

## Introduction:

My purpose is to examine the nature and impact of changes to the Roman Canon wrought by the Committee (the *Concilium*) which implemented *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the 1963 document on the liturgy generated by Vatican Council II and promulgated by Pope Paul VI in December of that year. The Committee redesigned the Mass of the Latin Rite in a matter of 5 years – from 1965 to 1969. There was a plethora of changes – some major. Whole seasons disappeared from the liturgical calendar (Epiphany, Septuagesima, and after Pentecost), being replaced by something called “Ordinary Time”. Saints’ feast days disappeared, such as St. Christopher (July 25), or were moved to another date after centuries of celebration at their former date, such as St. Thomas the Apostle (December 21 to July 3). The Ordinary part of the Mass lost its beginning and ending – Psalm 42 and the Last Gospel – and the Offertory was effectively scrapped. The *Orationes*, those prayers formerly identified as the Collect, the Secret, and the Postcommunion, many with a tradition from the time of Pope St. Gregory the Great, indeed, some authored by him, were either deleted from their traditional feast day and moved to another, or deleted entirely from the liturgy.<sup>i</sup> The annual liturgical cycle of biblical readings was replaced with a three-year cycle for Sundays and a two-year cycle for weekdays. In spite of the fact that this increased the number of biblical readings very substantially, as in the case of the *Orationes*, some readings from scripture disappeared from the liturgy entirely. Few sets of Propers (*Orationes* plus biblical readings) were left intact over the course of the liturgical year. Amidst these major revisions, a few changes were also made to the Roman Canon, now called Eucharistic Prayer #1. Compared to the other changes just mentioned, these few might seem, at first glance, minor. However, it is no secret that Catholic belief in the Real Presence has plummeted since 1970, and, I contend that an Eucharistic Prayer text which confuses and obscures its meaning is a cause that has contributed significantly to this sad effect.

## The Questions:

The Traditional Latin Mass (TLM) has only one Eucharistic Prayer. It is called the Roman Canon. It is the very heart of the Mass, where the Sacrament is conected and the Sacrifice is made. The *Novus Ordo Missae* (NOM) has diversified this core of the Mass by adding three additional Eucharistic Prayers and meaningfully changing the Roman Canon itself. There are, therefore, three questions to be addressed regarding the Roman Canon:

1. *Why was the Roman Canon essentially unchanged for nearly fourteen centuries?*
2. *Why is there only one Canon in the TLM?*
3. *Have the changes to the Roman Canon improved or impoverished Eucharistic Prayer #1?*

A fourth question is also suggested, namely, have the three additional “Eucharistic Prayers” been a positive or negative contribution to the Sacrifice of the Mass? But this is tangential to the present topic of the Roman Canon and a much broader question.

### **Why was the Roman Canon essentially unchanged for fourteen centuries?**

Addressing the provenance of the Roman Canon, Joseph Jungmann, S.J., a liturgical scholar at Vatican Council II, and a member of the Committee that gave us the NOM tells us:

“Right now we must accept this as certain: the core of our Mass canon, from the *Quam oblationem* on, including the sacrificial prayer after the consecration, was already in existence by the end of the fourth century.”<sup>ii</sup>

“Only the following parts of our Roman canon could not be found at the beginning of the fifth century: *Communicantes*, *Hanc Igitur*, *Memento etiam*, and *Nobis quoque*. However, these formulas too (with the exception of the *Memento* of the dead), are to be found in the oldest extant manuscripts of the Roman canon, in a form that must at all events belong to the sixth century. During the interval all these prayers came into being: and the others took on, where they differed, the form they have at present.”<sup>iii</sup>

So, if we accept this assertion, the Canon was complete by 600. No changes were made to it from that time until the Protestant revolution because it was considered of venerable origin and inviolable Tradition – not because of any law or decree of a pope.

Then, in 1570, Pope St. Pius V, at the behest of the Council of Trent, issued the papal bull *Quo Primum Tempore*. What was the motivation and intent of this document? It begins (emphasis mine):

“From the very first, upon Our elevation to the chief Apostleship, We gladly turned our mind and energies and directed all our thoughts to those matters which concerned the preservation of a pure liturgy, and We strove with God's help, by every means in our power, to accomplish this purpose. For, besides other decrees of the sacred Council of Trent, there were stipulations for Us to revise and re-edit the sacred books: the Catechism, the Missal and the Breviary.”

So, in the face of the Protestant revolution and Luther's distaste for the Mass as sacrifice, the variations in the Mass due to local custom needed to be standardized. The Mass must be preserved as a Catholic “pure liturgy” and it must be recognizable as such to differentiate it from proliferating Protestant services. Was the Canon used at Rome changed? No. The motivation is preservation. It continues (emphasis mine):

“Let all everywhere adopt and observe what has been handed down (tradita) by the Holy Roman Church, the Mother and Teacher of the other churches, and let Masses not be sung or read according to any other formula than that of this Missal published by Us. This ordinance applies henceforth, now, and forever....”

The principal at work here is the idea that Tradition is worth preserving today, is worth preserving tomorrow, and the next day, and the next century, *ad infinitum*.

The claim has been made that *Quo Primum Tempore* had the consequence of freezing in stone the Mass of Rome at the time, and that the Mass subsequently ossified for four hundred years between 1570 and 1970. The Roman Canon's provenance may be cited to refute just such a claim. It had already been unchanged for a thousand years before Pius V. It emerged during the fourth century transition from Greek to Latin in the liturgy – its authorship (or Author) lacking attribution. And it emerged nearly fully formed, certainly recognizable as the source of the Canon of the missal of Pius V. The prime mover behind this lack of movement

is the Church's regard for Tradition, not any papal edict. If there was an unfortunate consequence of *Quo Primum Tempore*, it is that the papal bull transferred the liturgy from the realm of Tradition to the realm of law. As such, it became much more easily reversible than Tradition, in spite of the bull's "now, and forever" intention. Note further that the bull, which, from the quote above seems to insist on conformity, makes a provision for Tradition in its implementation:

"This new rite alone is to be used unless approval of the practice of saying Mass differently was given at the very time of the institution and confirmation of the church by Apostolic See at least 200 years ago, or unless there has prevailed a custom of a similar kind which has been continuously followed for a period of not less than 200 years, in which most cases We in no wise rescind their above-mentioned prerogative or custom."

In an institution with a 2000-year history, Tradition is not a matter of a generation or two, but is instead measured in centuries. Having met that threshold, it is to be respected. Conformity was not the issue. The desire for a sound liturgy (one proven over centuries), and respect for Tradition are the driving forces. And, respect for Tradition is anything but ossification – "Tradition means giving a vote to the most obscure of all classes, our ancestors. It is the democracy of the dead."<sup>iv</sup>

The Roman Canon was unchanged from sometime before the year 600 until 1962. On November 13, 1962, Pope St. John XXIII added the name of St. Joseph to the first list of saints recited in the Canon. The initial serious suggestion that this should be done was made in 1815. It required nearly a century and a half, the requests of many cardinals and bishops, and, finally, papal intervention, to achieve this insertion. Even so, this change was still considered controversial. The other saints of the Canon, except for the Blessed Mother and the apostle John (who both stood at the foot of the Cross), had all endured martyrdom for the faith (at least that was the belief at the time of composition). Obviously, to say that the Roman Canon was a very stable prayer would be a gross understatement. Can we add a Saint's name to a list of saints? Yes, but very carefully and only in exceptional circumstances.

### **Why is there only one Canon in the TLM?**

Similar forces are at work here. In fact, respect for Tradition, what has been "handed down" and catholicity, meaning uniformity throughout time and place, apply to the whole of the TLM. Did the TLM spring forth in the fourth century whole and entire? No. Was there a plan for it, conceived in a committee, and then implemented in a few years? No. Around the Canon of the Mass various things were tried over the course of centuries, some found wanting and discarded (certain Psalms, sequences, prefaces), some found appropriate (Psalm 42, the Last Gospel) and retained. In *Quo Primum Tempore* Pope St. Pius V opined – "for it is most becoming that there be in the Church only one appropriate manner of reciting the Psalms and only one rite for the celebration of Mass." There was only one Canon from a very early time and it was the jewel around which the setting might vary, but not radically. Why?

The word "canon" is from the Greek and means "rule" or "measuring stick". When speaking of the Bible, the "Canon" is the fixed list of books that are considered to be "canonical". There is only one list and it does not change. In his commentary *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacraficio*, Benedict XIV said:

The Canon is the same (thing) as the Rule (yardstick): It (the word itself) is used by the voice of the Church in order that it signify the Canon of the Mass is the firm rule against which the Sacrifice of the New Testament is celebrated.<sup>v</sup>

There is only one kind of yardstick – it is three feet long and divided into 36 equal inches. The Canon is, therefore, the benchmark, if you will, for how the Sacrifice is to be made in the Latin Rite. There is no need for another one, shorter for Tuesdays or longer for Sundays. We offer the Sacrifice in the best manner (singular) that we are able, because that is what Christ did on Calvary. It is deliberately unchangeable and monolithic, as is the God to Whom it is prayed.

The word “orthodox” appears in the very first prayer of the Canon. Unity of belief is fostered by a common Canon, read (not heard) at every Mass, everywhere and always. As we believe in a Church that is one, holy, and Catholic, and that is consistent from the Apostles onward, St. Pius V believed there should be one, holy Mass, celebrated in all times and all places – a Catholic Mass with a single Canon. Such was the sense of the Church – until 1969.

### **Have the changes to the Roman Canon improved or impoverished Eucharistic Prayer #1?**

Eucharistic Prayer #1 (EP1) is textually very close to the Roman Canon of the TLM. It differs in four places:

1. The two lists of the saints may be abbreviated.
2. The standard conclusion “Through Christ our Lord” has been deemed optional in four of five prayers.
3. The words of the Consecration have been altered.
4. Three acclamations have been added.

It should be noted that none of these changes were explained to the laity, and their rationale was buried in the deliberations of the Committee on the Liturgy.

#### **- Options for the List of Saints**

The first list of the saints occurs in the *Communicantes*. The list contains the Blessed Mother and St. Joseph, the eleven Apostles and St. Paul, and then twelve martyrs of the early Church.

"Upon closer scrutiny the *Communicantes* reveals a well-planned arrangement. The twelve martyrs are aligned in hierarchical order. First come six bishops, five of them popes, and a non-Roman, Cyprian, contemporary of St. Cornelius (who is therefore the only one taken out of chronological order so as to be set side by side with Cyprian). Among the other six martyrs, the first two are clerics, Lawrence and Chrysogonus; then follow the laymen, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian."<sup>vi</sup>

Besides its hierarchical structure, the list is inclusive – from popes to laymen. The former were martyred in the first century. Cosmas and Damian were martyred late in the third century. When truncated via the option of the priest, besides the Blessed Mother and St. Joseph, only Peter, his brother Andrew, and Paul remain – no laymen, and two centuries of early Church history are omitted in the process.

The second list occurs in the *Nobis quoque*. This list is also structured. In place of the Blessed Mother, John the Baptist begins the list and is then followed by seven men (in the

order of their martyrdom) and seven women who also suffered martyrdom – another inclusive list. “Everything here points to Pope St. Gregory the Great (590-604) as having undertaken the final revision here as in the *Communicantes*.”<sup>vii</sup> When truncated at the option of the priest, it becomes an exclusive list of four men and drops over two centuries of early Church history.

The Communion of Saints is an article of the faith. We rely upon their intercession on our behalf. The Church has been inclusive from the beginning – that is part and parcel of her mission to save all souls. The option to truncate these two lists is both inconsistent with this inclusiveness and diminishes the sense of the Communion of Saints throughout time.

### **- Options for the Conclusion to Prayers**

The “standard conclusion” to prayers of intercession and commendation in the Canon is “Through Christ our Lord.” This occurs five times. The prayers in question ask for something from the Father, Who is referred to as “Lord” or “Thou”. This standard conclusion to our requests directed to the Father reminds us of the Gospel text – “Amen, Amen, I say to you, if you ask the Father anything in My name, He will give it you.” The entire Canon ends with the doxology: “Through Him, with Him, and in Him,…” referring to Christ. Now, in the NOM, at the option of the priest, four of these “standard conclusions” are optional – only the last (fifth) one is not optional. Why this change was made is baffling.

### **- Changes to the Words of the Consecration**

It should be noted at the outset that, in neither the TLM nor the NOM are the words of Consecration the exact words of Christ. They are, rather, a selection of the words and phrases from the four scriptural accounts of the Last Supper by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul’s first letter to Corinthians.<sup>viii</sup> For a millennium and a half the Church principally used the words from the account of St. Matthew as a formula for confecting both the bread and the wine. The changes to the words of Consecration are threefold and alter it from a formula in the one and only Canon for confecting the sacrament to a pair of “quotes” within a variable historical narrative in multiple Eucharistic Prayers. A prerequisite to an appreciation of the impact of these changes, is a clear understanding of the TLM text. Over the host the priest in a TLM says:

Who, the day before He suffered, took bread into His holy and venerable hands, and with eyes raised to heaven, to Thee, God, His almighty Father, giving thanks to Thee, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to His disciples saying, "All of you take and eat of this, for this is my Body."

The formula is a description primarily in the past tense of the action, followed by a quote in the present tense of the imperative. Over the chalice, the priest then says:

In like manner, after supper, taking this excellent chalice into His holy and venerable hands: and giving thanks to Thee, He blessed it and gave it to His disciples saying, “All of you take and drink of this. For this is the chalice of My Blood of the new and eternal covenant, the mystery of faith, which shall be poured out for you, and for many, for the remission of sins.”

Note the apparent effort to make this formula seem as immediate, and imminent, as possible by using present participles like “taking” “giving” and “saying”. Even more pointedly, note the use of “this excellent chalice” – an effort to equate the very cup in use by the priest, at this

altar, to the one on the table at the Last Supper. The close of the formula brings the only future reference – “which shall be poured out...” This has the unfortunate opposite effect of distinguishing and separating the sacrifice of our Lord’s Blood at the Last Supper from the sacrifice of our Lord’s Blood on the Cross, and ultimately, from the current Mass being said. What if, instead of reading “shall be poured out” the text read “is poured out”? Then, the whole formula would be immediate, current, in the present tense. The Last Supper, the Cross, and this Mass would be identified as concurrent and now, or, if you prefer, eternal and timeless. The Blood of the Lamb is consumed by the Apostles at the Last Supper, as it is poured out for us on the Cross, as it is consumed at every Mass since, and as it is sacrificed at every Mass to come.

The verb in question – shall be poured out – is translated from the Latin *effundetur*. The source for the Latin of this English translation is the Clementine Vulgate of 1592. This was a correction of Jerome’s Vulgate, which contains *effunditur*. The Clementine Vulgate has been superceded by the *Nova Vulgata*, which was issued by Pope St. John Paul II in 2002 to correct the Clementine Vulgate. It restores the text to *effunditur*. The change of one vowel changes the English translation from “shall be poured out” to “is poured out.” This revised translation, which was 40 years too late to correct the text of the 1962 *Missale Romanum*, would make the entire formula of the TLM both immediate to the Last Supper and eternal to the Mass through the Cross.

Having examined the content of the Consecration in the TLM, it is now possible to assess the impact of the threefold changes wrought by the NOM. The introductory text for both species is similar to the TLM, but the imperatives are both different. There is now a forced parallelism in the confecting of the bread and the wine. The text for the bread is as follows:

Take this, all of you, and eat of it.  
For this is my Body,  
Which will be given up for you.

The text for the wine is as follows:

Take this, all of you, and drink from it.  
For this is the chalice of my Blood, the Blood of the new and eternal covenant,  
Which will be poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.

First, the future tense clause “which will be given up for you” has been added to “This is my body”. This clause appears only in St. Paul’s recounting of the Last Supper and then, in this future tense, only in the Clementine Vulgate of 1592. It is not found in St. Jerome’s original Latin Vulgate of 382-405 nor is it found in the *Nova Vulgata* (well after the NOM was promulgated in 1969). Instead, after “This is my body” he says “for you” (St. Jerome) or “which is for you” (*Nova Vulgata*). At the Last Supper, and at that instance of transubstantiation alone, the Cross could be considered in the future, yet Matthew and Mark have no such phrase at all, and Luke simply says “This is my body which is given for you.” In all our subsequent NOM Masses, the added phrase – “which will be given up for you” – has the same semantic effect of distinguishing and separating, both the Last Supper and the Mass at hand from the Cross. It is difficult to see the merit of adding this clause as part of the words for confecting the sacrament, and, for a millenium and a half the Church saw fit to use St. Matthew’s recounting – “This is my body.”

As previously noted in regard to the TLM, this semantic separation of the Last Supper from the Cross occurs only over the chalice where there is (what would now be considered) an erroneous mixing of present and future tenses. Because, in the TLM, the words of the Consecration were consistently drawn from Matthew, by way of the Clementine Vulgate, the TLM also has this unfortunate separation. But we have demonstrated that a corrected translation (in light of the *Nova Vulgata*) would have eliminated this semantic separation. A correct rendering of St. Matthew's version of the Last Supper yields a consistent present tense effect in both formulas. The NOM version is also consistent in both formulas, but unfortunately in the future tense, and therefore, doubly wrong. One final observation in this regard – of the four sources for the words of Consecration: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and St. Paul – only Matthew was actually there on Holy Thursday.

Second, in the TLM, the formula for confecting the Blood of Christ includes the words “and eternal” in reference to the new covenant, and “the mystery of faith” in reference to the “chalice of my Blood.” These are not scriptural but they have a longstanding tradition. In fact, they are buried so far in the past that no one is certain of their origin. The NOM revisers chose to leave “and eternal” in the “quote” but elected to remove “the mystery of faith” from the “quote” and place the latter phrase as an isolated statement after the “quote.” In this new position, the phrase immediately precedes the third change made to the Canon – the addition of acclamations. There are three possible acclamations, only one of which is acclaimed in any particular Mass. Sadly, the net effect of these last two changes is confusion and error. To demonstrate this effect, permit the restatement of a text with which you are already familiar:

Priest: For this is the Chalice of My Blood,  
The Blood of the new and eternal covenant,  
Which will be poured out for you and for many,  
For the forgiveness of sins.  
Do this in memory of Me.  
The mystery of faith.

People: We proclaim your death O Lord,  
And profess your Resurrection  
Until you come again.

Note the acclamation proclaims the death of Christ the very moment after He has become present on the altar – whole and entire – Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity. And the acclamation ends with a view to His Second Coming while He is still physically present. The content of the acclamation, while not objectionable in any way, is proclaimed at a very inopportune time in the Mass, and serves to take our attention away from the Real Presence. Note also that the sequence of the text and its delivery disconnects the mystery of faith from its true antecedent – the Chalice of My Blood. In this new position it is not clear to what it refers, hence the confusion. Without proper catechesis the Catholic laity often assumes it is a forward reference to the acclamation rather than a backward reference to the true mystery that has just transpired on the altar, transubstantiation. Many of the faithful now believe the mystery of faith is whatever the acclamation says, hence the error. How can this be? The word “mystery” is singular and the acclamations are threefold. The acclamations as a group are not really mysterious in any real sense, but affirmations of historical events and professions of our

creed. The explanation lies in a prior poor translation. We have to examine the previous text of the NOM in English.

For over forty years the priest said: “Let us proclaim the mystery of faith: ” and he responded with the people. The most common response was “Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again.” The words “Let us proclaim” are not now and were not then in the Latin source for the translation, much less the anticipatory colon. The “Christ has died,...” response was not in the Latin source for the translation either. The Latin source for translation (into any language) is the same today as it was in November of 1969 when the NOM was propagated. The International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) was responsible for the insertion of these words and the colon. And, while there were three acclamations in the Latin source for the English translation, “Christ has died, etc.” was not one of them. Until the corrected English translation of 11/27/2011, it is easy to see how the confusion occurred. And, in the absence of catechesis (or a restoration of the apposition of “the mystery of faith” to the “Chalice of My Blood”), the error will persist because *lex orandi, lex credendi*. From the Catechism of the Catholic Church:

**1124** The Church’s faith precedes the faith of the believer who is invited to adhere to it. When the Church celebrates the sacraments, she confesses the faith received from the apostles – whence the ancient saying: *lex orandi, lex credendi* (or: *legem credendi lex satuit supplicandi*, according to Prosper of Aquitaine [5<sup>th</sup> cent.]). The law of prayer is the law of faith: the Church believes as she prays. Liturgy is a constitutive element of the holy and living Tradition.<sup>ix</sup>

**1205** In the liturgy, above all that of the sacraments, there is an *immutable part*, a part that is divinely instituted and of which the Church is the guardian, and parts that *can be changed*, which the Church has the power and on occasion also the duty to adapt to the cultures of recently evangelized peoples.<sup>x</sup>

We believe as we pray. Therefore, we must be extremely careful what we subject to change. Or, as Newman said regarding changes to the liturgy – “Precious doctrines are strung, like jewels, upon slender threads.”<sup>xi</sup> In 1965, concerned about this very same doctrine, the same pope who promulgated the NOM provided Holy Mother Church the encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*.<sup>xii</sup> In it he said the following:

9. There are, however, Venerable Brothers, a number of reasons for serious pastoral concern and anxiety in this very matter that we are now discussing, and because of Our consciousness of Our Apostolic office, We cannot remain silent about them.

10. For We can see that some of those who are dealing with this Most Holy Mystery in speech and writing are disseminating opinions on Masses celebrated in private or on the dogma of transubstantiation that are disturbing the minds of the faithful and causing them no small measure of confusion about matters of faith, just as if it were all right for someone to take doctrine that has already been defined by the Church and consign it to oblivion or else interpret it in such a way as to weaken the genuine meaning of the words or the recognized force of the concepts involved.

15. First of all, We want to recall something that you know very well but that is absolutely necessary if the virus of every kind of rationalism is to be repelled; it is



something that many illustrious martyrs have witnessed to with their blood, something that celebrated fathers and Doctors of the Church have constantly professed and taught. We mean the fact that the Eucharist is a very great mystery—in fact, properly speaking and in the words of the Sacred Liturgy, the mystery of faith. “It contains within it,” as Leo XIII, Our predecessor of happy memory, very wisely remarked, “all supernatural realities in a remarkable richness and variety of miracles.”

27. It is a good idea to recall at the very outset what may be termed the heart and core of the doctrine, namely that, by means of the Mystery of the Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Cross which was once carried out on Calvary is re-enacted in wonderful fashion and is constantly recalled, and its salvific power is applied to the forgiving of the sins we commit each day.

Ironically, the NOM rearrangement of the words of Consecration has caused “no small confusion about matters of faith, ...in such a way as to weaken the genuine meaning of the words.”

Finally, but not insignificantly, beyond the textual changes just reviewed, the delivery of EP1 has also changed. The most obvious difference is the fact that the priest now recites it aloud in the vernacular rather than silently in Latin. What are the consequences? The views offered here are, of necessity, largely subjective. But one modestly objective observation I have made when attending the NOM is that a minority of the attendees use the missalette. (In fact, the missalette is not even available in some churches.) Most listen and respond. At least, that is the appearance. The Fathers of Vatican Council II wanted the faithful to participate more in the liturgy (emphasis mine):

Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy.<sup>xiii</sup>

There are three adjectives that modify the noun “participation.” The first two – “full” and “conscious” imply something in addition to “active.” In fact, given their precedence in the sentence, it would be possible to conclude that “full” and “conscious” are hierarchical, and relate to an interior participation that is over and above “active.” The reading of the missalette demands an interior “conscious” participation that hearing and then responding aloud does not. The Fathers also recognized (emphasis mine):

To promote active participation, the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalms, antiphons, hymns, as well as by actions, gestures, and bodily attitudes. And at the proper time a reverent silence should be observed.<sup>xiv</sup>

The Canon was historically and, I submit, still is just such a “proper” time. Beyond reverential considerations, there is also the undeniable fact that a spoken text may be misspoken or, worse, modified by the priest – even though this is expressly forbidden, we know it happens. Orality is a source of variation. Silence protects the text. We have seen the deplorable English translation that required over forty years to remove words that were never in the original Latin. Translation is a very real source of error. Latin also protects the text.

The last difference of delivery centers upon the positions, gestures, and other rubrics required of the priest. And while the Roman Canon of the TLM and EP1 of the NOM are the focus of our attention, the types of changes outlined below extend to the whole of both Masses. (Note: any counts refer to a read Mass in both forms.) The following are in the Canon of the TLM but are not in EP1:

- 1 profound bow at the beginning of the Canon
- 2 bows of the head to the book (at the name of Pope and of Mary)
- 2 genuflections (one before each elevation of the Body and then the Blood)
- 2 bows to the Father at the two instances of the words “giving you thanks”
- 1 bow at the words “the Body and Blood of your beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ
- 2 kisses of the altar
- 24 Signs of the Cross (There are two left: one at the blessing in the *Te igitur*, and one where the priest signs himself at “every heavenly blessing”)
- The priest is required to keep the index and thumb of each hand touching each other after the words “This is my body” until the ablutions are completed after Holy Communion. (This is no longer required in the NOM.)

What is the significance of omitting these gestures? The sense that the priest is performing a (very) sacred action is diminished, in his own mind and in ours. In the NOM, belief in the Real Presence is not reinforced by many reverent actions and careful handling – because they were eliminated. Even if all the above gestures and postures are not observed by every member of the congregation, the priest performing them is constantly reminded that his purpose is not primarily to teach, certainly not to entertain, but rather to worship Almighty God.

These changes to the Roman Canon in EP1 vary from modestly unfortunate: the optional truncation of the lists of the saints and the optional suppression of the standard prayer conclusion – to extremely regrettable: the alteration of the words of Consecration combined with the addition of the acclamations. To say the latter has led many Catholics into error and misunderstanding is not an overstatement.

Have the changes to the Roman Canon improved or impoverished Eucharistic Prayer #1? The text has been impoverished, not improved. The changes have introduced problems that cry out for a solution. The most straightforward correction is to return to the text of the Canon in the TLM, along with its numerous reverential gestures, blessed silence, and *versus Deum* orientation. The acclamations could easily be removed from the Eucharistic Prayers (all of them). Removal would restore decorum to the core of the Mass and augment the sense of the sacred. If these changes are deemed too extreme, a minor elevation of the Host and Chalice at the words “the mystery of faith” would go a long way to reconnecting the “mystery” to its source.

### **Conclusion:**

We have briefly examined the long history and stable content of the Roman Canon within its context of the Traditional Latin Mass. We have compared the content of the Canon with that of Eucharistic Prayer #1. We have also looked at the accompanying gestures required for the TLM by the rubrics of the 1962 *Missale Romanum* with those of the NOM. And in a similar

vein, we noted the silence of the Canon and the lack thereof in EP#1. The consequences of these differences are manifold. The sense of the Communion of Saints throughout time is diminished (and made exclusively male in one case) when the lists of saints are truncated. The sense of the sacred has been diminished. The connection between the Last Supper, Good Friday, and this Mass has been attenuated. Reverence for the Real Presence has been diminished. And, most regrettably, the understanding that the “mystery of faith” is the Real Presence wrought by transubstantiation has been lost to many, many Catholics. This impoverishment of EP#1, devised by the Committee on the Liturgy, was a disservice to Catholics everywhere.

i Lauren Priestas - *The Collects of the Roman Missals* – chapter 3:

“Pope St. Gregory imprinted a spiritual character upon the season (Advent) that remained in place until the revision of the missal that followed Vatican II.” And,

“The collect that was moved to the first Sunday of Advent, Maertens tells us, was confectioned by Gregory himself.” And,

“Of the thirteen 1962 collects, seven were retained in the Advent corpus of the 1970/2002 missal. Five of the seven were revised, and none appears on the same day in both missals.”

ii J. A. Jungmann – *The Mass of the Roman Rite* – Vol.1, p. 53

iii *Ibid.* – Vol. 1, p. 55

iv G. K. Chesterton - *Orthodoxy* – chapter 4

v Benedict XIV - *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificium*, , Book 2, Chapter 12:

Canon idem valet ac Regula: ea utitur voce Ecclesiae ut significet, Canonem Missae esse firmam regulam, juxta quam Novi Testamenti Sacrificium est celebrandum.

vi Jungmann – Vol. 2, p. 172

vii *Ibid.* – Vol. 2, p. 235

viii Scriptural sources for the words of Consecration are shown in the table below. Note the repeated use of the future tense (the highlighted ‘...etur’ verbs) in the *Clementine Vulgate*:

	C	V	CLEMENTINE VULGATE (1592)	ST. JEROME'S VULGATE (382-405)	NOVA VULGATA (1965-1979)
PAUL 1 CORINTHIANS	11	23	Ego enim accepi a Domino quod et tradidi vobis, quoniam Dominus Iesus in qua nocte tradebatur, accepit panem,	ego enim accepi a Domino quod et tradidi vobis quoniam Dominus Iesus in qua nocte tradebatur accepit panem	Ego enim accepi a Domino, quod et tradidi vobis, quoniam Dominus Iesus, in qua nocte tradebatur, accepit panem
	11	24	et gratias agens fregit, et dixit: Accipite, et manducate: hoc est corpus meum, <b>quod pro vobis tradetur</b> : hoc facite in meam commemorationem.	et gratias agens fregit et dixit hoc est corpus meum <b>pro vobis</b> hoc facite in meam commemorationem	et gratias agens fregit et dixit: “ Hoc est corpus meum, <b>quod pro vobis est</b> ; hoc facite in meam commemorationem ”;
	11	25	Similiter et calicem, postquam cœnavit, dicens: Hic calix novum testamentum est in meo sanguine. hoc facite quotiescumque bibetis, in meam commemorationem.	similiter et calicem postquam cenavit dicens hic calix novum testamentum est in meo sanguine hoc facite quotiescumque bibetis in meam commemorationem	similiter et calicem, postquam cenatum est, dicens: “ Hic calix novum testamentum est in meo sanguine; hoc facite, quotiescumque bibetis, in meam commemorationem ”.
LUKE	22	19	Et accepto pane gratias egit, et fregit, et dedit eis, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur: hoc facite in meam commemorationem.	et accepto pane gratias egit et fregit et dedit eis dicens hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis datur hoc facite in meam commemorationem	Et accepto pane, gratias egit et fregit et dedit eis dicens: “ Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem ”
	22	20	Similiter et calicem, postquam cœnavit, dicens: Hic est calix novum testamentum in sanguine meo, qui pro vobis <b>fundetur</b> .	similiter et calicem postquam cenavit dicens hic est calix novum testamentum in sanguine meo quod pro vobis <b>funditur</b>	Similiter et calicem, postquam cenavit, dicens: “ Hic calix novum testamentum est in sanguine meo, qui pro vobis <b>funditur</b> .
MATTHEW	26	26	Cœnantibus autem eis, accepit Iesus panem, et benedixit, ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis, et ait: Accipite, et comedite: hoc est corpus meum.	cenantibus autem eis accepit Iesus panem et benedixit ac fregit deditque discipulis suis et ait accipite et comedite hoc est corpus meum	Cenantibus autem eis, accepit Iesus panem et benedixit ac fregit deditque discipulis et ait: “ Accipite, comedite: hoc est corpus meum ”.
	26	27	Et accipiens calicem gratias egit: et dedit illis, dicens: Bibite ex hoc omnes.	et accipiens calicem gratias egit et dedit illis dicens bibite ex hoc omnes	Et accipiens calicem, gratias egit et dedit illis dicens: “ Bibite ex hoc omnes: ”
	26	28	Hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis <b>effundetur</b> in remissionem peccatorum.	hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti qui pro multis <b>effunditur</b> in remissionem peccatorum	hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis <b>effunditur</b> in remissionem peccatorum.
MARK	14	22	Et manducantibus illis, accepit Iesus panem: et benedicens fregit, et dedit eis, et ait: Sumite, hoc est corpus meum.	et manducantibus illis accepit Iesus panem et benedicens fregit et dedit eis et ait sumite hoc est corpus meum	Et manducantibus illis, accepit panem et benedicens fregit et dedit eis et ait: “ Sumite: hoc est corpus meum ”.
	14	23	Et accepto calice, gratias agens dedit eis: et biberunt ex illo omnes.	et accepto calice gratias agens dedit eis et biberunt ex illo omnes	Et accepto calice, gratias agens dedit eis; et biberunt ex illo omnes.
	14	24	Et ait illis: Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis <b>effundetur</b> .	et ait illis hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti qui pro multis <b>effunditur</b>	Et ait illis: “ Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis <b>effunditur</b> .

The Vulgate shows the text in St. Luke as *quod pro vobis datur* which means “which is given for you” – present tense. The Vulgate shows no verb at all in St. Paul, only *pro vobis* or “for you”. The conflated text in St. Paul becomes “This is my body for you.”

ix *Catechism of the Catholic Church* – p. 291

x *Ibid.* – p. 310

xi Blessed J. H. Newman – *Ceremonies of the Church* – Sermon 7

xii Paul VI – *Mysterium Fidei* –

[http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-vi\\_enc\\_03091965\\_mysterium.html](http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_03091965_mysterium.html)

xiii *Sacrosanctum Concilium* – 14, (Austin Flannery, O.P., *Vatican Council II, the Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*)

xiv *Ibid.* – 30