vice, he dared to ask his gods the ‘gift’ of transforming everything he touched into gold. He was punished in a terrible way. Because literally everything that King Midas touched – including food and water – was turned into gold.

If we transpose this Greek story in the context of the theological reflections on the ‘Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil’, we can say that in Paradise any act of knowledge of Adam and Eve that was not oriented towards the Divine Wisdom was similar to the touch of King Midas: through their transgression, everything – including their thoughts and their bodies – was transformed, at God’s command, into an opaque, perishable matter, which lacks any ‘transparency’ to the immortal light of divine grace. This is how humans became mortals and Paradise was lost.

For the passionate, who ‘forgets’ the deep reasons of the things and beings created by God, the intellect becomes the slave of his passions. The thief, the greedy, or the debaucher subordinates his mind to the act of a dark knowledge, which seeks only to satisfy his lusts. For the first time, such a way of knowing, both suicidal and murderous, was practised by Eve and Adam in Paradise.

The virtuous man obediently subjects his mind – through Faith – to that imperishable Wisdom of the Divine Intellect that is always his main guide in life – including in the act of the natural knowledge of creation. This type of knowledge, which can be named theological contemplation, would have led Adam and Eve to spiritual perfection and, finally, to the beatific vision. As Sts Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus show us, human knowledge, when it remains focused on the Divine Wisdom, can lead to the eternal life proper to those happy beings – angels and saints – whose homeland is Paradise. But the same human knowledge, when it is exclusively and obsessively oriented towards those ‘earthly things’ that give especially bodily pleasures, will inevitably lead to spiritual death.

The virtuous man obediently subjects his mind – through Faith – to that imperishable Wisdom of the Divine Intellect that is always his main guide in life – including in the act of the natural knowledge of creation. This type of knowledge, which can be named theological contemplation, would have led Adam and Eve to spiritual perfection and, finally, to the beatific vision. As Sts Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus show us, human knowledge, when it remains focused on the Divine Wisdom, can lead to the eternal life proper to those happy beings – angels and saints – whose homeland is Paradise. But the same human knowledge, when it is exclusively and obsessively oriented towards those ‘earthly things’ that give especially bodily pleasures, will inevitably lead to spiritual death.
Summorum Pontificum Pilgrimage ‘Ad Sedem Petri’, 2022

by Joseph Shaw

The publishing schedule of Gregorius Magnus is such that only now can we note here the success of the most recent Rome pilgrimage organised by the Coetus Summorum Pontificum, of which the FIUV is a member.

Everything was organised with characteristic efficiency, and the numbers at events were considerably larger than before COVID: 1,000 people attended the Traditional High (Solemn) Mass in the Chapel of the Throne in St Peter’s Basilica, for example.

Also much remarked upon was the participation of Cardinal Matteo Maria Zuppi, Archbishop of Bologna and President of the Italian Bishops’ Conference, who officiated at the Vespers that opened the pilgrimage’s programme of devotional events.

The programme, which followed the established pattern of the pilgrimage, was as follows:

**Friday, 28th October 2022, at 5:30 p.m.**

Vespers in the Basilica of St Mary of the Martyrs (Pantheon), organised by the Institute of the Good Shepherd, presided over by His Eminence Cardinal Matteo Maria Zuppi, Archbishop of Bologna, President of the Italian Bishops’ Conference.

**Saturday, 29th October 2022**

9:30 a.m. – Adoration in the Basilica of San Celso e Giuliano, organised by the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest.

10:30 a.m. – Departure of the procession to St Peter’s Basilica.

11:30 a.m. – High Mass at the Altar of the Chair in St Peter’s Basilica, celebrated by Mgr Marco Agostini, of the Secretary of State and Pontifical Master of Ceremonies.

**Sunday, 30th October 2022, at 11:00 a.m.**

High Mass of Christ the King in the Church of the Holy Trinity of the Pilgrims, organised by the Priestly Fraternity of St Peter, celebrated by Mgr Patrick Descourtieux of the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith.

The necessary permissions have been secured for the 2023 pilgrimage; the dates will be 27-29th October. Coincidentally, the FIUV General Assembly is being planned for Saturday, 28th October.
The Latin Mass Society, founded in 1965, is an association of Catholic faithful dedicated to the traditional Latin liturgy of the Catholic Church, the teachings and practices integral to it, the musical tradition which serves it, and the Latin language in which it is celebrated.
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CIEL Conference in Rome

The conference was organised by Rubén Peretó Rivas and Fr Claude Barthe, and took place at the Istituto Maria Santissima Bambina on 20th February 2023. It represented the revival of the work of the Centre international d'études liturgiques (CIEL), which was founded in 1994 and suspended in 2007, since the ecclesial landscape had been so transformed by Pope Benedict XVI's Apostolic Letter Summorum Pontificum. The work of encouraging a serious intellectual engagement with the ancient Roman liturgy, which had been regarded as so urgent before 2007, has once again become urgent.

As well as hearing talks from many scholars, participants were presented with a book, Le CIEL sur la terre, edited by Professor Rubén Peretó Rivas, which presents afresh twelve conference contributions made over the years of the original series of CIEL conferences; a second volume is planned. The authors of these papers include many of the most prominent liturgical scholars and commentators of their era, many of them now deceased: Mary Berry, Fr Louis Bouyer, Cardinal Dario Castrillón Hoyos, Fr Cassian Folsom, Bishop Laise, Martin Mosebach, Marcel Peres, Fr J.-M. Pommarèse, Canon André Rose, Alice von Hildebrand, Fr Franck Quoëx, and Mgr Gilles Wach.

The conference was attended by FIUV members from Portugal, England, Germany, and even China, as well as by Christian Marquant of Paix Liturgique and two cardinals, Raymond Burke and Robert Sarah. Cardinal Burke’s salutatio to the conference, which was delivered in Italian, follows.

Greetings to CIEL Participants

Raymond Leo Cardinal Burke

Dear Friends,

I am happy to be here with you today to meet with you and, above all, I am pleased that CIEL’s work on the liturgy could be resumed.

One of the directives set forth by the Second Vatican Council in the Constitution Sacrosanctum Concilium was that the Sacred Liturgy be considered as one of the most necessary and important disciplines of study [cf. Sacrosanctum Concilium n. 16] in the theological faculties, especially those that form candidates for the priesthood. Unfortunately, we note that this has rarely happened and that the study of liturgy has instead been eliminated from the
curriculum of seminaries and theological faculties. And even if one wished to remedy this situation, it would not be easy to do so, since Liturgy in the Catholic academic world has almost ceased to be a discipline that requires research with scientific rigour, contenting itself in most cases with a purely 'pastoral' approach, i.e., without consideration for liturgical doctrine.

On the other hand, some academic centres in the secular sphere have also dedicated themselves to the study of the Latin Liturgy from perspectives that, while not their own, nevertheless represent a valuable contribution. Archaeology, literature, and history, as well as the artistic, musical, and social disciplines, have made significant contributions to this 'cultural' phenomenon. Social anthropology has also contributed to the understanding of the Holy Liturgy as a 'ritual performance'.

However, the interest of Catholics in the Sacred Liturgy is not just because it is prescribed by an ecumenical council or because it is a cultural object worth studying.

The Church must ensure that scientific studies on the Liturgy are also informed by the indispensable supernatural and spiritual aspect, thus taking into account the divine Law. It was precisely in order to achieve this connection that the International Centre for Liturgical Studies (CIEL) was founded in 1994. Since then, it has regularly organised research and reflection days in which specialists not only from the liturgical field but also from other disciplines such as theology, spirituality, and philosophy participate.

Since the Second Vatican Council, but certainly not because of the Council’s teaching, too much attention has been paid to the human aspect of the Sacred Liturgy, neglecting the essence of the Sacred Liturgy as God’s encounter with us through sacramental signs, that is, as the direct action of the glorious Christ in the Church to give us the grace of the Holy Spirit.

The late Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, in his classic work, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, reminds us of the relationship of man’s worship of God to his moral rectitude, in general, observing:

Ultimately, it is the very life of man, man himself as living righteously, that is the true worship of God, but life only becomes real life when it receives its form from looking toward God. Cult exists in order to communicate this vision and to give life in such a way that glory is given to God.¹

The right understanding of the Sacred Liturgy is, in fact, key to the understanding of every dimension of life. That right understanding is safeguarded by the law, the discipline, which protects, first, the relationship of man with God. Cardinal Ratzinger concludes by recalling what might be called the right of God:

When human affairs are so ordered that there is no recognition of God, there is a belittling of man. That is why, in the final analysis, worship and law cannot be completely separated from each other. God has a right to a response from man, to man himself, and where that right of God totally disappears, the order of law among men is dissolved, because there is no cornerstone to keep the whole structure together.²

In conclusion, I welcome the publication of the first volume of selected proceedings of the CIEL colloquia, for which I had the joy of writing the foreword. It is an important contribution to the efforts to provide the Church with serious studies on its Liturgy. It is a collection of studies, produced on an academic basis, dealing with topics on various aspects of the Liturgy. For example, one group of chapters deals with the history and evolution of

² Ibid., p. 9.
liturgical books such as the Missal or Pontifical, not only from the perspective of external criticism, which is always necessary, but also from the perspective of the ecclesiology they reflect. Others refer to the characteristics that sacred music should possess, and there is also present the treasured testimony of those who were members of the commissions and working groups responsible for the liturgical reform promoted by the Second Vatican Council.

These works have certainly not lost their value over time and are informed by the teaching of the late Pope Benedict XVI. He was an especially gifted teacher of the Catholic Faith, with a particular appreciation of the highest and most perfect expression of the Faith: Sacred Worship. His sound teaching, especially regarding the Sacred Liturgy, remains a lasting and living heritage.

May today's conference and the publication of this work help to keep this beautiful legacy alive and thus, modestly but decisively, to maintain 'God's rights', both in the Sacred Liturgy and, by extension, in the whole society. Finally, we entrust the fruitfulness of these works to Christ the King, Creator and Master of all things, to whose honour true worship and the Sacred Liturgy are addressed.
An English Apostolate: the Guild of St Clare

by Joseph Shaw

An English Apostolate: the Guild of St Clare was founded in Oxford in 2009. Its purpose is to repair and make the liturgical vestments necessary for the celebration of the Traditional liturgy of the Catholic Church, to pass on the skills necessary for this, and also to promote domestic sewing.

This rather specialised apostolate, which is affiliated to the Latin Mass Society, has proved very popular. It now has five chapters in different parts of the country: Oxford, Birmingham, London, Withermarsh Green, and the North (encompassing Manchester and York). Each year it holds two residential retreats, an annual training event with the Royal School of Needlework (RSN), and numerous other local and national meetings to make and repair vestments.

We prefer to let the photographs speak for themselves, but the Guild is characterised by two key principles. The first is the Guild’s association with the Traditional Mass. This unites both the participants and the work they do. It means that the Guild’s members and volunteers do their work in a spirit of service to the Church, providing an indispensable (but too often lacking) practical support for the celebration of the ancient Mass. The liturgy should be celebrated using vestments worthy of it. The ancient Mass requires specialist vestments (maniple, tunicle, humeral veil, etc.) little known in the Novus Ordo. These vestments require traditional skills to be mended or replaced. Only those with a love for the old liturgy will be motivated to do this work.

Second is the Guild’s commitment to traditional techniques and high

Faciesque vestem sanctam Aaron fratri tuo in gloriam et decorum. (Exodus 28:2)
And thou shalt make a holy vesture for Aaron, thy brother, for glory and for beauty.
standards. At Guild events, work can be found for sewers of all levels of experience, but it is part of the Guild’s mission to pass on techniques learnt from experts in the field, particularly the RSN. Leading members of the Guild have qualifications from this venerable institution, and formal and informal training is built into its events.

Despite decades of often wanton destruction, Catholic sacristies still contain mountains of vestments from the ‘old days’. These are frequently in a poor state of repair, and sets are often missing items. Every few months a suitcase-ful of them arrives at the offices of the Latin Mass Society, often saved from being thrown away. Sometimes chasubles are

A green chasuble disassembled

Replacing spangles on a Benediction humeral veil
Replacing the central panel of a chasuble
Restoring embroidery

preserved with nothing else; sometimes everything is present except a maniple, or a stole, or a chalice veil. Shoulders and edges may be worn; linings may need to be replaced; old, botched repairs may need to be redone; fine embroidery may need to be secured and repaired.

The Guild aims, with skill, patience, and love, to bring these vestments back to life; to make it possible for them to be used once more for the celebration of Holy Mass.
A one-fifth scale chasuble project with the RSN

Unpicking a lining with help from servers

More information about the Guild of St Clare can be found at https://guildofstclare.org or by emailing guildofstclare@lms.org.uk.
Os Justi Press is a new imprint with a focus on the Traditional Mass and associated theological issues. In this it joins the long-established Tan Books, and the newer Arouca Press and Angelico Press. Under the leadership of the prolific Peter Kwasniewski, it specialises in short, high-quality studies.

This edition of Gregorius Magnus includes an advert for three new books which illustrate Os Justi’s output, and which we review below: these are in fact the first three of this press’s series, ’Studies in Catholic Tradition’. To provide full disclosure, one, by Joseph Shaw, President of the FIUV and editor of Gregorius Magnus, is reviewed by the acclaimed Traditional Catholic author; and convert from the New Age, Roger Buck. The other two are reviewed by Joseph Shaw himself.

Disputed Questions on Papal Infallibility, by John P. Joy (164 pp; Os Justi, 2022)

The author of this volume is an expert in the field of the Magisterium, and parts of this work have been previously published in the peer-reviewed Catholic theological journal Nova et Vetera. Joy is able to put his hand on quotations to illustrate the full range of (serious) opinions on the subject of papal infallibility, from the most recent debates, from the nineteenth-century context of the definition of the dogma at the First Vatican Council, and from treatments of earlier centuries, and he is able to explain their context as well. The meaning of the declarations of the First Vatican Council, for example, must be understood in the context provided by the Council’s official ‘relator’, whose job it was to explain to the Council Fathers the meaning of the propositions they were considering.

Joy’s analysis is systematic and thorough despite its relative brevity. Among his key points is the reality of the distinction between the Pope’s infallible teaching and those perfectly genuine exercises of his teaching office which are nevertheless not infallible. Absurd as it seems, some treatments of this subject have the consequence that all exercises of the Papal Magisterium are, at least for practical purposes, infallible. However, something can be binding, in the sense that we are obliged to accept it with ‘religious submission of mind and will’ until overturned, and still be fallible.

One reason for this is that the ‘religious submission’ due to non-infallible teaching is not equivalent to the act of faith required for doctrines of the Church taught infallibly, whether by the Pope, Councils, or the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church (the last being simply what has been taught always and everywhere).

Another is that fallible teaching can, by definition, fail, be in error, and if it does so this failure may well be evident, to the Faithful as well as to Church officials, at some point: whether when it is first given, or later. Most obviously, it will clearly fail if it contradicts an act of teaching of greater authority; this may be evident, or it may require a serious theological investigation to uncover this. If a Catholic – whether an ordinary layman or a theologian, bishop, or a pope – becomes aware of this contradiction, it would obviously be right to submit to the teaching with the greater authority, and reject the other, since one cannot simultaneously believe both of two things which contradict each other: at least, if one is aware that they contradict each other!

It follows that a faithful Catholic may on occasion refuse submission to a teaching, not because of ‘private judgement’ – his own judgement that it is not correct – but because of his docility to other, and better-established, teachings of the Church.

One question which is sometimes asked is what, exactly, prevents a pope from making a mistake when exercising the gift of infallibility. An answer Joy rejects is the idea that if a supposed act of teaching is wrong then it is by definition not an act of teaching. This would render the gift of infallibility meaningless: the pope would simply be correct whenever he was correct.

Naturally, the necessary conditions must be fulfilled; these are not legalistic but, rather, get to the heart of the pope’s intention, when making a particular statement, to address the whole world with a binding statement about faith or morals. If these conditions are fulfilled, then that teaching must be held by faith. The pope is prevented from erring in such pronouncements not by a circular logic, but, usually, by the normal process of guidance by God, and his own discernment. God’s guarantee means that, however, should a pope be particularly stubborn in his desire to assert some falsehood, God would bring it about that he does not do so, at least in the necessary form. Joy notes that this could be done by making the pope lose his pen, as well as by making him lose his life.

Throughout history, popes have been very cautious in claiming to teach infallibly. Pope Francis is particularly so, couching many of his most famous
and influential statements in terms which clearly rule out their being infallible exercises of the Magisterium: in footnotes to documents, in interviews with journalists on aeroplanes, in private letters, and so on.

Joy’s book, then, is timely not so much to counter the claims of an assertive papacy as to counter the claims of those who see themselves as the pope’s partisans. It is perhaps inevitable that those who favour the ideas of a particular pope should tend to exaggerate the weight of his pronouncements: supporters of Pope John Paul II sometimes write as if that pope’s canonisation makes a decisive difference to the authority of his writings, which of course it does not. The social-media heresy-hunting of some liberal Catholics on behalf – as they imagine – of Pope Francis, is one of the most tedious features of Catholic discussions today, and readers will do well to clarify the issue of papal infallibility in their own minds with the aid of this excellent little book.

**Does Traditionis Custodes Pass the Juridical Rationality Test? A Canonical-Theological Study**, by Fr Réginald-Marie Rivoire, FSVF, translated by Fr William Barker, FSSP (86 pp; Os Justi, 2022)

Fr Rivoire is a canonist and member of the France-based Fraternity of St Vincent Ferrer, a Traditional community which uses the ancient Dominican liturgy. His short book is a lucid and careful assessment not of the exact meaning of the text of *Traditionis Custodes*, its accompanying Letter, and the *Responsa ad dubia* that followed it – though related matters do arise in this work – but rather of how it coheres in a much more profound sense with the Church’s legal principles.

These are not arguments one would commonly hear before an ecclesiastical tribunal, but they are fundamental to the proper attitude one should take to documents which will almost certainly never be tested in a canonical trial. How do the statements made in these documents relate to the Church’s principles about liturgy and law?

The problems involved in *Traditionis Custodes* owe their origin, naturally, to the liturgical reform of 1969, if not to even earlier developments. The rupture in the liturgical tradition that this reform represented is a historical reality, and this reality has had to find expression in the Church’s law. Pope Paul VI permitted the celebration of the ‘former Missal’ and by implication acknowledged that it had never been abrogated: not only for aged priests, but, with the English Indult, for the benefit of the laity. It would make no sense to make formal permission for the continued celebration of an earlier edition of ‘the same Missal’; on the other hand, such celebrations would not represent much threat to the unity of the Church (though different versions of a vernacular translation may cause more of a problem). But if the 1962 and 1970 Missals are not ‘the same Missal’, then how do they relate to each other?

In 2007, Pope Benedict XVI made one attempt to provide a legal framework for this reality, by calling the earlier Missal the ‘Extraordinary Form’ of the Roman Rite, and the later one the ‘Ordinary Form’. This is perhaps not a perfect solution, but as Rivoire expresses it, it is an attempt to order the real world. The attempt in *Traditionis Custodes* to claim that the reformed Missal has a monopoly of the *lex orandi* of the Roman Rite seems to be an attempt to deny reality.

Rivoire’s argument is not simply that, as matter of liturgical history and theology, this claim is problematic. Rather, since this claim is presented as the principle behind this piece of legislation, the legislation as a whole is problematic: it fails to engage in the right way with the realities it is seeking to order. In the Church, canon law does not simply impose itself on meaningless facts, but has to find a foundation in reality for the good of souls, if it is to work as law. For human law is an attempt to order reality for the common good, and can either succeed in this or fail. Law that has failed, however, is ultimately not law; it imposes no obligation.

This, to reiterate what I noted above, may seem of no practical consequence: it looks like law and we can expect it to be treated like law for practical purposes. It does, however, make a difference to how we should view it, as a matter of conscience.

Similarly, Rivoire makes an interesting argument about the lack of a *vacatio legis*: the way *Traditionis Custodes* came into force immediately. Many observers remarked on this, which is very unusual in legislation that imposes complex obligations. The lack of a *vacatio legis* was a mark of discourtesy, even of cruelty, towards those it affects.

However, Rivoire’s point is different. It is a principle of canon law that there should be a *vacatio legis*: it is a matter of law succeeding in regulating what is to be regulated, and this is related to what law is. It was simply impossible for bishops to implement regulations issued on a Friday for that very Sunday. Although as time goes on, it has been possible for those affected by the law to catch up with it, this is another indication of what Rivoire calls a lack of ‘juridical rationality’.

There are many other arguments in this book which I cannot discuss here, and it is up to readers to decide how convincing they are, and how they affect a proper attitude to *Traditionis Custodes* and associated documents. Some people have said, in response to these documents, that we are living through a post-law period of the history of the Church. This, however, is impossible: the Church is a community governed by law, based on the law of God. If ecclesiastical legislation fails to be real law, then our response to it needs to take that into account. In the end, as the final canon in the Code of Canon Law reminds us, *salus animarum est suprema lex*: the good of souls is the supreme law in the Church, because that corresponds to the very nature of the Church. A law which prevents the Church from fulfilling the mission entrusted to her by God is not a law binding on the Church.
Before pronouncing something truly great, prudence demands caution. Whether it be a book, a poem, a symphony, or any other work of art, longer consideration, a certain test of time, is needed. Closing the pages of Joseph Shaw’s first book, it was necessary to remind myself of this. For the temptation to over-hasty hyperbole was present, after finishing this wide-ranging set of essays entitled The Liturgy, the Family, and the Crisis of Modernity.

What can I say? I am moved, moved more deeply than I know how to say. I am startled, startled because although I expected a worthy, well-argued effort from Shaw – whose judiciousness and clarity of analysis have long impressed – I did not expect an impact like this.

Broadly speaking, that impact came on two fronts: both Shaw’s analysis of modernity’s crisis and the quality and substance in his articulation of my only hope for this crisis – which is that the Catholic Church finds her way back to her true nature.
But let us begin with the first: the crisis. Here is a penetrating excavation of the depths of sheer chaos, deepening chaos, of the modern world. Now, conservatives and traditionalists have a well-known set of narratives to explain this calamity, which ranges from morality to epistemology, from the collapse of ethical standards to the despair of knowing whether anything is really true. At least, the good books possess such accounts. Other books, alas, too easily descend into vilifying enemies as evil foes of the righteous, whether these be certain progressive politicians, sinister economic cabals, secret societies, or even ethnic groups.

I have read both sorts of books for twenty years at least. Picking up Shaw, I felt confident of a careful, nuanced narrative of the first type: an admirable examination of territory that is, nonetheless, familiar. Again, though, I was startled. For after all these years, it is rare to find something as fresh, as thought-provoking, as original as the exploration of the crisis in these pages – one that marries acute, up-to-the-minute observation of unfolding secular trends with a striking inquest into the deep, underlying reasons for these trends (or rather tragedies).

To be clear, there is no overarching examination of the chaos here. As its title suggests, Shaw’s book is thematic rather than comprehensive and systematic. Only selected shards of the crisis – e.g., feminism, Freudianism, the castigation of custom, ritual, and authority in favour of an often-manic search for ‘authenticity’, etc. – are held up to the light.

But what a light! Depths of darkness are dispelled by a careful, original mind that has self-evidently sought for answers (no, thirsted for answers) over long years. Shaw is also bold, daring to go places where other conservative thinkers hesitate. Just how bad is patriarchy, Shaw asks, shunning the kind of reflexive concessions to feminism that too many of us indulge in without a moment’s thought. And more in the book reveals a courageous refusal to kowtow to the automatic idols of the modern age. Then, there is the judicious tone throughout. Here is no frenzied, vitriolic quest to smash these idols to smithereens. Just question them, even gently question them. For God’s sake. For humanity’s sake. So that we are all not swept away in an unconscious confession to the Feminist Creed being unquestionably correct in everything it ever says of patriarchy ...

But I began by saying I was impacted by more than just deconstructing of crisis. No, Shaw’s response to this crisis not only moves me, it also, as I shall come to, nourishes. Now, the book is subtitled Essays of a Traditional Catholic. No one should be surprised, then, that the solution offered here is a courageous, consistent commitment to the Faith, with particular emphasis on the Latin Mass, as capable of meeting deep spiritual needs that a modern rationalist liturgy fails to reach.

In other words, Shaw stands for a staunch Catholicism. Yet with a difference! Too much staunch Catholicism these days is marred by aggression, even viciousness. This is sadly understandable, inasmuch as traditionalists have long been treated like lepers. (As Shaw notes, even Joseph Ratzinger pointed this out as long ago as 2002!) Moreover, traditionalists register the sheer scale of the ecclesial catastrophe like few others. Awake as they are, it is surely forgivable if their pained hearts sometimes react to those who remain comfortably numb, let alone those who actively seek to subvert and destroy.

Alas, aggression all too easily alienates. And here I mean not only extreme progressives in the Church, but also middle-of-the-road layfolk who might more easily listen to traditionalists, did they not sound so shrill.

No, Shaw proffers something decidedly un-shrill. His arguments are reasoned and fair-minded with, one may add, often brilliant philosophical precision and questioning (again with fairness) of the inherent contradictions and unuestioned assumptions at the heart of modernity.

But beyond all this is something more elusive, harder to capture in words. Perhaps there is no more apt adjective than rich. Now, Shaw’s new book is enriched by erudition and tradition, but I mean something still more by that term. That ‘more’, though, is, again, elusive. But certainly, it relates to the self-evident fruit in these pages of a man striving over years to live and think, really think, in committed, consistent conformity to Catholic faith and tradition. Such striving must yield integration and substance, and perhaps these, more than anything else, lie at the root of what so deeply nourishes me here. At any rate, nourished I am. And I feel galvanised into further effort towards striving for the same – as the only real response I see to the grim, growing horror confronted in these pages.

Prudently, I wait before declaring this book a true great of our age. But that does not stop me feeling a certain greatness therein, still working in my heart after closing the pages.
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Una Voce: The History of the Foederatio Internationalis Una Voce, by Leo Darroch: Extract

In this extract, from pages 32-35, having mentioned the ‘Ottaviani Intervention’ (a critique of the Novus Ordo Missae signed by the former Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal Ottaviani, and by Cardinal Bacci), Leo Darroch discusses the first-ever FIUV Bulletin.

It was against this background that the first official FIUV Bulletin was issued on 3 September 1970. It was sub-titled The Battle for the Mass’ and it opened with this comment:

When the Mass has been overturned, we will, I think, have overturned all of the Papacy as well. Because it is on the Mass, as on a rock, that the Papacy rests, with its Monasteries, its Bishoprics, its Colleges, its Altars, priests, and doctrines – the whole bally lot. It will all, of necessity, fall to pieces when the sacrilege and abomination of the Mass is done away with. (Luther)

Luther, did not, of course, deny the authenticity of the Gospel reports of the Last Supper. He did, however, fulminate against the ‘Mass’ inasmuch as it enshrines and proclaims the doctrine that the priest, by virtue of his ordination, acts in persona Christi and is thus endowed with that divine power which ‘in objective ontological reality’ changes the substance or nature of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ.

After its denial by all the reformers, this apostolic doctrine became one of the hallmarks of the true Catholic faith. In the Ordo Missae of Pope St Pius V, it found an expression that was theologically incontrovertible and artistically as near to perfection as man can ever hope to get.

For greater ‘pastoral effectiveness’, the Second Vatican Council ordered that the rite should be revised ‘in such a manner that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts and also the connection between them may be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active (pia et actuosa) participation by the people may be more easily achieved’.

It is nowhere suggested in the documents of Vatican II that the Church’s understanding of the ‘intrinsic nature and purpose’ of the parts of the Mass had undergone any change since the time of St Pius V. The principal aim of the reform was, therefore, to ‘manifest more clearly’ that same doctrine which was expressed with such near perfection in the Tridentine Ordo Missae. It is by this standard that the reform of the Mass must be judged.

When the new Ordo was published, together with the Institutio Generalis, Notitiae 46 (June 1970) declared that Chapter II of the Institutio was one of the fundamental sections of the document in that it offered ‘the description of the rite not so much in its rubrical and ceremonial contours, but rather under its doctrinal aspect’. Chapter II started with the notorious no. 7, which defined the Mass as a ‘supper’ where the people of God are called together into one place and during which the priest acts over them and acts in the person of Christ. There is no indication of the Real Presence, or Sacrifice, or the sacred character of the officiating priest.

It was this assertion that justified, and indeed made necessary, the sober but severe criticism to which the Institutio Generalis was promptly subjected, particularly in the Critical Study encouraged and approved by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci. With this courageous and timely criticism some of the Una Voce associations identified themselves – not ex praeconcepta oppositione ad culuisvis generis novitates (not ‘from a preconceived opposition to any kinds of innovation’), as Notitiae 54 (June 1970) suggested, but in a responsible exercise of sentire cum Ecclesia [thinking with the Church].

That this is so had become abundantly clear: in the fourth [sic] edition of the Institutio the gravest ambiguities had been corrected, and a specially added Prooemium reaffirmed the Church’s fides immutata (unchanged faith) and traditio non intermissa (unbroken tradition) regarding this central act of her worship. Moreover, in presenting these changes, Notitiae no longer claimed any doctrinal authority for the Institutio but described it, chastened, as a ‘pastoral and rubrical document’.

The importance of all this could hardly be over-emphasised. Had the Institutio not been revised and downgraded, it would have encouraged (to say no more) a subtle but elementary change in the celebrating priest’s intention with the result that the validity of any Mass being said according to the new Ordo would have become questionable – except in cases where it was certain that the individual celebrant had not been caught in this subversive current. It is evident, in retrospect, that the Church had only just been spared that very ‘overturning’ of the Mass hoped for by Luther.

As to the new Ordo itself, it could not seriously be pretended that it succeeded in ‘manifesting more clearly the intrinsic nature and purpose of the several parts of the Mass, as also the connection between them’. In fact, it must be doubted that this was ever genuinely aimed for by Professor Wagner (director of the German Liturgical Institute in Trier – also charged with the revision of the Ordo Missae) and his team of experts or else the results would surely have been more convincing.
Before very long I believe that neither clergy nor faithful will pay any attention to the voices of those who in the name of reform would destroy the Church.

Unfortunately, the passage of time has proved that His Eminence’s belief was sadly mistaken.

In these circumstances, Dr de Saventhem explained that the primary duty of the Una Voce Federation seemed clear: to ‘watch’ and ‘advise’. To watch in the trebble meaning of observation, vigilance and protection, and to ‘advise’ in the treble meaning of information, counsel and warning. To do this responsibly, in the proper attitude of critical obedience, he said that the members of the FIUV needed all the Gifts of the Holy Ghost. He said that they are in us, of course, with habitual grace and from the day of our baptism, but everyone must learn to use them consciously, and particularly in relation to the work in Una Voce. He asked that all members of the movement recite, at least on every Thursday (the day of the Votive Mass to the Holy Ghost) one of the hymns, or the Litany, or the Prayer for the Sevenfold Gifts, to Him Who septiformis munere (seventhly graces) can kindle in our hearts the light of Truth and of true Love for our grievously afflicted Mother, the Church.

Such were the feelings of the day, ranging as they did from bemused confusion to outrage, that one priest in Hertfordshire, England, pinned a notice in the porch of his church which said – write large:

The Normative Mass is capable of two interpretations of its words.

Therefore, I wish to make it clear:

1. that when I use this Mass I intend the CATHOLIC interpretation of its words: that is to say that—
   i. I regard myself as a priest offering sacrifice upon an altar,
   ii. that the sacrifice which I offer is none other than Jesus Christ Himself present in Person under the appearances of bread and wine,
   iii. that the people and I, together, are then the guests of the Lord God at a meal at which sustenance for our souls is provided for us by the Lord God Himself.

2. that when I use this Mass, I specifically exclude from my intention any NON-CATHOLIC interpretation of its words: that is to say that— I do NOT regard myself as a President of an assembly gathered together to celebrate a remembrance service in memory of Jesus Christ, by the partaking of a communal meal of eucharistic bread and wine.

Leo Darroch’s Una Voce: The History of the Foederatio Internationalis Una Voce (Gracewing, 2017) is available from the online bookshop of the Latin Mass Society and elsewhere.
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The Liturgy of the Church, the last book to come from Dom Michel’s fruitful pen during his lifetime, is a first-rate exposition of the worship and sacramental life of the Roman Church.

—Fr. Thomas Kocik

Dom Michel is an exemplary figure of the healthy phase of the Liturgical Movement, prior to its radicalization at the hands of progressive iconoclasts.

—Dr. Peter A. Kwasniewski

Originally published in 1937, this reprint brings Dom Virgil Michel’s complete expository survey of the liturgy of the Church as viewed by one of the leaders of the liturgical movement back into circulation. Published with a new foreword by Dom Alcuin Reid.

$23.95 USD (paperback) & $30.95 (hardcover), 388 pages.

Available from aroucapress.com, Amazon, & other online retailers.
Position Paper: Tradition, Reform, and Restoration

First published in August 2015 as the 27th Position Paper of the FIUV, this paper was included with all the other Position Papers in Joseph Shaw, ed, The Case for Liturgical Restoration: Una Voce Studies on the Traditional Latin Mass (Angelico Press, 2019).

This paper seeks to address two possible objections to the revival of the preconciliar Latin liturgy: that such a project is contrary to the spirit of reform called for by the Church, particularly by the Second Vatican Council; and that such a project is contrary to the nature of tradition itself, which should not be ‘rediscovered’, but only ‘passed on’.

For the purposes of this paper, it is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of reform and restoration, and individual projects of reform or restoration. There have been many such projects, both proposed and implemented, in the history of the Church, some sponsored by the papacy or by councils, others by individual bishops, religious superiors, movements, or individual scholars. These projects may be in tension with each other, and each must be assessed on its own historical and theological merits. In this book we address some such past projects (such as the Plan psalter and the Holy Week reform of 1955), and we propose some modest reforms (such as changes to holy days of obligation and the Eucharistic fast). The purpose of the present chapter, however, is not to argue for or against specific proposals, but to clarify the concepts of reform and restoration themselves.

Reform and restoration: instauratio

The spread of the traditional Latin liturgy can be described as the recovery and restoration of tradition, and closely related movements can be identified in relation to sacred music, popular devotions, theological sources, and so on. The question to be considered first is whether a movement of restoration is appropriate in the light of the call for reform often made in the Church, and particularly in the Second Vatican Council. Simply put, the objection is that the concepts of restoration and of reform are opposed.

In the language of the Church, however, there is no tension between the concepts. On the contrary, we see in the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Liturgy Sacrosanctum Concilium and its official English translation that the English nouns ‘reform’, ‘revision’, and ‘restoration’ are all used to translate the Latin instauratio; the corresponding verbs are used to translate the corresponding Latin verb instaurare. The verbs restituirae, ‘to restore’,4 and recognoscere, consistently translated ‘revise’, are frequently used in Sacrosanctum Concilium to stand for the same idea.

What, then, is the kind of change called for by this language? Sacrosanctum Concilium clarifies the meaning, in conformity with the usage of the terms over many centuries:

Lastly, in faithful obedience to tradition, the sacred Council declares that holy Mother Church holds all lawfully acknowledged rites to be of equal right and dignity; that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way. The Council also desires that, where necessary, the rites be revised (recognoscantur) carefully in the light (mens, ‘mind’) of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigour to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times.5

Recognoscantur here means ‘be checked for authenticity and accuracy’; the translation ‘revise’ is misleading.6 Like instauratio, it implies a checking that something is correct, in light of tradition.

Thus, the primary concept at work here is that of restoration. The translation of any of these Latin terms with the English ‘reform’ is inaccurate, given the way the English term is generally used; ‘revise’ and ‘revision’ are also questionable.7 Instauratio is the seeking out of the genuine, correct, and old form of things, aiming at making something vital again, for its original purpose (see appendix). (It is worth noting that the Italian ‘riforma’, which is used to translate Latin terms just mentioned, has ‘restoration’ as a primary meaning, and so has less potential to mislead.)

A notable example in Sacrosanctum Concilium is the instauratio of Gregorian chant (n. 117); other examples are the references to the charism of the

---

1 Both subjects of other Position Papers.
2 Two other Position Papers.
3 Examining the English translation of SC from the Vatican website, we find the following translations for instauratio and instaurare (italicated): ‘a general restoration of the liturgy’ (n. 21), ‘recent liturgical reforms’ (n. 23); ‘the restoration, progress, and adaptation of the sacred liturgy’ (n. 24); ‘the revision of the liturgy’ (n. 33); ‘the rites for the baptism of adults are to be revised’ (n. 66); ‘the restoration already so happily begun’ (n. 87); ‘when the office is revised’ (n. 89); ‘in revising the Roman office’ (n. 90); ‘restoration by St Pius X’ (n. 117); ‘the reformed liturgy’ (n. 128).
4 SC uses the word five times, and the Vatican website’s translation always uses ‘restore’ to render it. Thus: ‘other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored’ (n. 50); ‘there is to be restored, after the gospel and the homily, the common prayer or the prayer of the faithful’ (n. 53); ‘hymns are to be restored to their original form’ (n. 93); ‘the discipline of the sacred seasons shall be preserved or restored to suit the conditions of modern times’ (n. 107); ‘some of them, which used to flourish in bygone days, are to be restored as may seem good’ (n. 109a).
5 Sacrosanctum Concilium n. 7.
6 The Oxford Latin Dictionary gives, for recognoscere: 1. To examine, review, inspect ... b. to examine, check (a document) in order to establish authenticity, accuracy, etc. 2. To give recognition to, acknowledge. 3. To recall (something previously known), to recognize. Clearly it is the meaning given in b which is relevant here. Other uses of the word as translated into English in SC are as follows: ‘careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised’ (n. 23); ‘The liturgical books are to be revised as soon as possible’ (n. 25); ‘when revising the liturgical books’ (n. 38); ‘The rite of the Mass is to be revised’ (n. 50). and so on (the word appears nineteen times).
7 The Oxford Latin Dictionary is not aware of ‘reform’ as a meaning of the Latin noun or verb, giving as the primary meanings the notion of repetition, though ‘renew’ and ‘restore’ are also given for the verb, and an instaurator is ‘a person who renews or restores’.
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founders as the key to the reform of a religious community or order, as demanded by the Second Vatican Council’s decree on the religious life; another would be the emphasis on the teaching of the Church Fathers given by the Council’s decree on priestly training. In each case, ‘reform’ is a matter of restoration. Again, when it comes to specifics, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy states: ‘elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the vigour which they had in the days of the holy Fathers, as may seem useful or necessary’ (n. 50).

The specific proposals of Sacrosanctum Concilium historically opened the way to the publication of what is now known as the Ordinary Form of the Roman rite. Pope Benedict XVI authorized the use of the ‘previous liturgical tradition’ (‘Traditio liturgica antecedens’: Summorum Pontificum 5.1) as an Extraordinary Form of the Roman rite. If the Ordinary Form represents one attempt at an instauratio of the Roman rite, the renewed use of the Extraordinary Form represents, for today, another attempt: the restoration to use of rites that were used formerly, in light of the needs of today. We have not attempted to consider the validity of the liturgical principles involved in each case, how they might relate to each other, or what authority they may have. It is enough for present purposes to establish the centrality of the notion of instauratio in the Church’s self-understanding, and its continuing relevance in the development of the liturgy.

The problem of discontinuity

The etymology of ‘tradition’ (traditio) reminds us that tradition is what is passed on: as St Paul told the Corinthians, ‘For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received’ (‘Tradidi enim vobis in primis quod usus antiquior’: 1 Cor 15:3). This is clearest when each generation hands on to the next what it received from the previous generation. The instauratio of making the usus antiquior more widely available goes beyond merely preserving what has been given us by those who passed it to us as our parents and teachers: it includes the bringing back of things that have actually been lost, or nearly lost, for a period of time. In this, however, it remains a more modest form of instauratio than those envisaged either by the Second Vatican Council or by the 1955 reform of Holy Week, which sought to restore to use rites and texts that had entirely fallen out of use, not for decades, but for centuries.

In his 1947 Encyclical Mediator Dei, Pope Pius XII urges caution on those who seek the restoration of things lost in distant centuries:

The liturgy of the early ages is most certainly worthy of all veneration. But ancient usage must not be esteemed more suitable and proper, either in its own right or in its significance for later times and new situations, on the simple ground that it carries the savour and aroma of antiquity. The more recent liturgical rites likewise deserve reverence and respect. They, too, owe their inspiration to the Holy Spirit, who assists the Church in every age even to the consummation of the world (Mt 28:20). They are equally the resources used by the majestic Spouse of Jesus Christ to promote and procure the sanctity of man. 

Nevertheless, the restoration of tradition from decay or misdevelopment is certainly not ruled out, and there are important precedents for such projects.

First, and most radical of all, is the restoration of tradition by Our Lord in the Gospels. Our Lord criticizes the Pharisees for ‘making void the word of God by your own tradition’ (Mt 7:13); again, on the subject of divorce, He says, ‘from the beginning it was not so’ (Mt 19:8). By sweeping away the human tradition, in one case, and the dispensation (Dt 22:1), in the other, Our Lord recovers the true tradition.

This appeal to the most ancient elements of tradition, against the practice of many centuries, is appropriate to the Kingdom established by Our Lord, and is made possible by his authority. It is not often that such a radical restoration would be possible without that authority, even if the Church’s indefectibility were not sufficient to render it unnecessary.

In a second category, less radical in terms of the length of the discontinuity, but involving more complexity and detail, are the restorations of the Temple cult recorded in the Old Testament, following periods of apostasy or foreign occupation: by Hezekiah (2 Chron 29-30); by Josiah (2 Chron 34-35); by Ezra (Ezra 6; Neh 8-9); and by Judas Maccabaeus (2 Macc 10). This is to say nothing of major programs of physical restoration that had to take place from time to time, and the complete rebuilding of the Temple under Herod the Great. These are important illustrations of the possibility of instauratio from written records. These restorations were rendered necessary and urgent by the fact that the Temple cult and other regulations were enjoined as a matter of Divine Law.

In the era of the Church, we find that liturgical practices and texts current in one place are influenced or replaced by those of another, where the former were for one reason or another regarded as corrupt or otherwise inferior. Examples would include the influence of the Roman liturgy in the Frankish dominions in the 8th century, and the influence of German liturgical practices in Rome in the 10th century.

A third kind of instauratio is that of the many religious who have sought to bring back their orders to the spirit of their founders, from which the order had gradually departed, and the restoration, first of Benedictine monasticism, and then of Gregorian chant, in the 19th and early 20th centuries at St Peter’s Abbey, Solesmes. It is interesting to note that, as well as a reliance on manuscripts, the Solesmes chant scholar Dom Joseph Pothier was directly concerned with its value for his own day, considering how the chant could be sung with ease and beauty, while also attempting to discern, in the practice of chant of his day, ‘the feeble echo of a powerful
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8 Perfectae Caritatis (28th October 1965), n. 2.
9 Optatam Totius, n. 16.
10 Pius XI, Mediator Dei, n. 61.
While fallible, the attempt at restoration was necessary, if the riches of the chant tradition were to be made available for the Church in their fullness.

Conclusion

The *instauratio* represented by the spread of the celebration of the *usus antiquior* is an example of seeking in the Church’s treasury for those things, whether old or new, that can be of benefit to the faithful and the Church’s evangelizing mission (cf. Mt 13:52).

At a practical level, this project has many things in its favour. It is not necessary to rely solely on book-learning, as there has not been a complete discontinuity in the celebration of the older Form, particularly in light of the permissions immediately given to older priests to continue to use it when the 1969 missal was promulgated, and the English Indult of 1971. When wide permissions for the celebration of the *usus antiquior* were given by Pope John Paul II in 1984 and 1988, it was well within the lifetimes of those who had been expert in the liturgy prior to 1962.

Furthermore, the written records of the former liturgical tradition are remarkable for their detail, and can be supplemented by audio-visual records of it.

The aim of this work of *instauratio*, and related projects in the area of chant, devotions, and theology, is not a wholesale return to a former era, any more than this was the aim of the creators of the missal of 1969 when they restored certain older liturgical practices such as the Prayers of the Faithful, the people’s direct participation in the kiss of peace, and certain ancient liturgical texts. It is, rather, a matter of putting the Church’s liturgical patrimony to work, in relation to modern conditions.

---


The FIUV Position Papers have been republished in the form of a book edited by Joseph Shaw, *The Case for Liturgical Restoration*. Available on Amazon and elsewhere.
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