

Introduction

The following two essays are the issue of a an effort from 2003 to 2012 to explain to classrooms of sophomore boys at a Jesuit high school why the Traditional Latin Mass (TLM) is worthy of their attention – a thing which is difficult to acquire from them and harder to keep! These were very "bright" lads, attending a school noted for its academic excellence. The first essay is excerpted from a presentation which developed over those years, during which time dramatic changes occurred in the Latin Church: After a very long reign, Pope John Paul II died and Cardinal Ratzinger became Benedict XVI on April 19, 2005, and promulgated *Summorum Pontificum* on July 7, 2007, and then Benedict resigned February 28, 2013. You will note that 2013 is beyond the boundary of the presentation effort. That is because the presentation, which was scheduled for March of 2013, was canceled with no explanation after the Pope resigned. If there is a conclusion to be drawn here, I leave it to you to do so. The second "essay" is a rough measurement of the result of their assignment to attend a TLM and write a two-page paper with their observations.

Essay 1 – The Flawed "Work of Human Hands"

On 12/4/2003 Vatican Council II approved *Sacrosanctum Concilium* – the only Council document on the liturgy. Ask yourself, as we look at excerpts from this document, "If I was a Council father at the time, what would I expect to happen to the Mass if this document was ratified?"

From *Sacrosanctum Concilium*:

Article 36. (a "norm")

The use of the Latin language, with due respect to particular law, is to be preserved in the Latin rites. But since the use of the vernacular, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or in other parts of the liturgy, may frequently be of great advantage to the people, a wider use may be made of it, especially in readings, directives and in some prayers and chants.

Do you see anything here you could label a "rule"? (Perhaps, if you removed the clause "with due respect to particular law" you could say "The use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites" constitutes a rule.) Has Latin been "preserved" in the *Novus Ordo Missae*?

Article 54. (a "decree")

A suitable place may be allotted to the vernacular in Masses which are celebrated with the people, especially in the readings and "the common prayer," and also, as local conditions may warrant, in those parts which pertain to the people, according to the rules [?] laid down in Article 36 of this Constitution. Nevertheless care must be taken to ensure that the faithful may also be able to say or sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which pertain to them.

(Note: "the common prayer" are the petitions concluded by "We pray to the Lord.")

Are there any real "rules" in Article 36?

One thing is certain. The only firm statement in this "decree" has been ignored. How many attendees of the *Novus Ordo Missae* can "say or sing together in Latin" anything at all?

Article 116. (a "decree")

The Church recognizes Gregorian chant as being specially suited to the Roman liturgy. Therefore, other things being equal, it should be given pride of place in liturgical services.

I think I could have voted for this document and reasonably expected only the readings to be given in the vernacular. I certainly would not have expected the entire Mass to be in the

vernacular, nor would I have expected guitars and saccharin tunes. I think many, certainly not all, of the Council fathers were snookered. And it is of little wonder. The document itself is full of self-referential re-directions from one paragraph to a preceding or subsequent one. Sequentially reading the document is not easy. It was the first document produced and approved by the Council.

We must remember, VCI was not a dogmatic council but a pastoral council:

- “There are those who ask what authority, what theological qualification, the Council intended to give to its teachings, knowing that it avoided issuing solemn dogmatic definitions backed by the Church’s infallible teaching authority. The answer is known by those who remember the conciliar declaration of March 6, 1964, repeated on November 16, 1964. In view of the pastoral nature of the Council, it avoided proclaiming in an extraordinary manner any dogmas carrying the mark of infallibility.” (Pope Paul VI, General Audience, January 12, 1966 [only one month after the Council was closed by him], published in the *L’Osservatore Romano* 1/21/1966 - http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/audiences/1966/documents/hf_p-vi_aud_19660112_it.html)
- “Differing from other Councils, this one was not directly dogmatic, but disciplinary and pastoral.” (Pope Paul VI, General Audience, August 6, 1975)
- “Certainly there is a mentality of narrow views that isolates Vatican II and which provoked this opposition. There are many accounts of it, which give the impression that from Vatican II onward, everything has been changed, and what preceded it has no value or, at best, has value only in the light of Vatican II. ... The truth is that this particular Council defined no dogma at all, and deliberately chose to remain on a modest level, as a merely pastoral council.” (Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Address to the Chilean Episcopal Conference, July 13, 1988)

Yet, in 1969, only four years after the end of the Council, the Mass of over 15 centuries, the Mass of nearly all the saints, the Mass that subdued the barbarians when the Roman legions failed, the Mass that spread Catholicism throughout the world, was banned throughout the world. I should also note, as someone who lived through this revolution, the people in the pews were not calling for changes in the Mass nor to eliminate Latin. This so-called “reform” was imposed from above, it did not originate with the average Catholic. As a consequence, generations of Catholics have been robbed of their liturgical patrimony - the Traditional Latin Mass. For decades we have wandered in a liturgical wilderness, but unlike the Hebrews who knew they were lost in the desert, and who were searching for the promised land, few bishops have had the courage to say to us that we have lost our liturgical way. Generations of Catholics have been exposed to nothing else and think the present disintegrated, and I use that word on the highest authority, state of the liturgy is “normal.” How did this happen?

A Committee on the Liturgy, led by Annibale Bugnini (who had been dismissed in 1962 by Pope John XXIII before the Council), was charged by Pope Paul VI with the task of implementing *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. How did Bugnini approach his task?

“We must strip from our Catholic prayers and from the Catholic liturgy everything which can be the shadow of a stumbling block for our separated brethren, that is, for the Protestants.” (Annibale Bugnini, *L’Osservatore Romano*, 3/19/1965.) If we “read between the lines” it is not hard to imagine why belief in the Real Presence would be minimized by Bugnini lest it prove “a stumbling block.”

Father Joseph Gelineau SJ, who was a *peritus* at the Council, i.e. a theological and liturgical expert, a strong proponent of the postconciliar revolution, and a member of the Committee, said of the reform (from *Demain la liturgie*, [The Liturgy of Tomorrow] 1976):

"To tell the truth it is a different liturgy of the Mass. This needs to be said without ambiguity: the Roman Rite as we knew it no longer exists. It has been destroyed."

(As a footnote to the Bugnini story, in January, 1976, Pope Paul VI sent Bugnini to Tehran as Papal Nuncio. This backwater post was not a reward for his services!)

Pope Benedict XVI was also a *peritus* at Vatican Council II. He was part of the revolution. In his earlier writings during and immediately after the Council, he was optimistic and could probably be fairly characterized as a liberal reformer. He observed the effects throughout the remainder of his life. After 10 years of anything but the renewal that was hoped for, he began to, shall we say, rethink his views. Note what appears to be happening in the thought of Pope Benedict relative to the Council and to the *Novus Ordo Missae* in the following quotes:

Where does he start?

Where does his focus turn?

What are his conclusions?

Here are, chronologically, some of his observations:

From a statement by Cardinal Ratzinger published in the December 24, **1984** English edition of *L'Osservatore Romano*:

"Certainly the results [of Vatican II] seem cruelly opposed to the expectations of everyone, beginning with those of Pope John XXIII and then of Pope Paul VI: expected was a new Catholic unity and instead we have been exposed to self-destruction. Expected was a new enthusiasm, and many wound up discouraged and bored. Expected was a great step forward; instead we find ourselves faced with a progressive process of decadence which has developed for the most part under the sign of a calling back to the Council, and has therefore contributed to discrediting it for many. The net result therefore seems negative. I am repeating here what I said ten years after the conclusion of the work [Vatican II]: it is incontrovertible that this period has definitely been unfavorable for the Catholic Church."

Yet this view is but an echo of what Pope Paul VI, who presided over the Council, said a mere three years after its conclusion:

"The Church finds herself in an hour of anxiety, a disturbed period of self-criticism, or what would even better be called self-destruction. It is an interior upheaval, acute and complicated, which nobody expected after the Council. It is almost as if the Church were attacking itself. We looked forward to a flowering, a serene expansion of conceptions which matured in the great sessions of the Council. But one must notice above all the sorrowful aspect. It is as if the Church were destroying herself."

(Address to the Lombard Seminary at Rome, December 7, 1968 -

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1968/december/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19681207_seminario-lombardo_it.html)

And then elaborated upon a few years later:

"We have the impression that through some cracks in the wall the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God: it is doubt, uncertainty, questioning, dissatisfaction, confrontation. [...] We thought that after the Council a day of sunshine would have dawned for the history of the Church. What dawned, instead, was a day of clouds and storms, of darkness, of searching and uncertainties."

(Sermon during the Mass for Sts. Peter & Paul in St. Peter's Basilica, on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of his coronation, June 29, 1972 - http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/homilies/1972/documents/hf_p-vi_hom_19720629_it.html)

A year later, Cardinal Ratzinger says that the intentions of the Council Fathers were not followed. By returning to the documents the Fathers authorized and rereading them, maybe we can get it straight.

From The Ratzinger Report, **1985**:

"Many of the concrete effects, as we see them now, do not correspond to the intentions of the Council Fathers, but we certainly cannot say: 'It would have been better if it had not been.'.... I believe, rather, that the true time of Vatican II has not yet come, that its authentic reception has not yet begun: its documents were quickly buried under a pile of superficial or frankly inexact publications. The reading of the letter of the documents will enable us to discover their true spirit. If thus rediscovered in their truth, those great texts will make it possible for us to understand just what happened and to react with a new vigor. I repeat: the Catholic who clearly and, consequently, painfully perceives the damage that has been wrought in his Church by the misinterpretations of Vatican II must find the possibility of revival in Vatican II itself. The Council is his, it does not belong to those who want to continue along a road whose results have been catastrophic."

Three years later, he refers to the problems in the liturgy.

From Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger's address to the Chilean bishops, July 13, **1988** (10 days after *Ecclesia Dei Afflicta* [The Afflicted Church of God] from Pope John Paul II):

"While there are many motives that might have led a great number of people to seek a refuge in the traditional liturgy, the chief one is that they find the dignity of the sacred preserved there. After the Council there were many priests who deliberately raised 'desacralization' to the level of a program,... they put aside the sacred vestments; they have despoiled the churches as much as they could of that splendor which brings to mind the sacred; and they have reduced the liturgy to the language and the gestures of ordinary life, by means of greetings, common signs of friendship, and such things... That which previously was considered most holy -- the form in which the liturgy was handed down -- suddenly appears as the most forbidden of all things, the one thing that can safely be prohibited."

The tie that binds people to the "Mass of the Ages" is not just an emotional preference, not just feelings – "they find the dignity of the sacred preserved there."

Five years later, he is writing a preface (in French for the French edition) of a book that was extremely critical of the reform of the liturgy by a renowned liturgist, Msgr. Klaus Gamber. And Ratzinger, like Gamber, is very critical of the new liturgy.

From Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger's preface to The Reforms of the Roman Liturgy, Its Problems and Background by Msgr. Klaus Gamber, **1993**:

"It is difficult to say briefly what is important in this quarrel of liturgists and what is not. But perhaps the following will be useful. J.A. Jungmann, one of the truly great liturgists of our century, defined the liturgy of his time, such as it could be understood in the light of historical research, as "liturgy which is the fruit of development"; probably in contrast with the Eastern notion which does not see liturgy as developing or growing in history, but only the reflection of the eternal liturgy, whose light, through the sacred celebration,

illuminates our changing times with its unchanging beauty and grandeur. Both conceptions are legitimate and are not irreconcilable....

What happened after the Council [Vatican II] was something else entirely: in place of liturgy as the fruit of development over centuries came fabricated liturgy. We abandoned the organic process of growth and development over centuries, and replaced it - as in a manufacturing process - with a fabrication, a banal, on-the-spot product."

Finally, five more years later, we arrive at the focus of his criticism of what happened after Vatican Council II.

From *Milestones* by Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, **1998**:

"...the crisis in the Church that we are experiencing today is to a large extent due to the disintegration of the liturgy."

The liturgy has "disintegrated" – This is the basis for my assertion above that "generations of Catholics have been exposed to nothing else and think the present disintegrated...state of the liturgy is 'normal'."

So, what to do?

From *Voici quel est notre Dieu* [This is our God], p. 29 - Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (**2001**):

"It is necessary to stop the ban of the liturgy that was in force until 1970. Currently, anyone who defends the validity of that liturgy or who practices it, is treated like a leper: all tolerance ceases. The like has never been seen before in the Church's entire history. By adopting this attitude toward them, they despise the Church's entire past."

And this he did with *Summorum Pontificum* in **2007**.

Why?

There is a "fatal flaw" in the tragedy that is the *Novus Ordo Missae*. At the Consecration, the words have been changed unnecessarily and very harmfully. Here is the translation of the Consecration of the wine to the Blood of Christ:

In a similar way, when supper was ended, he took this precious chalice in his holy and venerable hands, and once more giving you thanks, he said the blessing and gave the chalice to his disciples, saying: 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. Do this in memory of me.

Immediately afterwards the priest says "The [singular] mystery of faith." To which the congregation responds with one of three acclamations:

We proclaim your death O Lord, and profess your Resurrection until you come again.

Or

When we eat this Bread and drink this Cup, we proclaim your death O Lord, until you come again.

Or

Save us, Savior of the world, for by your Cross and Resurrection you have set us free.

Sadly, none of these are "The Mystery of Faith" or, in Latin, *Mysterium Fidei*. Before I revealed the acclamations above, I asked the lads "What is the mystery of faith?" I typically got one or the other acclamation (and before the new translation in 2011, I would get "Christ has died, Christ has risen, Christ will come again" – a liturgical abuse that was never in the text). So I

asked them "How can three be singular?" Silence. Then I showed them the relevant part of the translation from the Mass of the Ages:

Take and drink ye all of this. For this is the Chalice of My Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the Mystery of Faith: which will be poured out for you and for many unto the remission of sins.

When I asked "What is the Mystery of Faith, here?" there was a pause and then I would get an answer like "the Blood of Christ" or, on a good day, "the Real Presence."

As we should know from Pope Paul VI's encyclical of 9/3/65 (3 months before the end of the Council and 4 years before the *Novus Ordo Missae*) entitled *Mysterium Fidei*:

1. The Mystery of Faith, that is, the ineffable gift of the Eucharist that the Catholic Church received from Christ,

10. For We can see that some of those who are dealing with this Most Holy Mystery ("the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist") in speech and writing are disseminating opinions ... 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.

11. To give an example of what We are talking about, it is not permissible... to discuss the mystery of transubstantiation without mentioning what the Council of Trent had to say about the marvelous conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and the whole substance of the wine into the Blood of Christ, as if they involve nothing more than "transignification," or "transfinalization" as they call it; or, finally, to propose and act upon the opinion that Christ Our Lord is no longer present in the consecrated Hosts that remain after the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass has been completed.

15. ... 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.

39. This presence is called "real" not to exclude the idea that the others are "real" too, but rather to indicate presence par excellence, because it is substantial and through it Christ becomes present whole and entire, God and man.

46. To avoid any misunderstanding of this type of presence, which goes beyond the laws of nature and constitutes the greatest miracle of its kind, (50) we have to listen with docility to the voice of the teaching and praying Church. Her voice, which constantly echoes the voice of Christ, assures us that the way in which Christ becomes present in this Sacrament is through the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into His body and of the whole substance of the wine into His blood, a unique and truly wonderful conversion that the Catholic Church fittingly and properly calls transubstantiation

Inserting proclamations / acclamations by the laity just after the most solemn moment in the Mass trivializes what just happened at the hands of the priest, especially when the content of those texts has nothing to do with the Real Presence / Transubstantiation. Why do we proclaim Christ's death at the moment His Real Presence has just substantially arrived on the altar? This poor "fabrication" of the *Novus Ordo Missae* has led generations of Catholics to misunderstand the "Mystery of Faith."

It is my contention that the only significant change to the Roman Canon by the liturgists of the "Spirit of Vatican II" was a colossal mistake. Removing the words "*mysterium fidei*" from the Consecration (where they had been since before 600AD) has served to diminish belief in the Real Presence - an article of faith for Catholics.

Ironically, once again from *Mysterium Fidei*, we have these words of Pope Paul VI:

23. ...Once the integrity of the faith has been safeguarded, then it is time to guard the proper way of expressing it, lest our careless use of words give rise, God forbid, to false opinions regarding faith in the most sublime things.

24. And so the rule of language which the Church has established through the long labor of centuries, with the help of the Holy Spirit, and which she has confirmed with the authority of the Councils, and which has more than once been the watchword and banner of orthodox faith, is to be religiously preserved, and no one may presume to change it at his own pleasure or under the pretext of new knowledge.

Yet this last is exactly what happened after Vatican Council II. The Committee on the Liturgy tinkered with the Consecration by moving "*mysterium fidei*" to a position which has given rise "to false opinions regarding faith in the most sublime things." This was not done "with the help of the Holy Spirit."