



Volume Seven, Number Two

Easter tide 2011

HIS HOLINESS POPE BENEDICT XVI ANSWERS OUR PRAYERS

The Instruction *Universae Ecclesiae [UE]* (“to the Universal Church”: a telling title) is now published. Dated (in the new calendar) on the Feast of St Pius V, and issued on the anniversary of the first apparition of Our Blessed Lady to the children of Fatima in 1917, this document clarifies *Summorum Pontificum [SP]*, issued nearly three years ago, and, where necessary, corrects both misunderstandings and, where they have occurred, tendentious and occasionally malicious interpretations of a papal *motu proprio* which was meant to bring the ancient Latin rite of Mass back to its rightful place in the daily liturgical and devotional life of the Church.

We can do little better here than to point out the best aspects of this historic document (which we reproduce *in toto* elsewhere) and, occasionally, the one or two places where objections might be fairly raised :

The first three paragraphs make clear that SP was a document meant for the whole Church, i.e. for each and every diocese in the world, however remote. Here the Commission is responding to those parts of the Church, either dioceses or even entire nations, which have more or less comprehensively ignored SP with the facile excuse that it was not meant for them, because they had not had a history of support for the old rites among either priests or laity. The response of both Pope Benedict and now his commission *Ecclesia Dei* is clear: “each particular Church must be in accord with the universal Church not only regarding the doctrine of the faith and sacramental signs, but also as to the usages universally handed down by apostolic and unbroken tradition. These are to be maintained not only so that errors may be avoided, but also so that the faith may be passed on in its integrity, since the Church’s rule of prayer (*lex orandi*) corresponds to her rule of belief (*lex credendi*).” Entire episcopal conferences are going to need to change their ways: in Portugal, for example, the old rite is officially allowed precisely nowhere. Perhaps Pope Benedict has given the Portuguese bishops a hint by publishing this document on the anniversary of a date so important in their nation’s history.

The authors of UE have a sense of humour: “Many of the faithful, formed in the spirit of the liturgical forms prior to the Second Vatican Council, expressed a lively desire to maintain the ancient traditions.” The *Critical Examination of the New Mass* by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci, the establishment of Econe in 1971, the occupation of St Nicolas du Chardonnet in 1977, the founding of *Una Voce* and the Latin Mass Society, etc., etc. - “lively” indeed! This evocation of the history of the movement makes pointless the later insistence (para. 19) that the faithful who ask for the celebration of the *forma extraordinaria* “must not in any way support or belong to groups which show themselves to be against the validity or legitimacy of the Holy Mass or the Sacraments celebrated in the *forma ordinaria* ...” No one doubts the validity (continued on back cover)



Mass at St James Parish Church, St Andrews on Good Shepherd Sunday. Above: the Incensation of the *Oblata*; below: during the Canon of the Mass. The polyphonic Mass was sung by four students, and another four served the Mass. Over forty students and parishioners were in attendance. (photos: Matthew Hudson)



UNIVERSAE ECCLESIAE

PONTIFICAL COMMISSION *ECCLESIA*

DEI

INSTRUCTION on the application of the Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum* of HIS HOLINESS POPE BENEDICT XVI given *Motu Proprio*.

I. Introduction

1. The Apostolic Letter *Summorum Pontificum* of the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XVI given *Motu Proprio* on 7 July 2007, which came into effect on 14 September 2007, has made the richness of the Roman Liturgy more accessible to the Universal Church.

2. With this *Motu Proprio*, the Holy Father Pope Benedict XVI promulgated a universal law for the Church, intended to establish new regulations for the use of the Roman Liturgy in effect in 1962.

3. The Holy Father, having recalled the concern of the Sovereign Pontiffs in caring for the Sacred Liturgy and in their recognition of liturgical books, reaffirms the traditional principle, recognised from time immemorial and necessary to be maintained into the future, that “*each particular Church must be in accord with the universal Church not only regarding the doctrine of the faith and sacramental signs, but also as to the usages universally handed down by apostolic and unbroken tradition. These are to be maintained not only so that errors may be avoided, but also so that the faith may be passed on in its integrity, since the Church's rule of prayer (lex orandi) corresponds to her rule of belief (lex credendi)*”.

4. The Holy Father recalls also those Roman Pontiffs who, in a particular way, were notable in this task, specifically Saint Gregory the Great and Saint Pius V. The Holy Father stresses moreover that, among the sacred liturgical books, the *Missale Romanum* has enjoyed a particular prominence in history, and was kept up to date throughout the centuries until the time of Blessed Pope John XXIII. Subsequently in 1970, following the liturgical reform after the Second Vatican Council, Pope Paul VI approved for the Church

of the Latin rite a new Missal, which was then translated into various languages. In the year 2000, Pope John Paul II promulgated the third edition of this Missal.

5. Many of the faithful, formed in the spirit of the liturgical forms prior to the Second Vatican Council, expressed a lively desire to maintain the ancient tradition. For this reason, Pope John Paul II with a special Indult *Quattuor abhinc annos* issued in 1984 by the Congregation for Divine Worship, granted the faculty under certain conditions to restore the use of the Missal promulgated by Blessed Pope John XXIII. Subsequently, Pope John Paul II, with the *Motu Proprio Ecclesia Dei* of 1988, exhorted the Bishops to be generous in granting such a faculty for all the faithful who requested it. Pope Benedict continues this policy with the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* regarding certain essential criteria for the *Usus Antiquior* of the Roman Rite, which are recalled here.

6. The Roman Missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI and the last edition prepared under Pope John XXIII, are two forms of the Roman Liturgy, defined respectively as *ordinaria* and *extraordinaria*: they are two usages of the one Roman Rite, one alongside the other. Both are the expression of the same *lex orandi* of the Church. On account of its venerable and ancient use, the *forma extraordinaria* is to be maintained with appropriate honor.

7. The *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* was accompanied by a letter from the Holy Father to Bishops, with the same date as the *Motu Proprio* (7 July 2007). This letter gave further explanations regarding the appropriateness and the need for the *Motu Proprio*; it was a matter of overcoming a lacuna by providing new norms for the use of the Roman Liturgy of 1962. Such norms were needed particularly on account of the fact that, when the new Missal had been introduced under Pope Paul VI, it had not seemed necessary to issue guidelines regulating the use of the 1962 Liturgy. By reason of the increase in the number of those asking to be able to use the *forma extraordinaria*, it has become necessary to provide certain norms in this area.

Among the statements of the Holy Father was the following: “*There is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal. In the history of the Liturgy growth and progress are found, but not a*

rupture. What was sacred for prior generations, remains sacred and great for us as well, and cannot be suddenly prohibited altogether or even judged harmful.”

8. The Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum* constitutes an important expression of the Magisterium of the Roman Pontiff and of his *munus* of regulating and ordering the Church’s Sacred Liturgy. The Motu Proprio manifests his solicitude as Vicar of Christ and Supreme Pastor of the Universal Church, and has the aim of:

- a. offering to all the faithful the Roman Liturgy in the *Usus Antiquior*, considered as a precious treasure to be preserved;
- b. effectively guaranteeing and ensuring the use of the *forma extraordinaria* for all who ask for it, given that the use of the 1962 Roman Liturgy is a faculty generously granted for the good of the faithful and therefore is to be interpreted in a sense favourable to the faithful who are its principal addressees;
- c. promoting reconciliation at the heart of the Church.

II. The Responsibilities of the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*

9. The Sovereign Pontiff has conferred upon the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* ordinary vicarious power for the matters within its competence, in a particular way for monitoring the observance and application of the provisions of the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum* (cf. art. 12).

10. § 1. The Pontifical Commission exercises this power, beyond the faculties previously granted by Pope John Paul II and confirmed by Pope Benedict XVI (cf. Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, artt. 11-12), also by means of the power to decide upon recourses legitimately sent to it, as hierarchical Superior, against any possible singular administrative provision of an Ordinary which appears to be contrary to the Motu Proprio.

§ 2. The decrees by which the Pontifical Commission decides recourses may be challenged *ad normam iuris* before the Supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura.

11. After having received the approval from the Congregation for Divine Worship and

the Discipline of the Sacraments, the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* will have the task of looking after future editions of liturgical texts pertaining to the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite.

III. Specific Norms

12. Following upon the inquiry made among the Bishops of the world, and with the desire to guarantee the proper interpretation and the correct application of the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, this Pontifical Commission, by virtue of the authority granted to it and the faculties which it enjoys, issues this Instruction according to can. 34 of the *Code of Canon Law*.

The Competence of Diocesan Bishops

13. Diocesan Bishops, according to Canon Law, are to monitor liturgical matters in order to guarantee the common good and to ensure that everything is proceeding in peace and serenity in their Dioceses, always in agreement with the *mens* of the Holy Father clearly expressed by the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*. In cases of controversy or well-founded doubt about the celebration in the *forma extraordinaria*, the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* will adjudicate.

14. It is the task of the Diocesan Bishop to undertake all necessary measures to ensure respect for the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite, according to the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*.

The *coetus fidelium* (cf. Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, art. 5 § 1)

15. A *coetus fidelium* (“group of the faithful”) can be said to be *stabiliter existens* (“existing in a stable manner”), according to the sense of art. 5 § 1 of the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, when it is constituted by some people of an individual parish who, even after the publication of the Motu Proprio, come together by reason of their veneration for the Liturgy in the *Usus Antiquior*, and who ask that it might be celebrated in the parish church or in an oratory or chapel; such a *coetus* (“group”) can also be composed of persons coming from different parishes or dioceses, who gather together in a specific parish church or in an oratory or chapel for this purpose.

16. In the case of a priest who presents himself occasionally in a parish church or an oratory with some faithful, and wishes to celebrate in the *forma extraordinaria*, as foreseen by articles 2 and 4 of the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, the pastor or rector of the church, or the priest responsible, is to permit such a celebration, while respecting the schedule of liturgical celebrations in that same church.

17. § 1. In deciding individual cases, the pastor or the rector, or the priest responsible for a church, is to be guided by his own prudence, motivated by pastoral zeal and a spirit of generous welcome.

§ 2. In cases of groups which are quite small, they may approach the Ordinary of the place to identify a church in which these faithful may be able to come together for such celebrations, in order to ensure easier participation and a more worthy celebration of the Holy Mass.

18. Even in sanctuaries and places of pilgrimage the possibility to celebrate in the *forma extraordinaria* is to be offered to groups of pilgrims who request it (cf. Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, art. 5 § 3), if there is a qualified priest.

19. The faithful who ask for the celebration of the *forma extraordinaria* must not in any way support or belong to groups which show themselves to be against the validity or legitimacy of the Holy Mass or the Sacraments celebrated in the *forma ordinaria* or against the Roman Pontiff as Supreme Pastor of the Universal Church.

Sacerdos idoneus (“Qualified Priest”) (cf. Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, art 5 § 4)

20. With respect to the question of the necessary requirements for a priest to be held *idoneus* (“qualified”) to celebrate in the *forma extraordinaria*, the following is hereby stated:

- a. Every Catholic priest who is not impeded by Canon Law is to be considered *idoneus* (“qualified”) for the celebration of the Holy Mass in the *forma extraordinaria*.
- b. Regarding the use of the Latin language, a basic knowledge is necessary, allowing the priest to pronounce the words correctly and understand their meaning.
- c. Regarding knowledge of the

execution of the Rite, priests are presumed to be qualified who present themselves spontaneously to celebrate the *forma extraordinaria*, and have celebrated it previously.

21. Ordinaries are asked to offer their clergy the possibility of acquiring adequate preparation for celebrations in the *forma extraordinaria*. This applies also to Seminaries, where future priests should be given proper formation, including study of Latin and, where pastoral needs suggest it, the opportunity to learn the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite.

22. In Dioceses without qualified priests, Diocesan Bishops can request assistance from priests of the Institutes erected by the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, either to celebrate the *forma extraordinaria* or to teach others how to celebrate it.

23. The faculty to celebrate *sine populo* (or with the participation of only one minister) in the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite is given by the Motu Proprio to all priests, whether secular or religious (cf. Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, art. 2). For such celebrations therefore, priests, by provision of the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, do not require any special permission from their Ordinaries or superiors.

Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Discipline

24. The liturgical books of the *forma extraordinaria* are to be used as they are. All those who wish to celebrate according to the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite must know the pertinent rubrics and are obliged to follow them correctly.

25. New saints and certain of the new prefaces can and ought to be inserted into the 1962 Missal, according to provisions which will be indicated subsequently.

26. As foreseen by article 6 of the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*, the readings of the Holy Mass of the Missal of 1962 can be proclaimed either solely in the Latin language, or in Latin followed by the vernacular or, in Low Masses, solely in the vernacular.

27. With regard to the disciplinary norms connected to celebration, the ecclesiastical discipline contained in the Code of Canon Law of 1983 applies.

28. Furthermore, by virtue of its character of special law, within its own area, the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* derogates from those provisions of law, connected with the sacred Rites, promulgated from 1962 onwards and incompatible with the rubrics of the liturgical books in effect in 1962.

Confirmation and Holy Orders

29. Permission to use the older formula for the rite of Confirmation was confirmed by the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* (cf. art. 9 § 2). Therefore, in the *forma extraordinaria*, it is not necessary to use the newer formula of Pope Paul VI as found in the *Ordo Confirmationis*.

30. As regards tonsure, minor orders and the subdiaconate, the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* does not introduce any change in the discipline of the *Code of Canon Law* of 1983; consequently, in Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life which are under the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, one who has made solemn profession or who has been definitively incorporated into a clerical institute of apostolic life, becomes incardinated as a cleric in the institute or society upon ordination to the diaconate, in accordance with canon 266 § 2 of the *Code of Canon Law*.

31. Only in Institutes of Consecrated Life and Societies of Apostolic Life which are under the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, and in those which use the liturgical books of the *forma extraordinaria*, is the use of the *Pontificale Romanum* of 1962 for the conferral of minor and major orders permitted.

Breviarium Romanum

32. Art. 9 § 3 of the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* gives clerics the faculty to use the *Breviarium Romanum* in effect in 1962, which is to be prayed entirely and in the Latin language.

The Sacred Triduum

33. If there is a qualified priest, a *coetus fidelium* (group of faithful), which follows the older liturgical tradition, can also celebrate the Sacred *Triduum* in the *forma extraordinaria*. When there is no church or oratory designated exclusively for such celebrations, the parish priest or Ordinary, in

agreement with the qualified priest, should find some arrangement favourable to the good of souls, not excluding the possibility of a repetition of the celebration of the Sacred Triduum in the same church.

The Rites of Religious Orders

34. The use of the liturgical books proper to the Religious Orders which were in effect in 1962 is permitted.

Pontificale Romanum and the Rituale Romanum

35. The use of the *Pontificale Romanum*, the *Rituale Romanum*, as well as the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* in effect in 1962, is permitted, in keeping with n. 28 of this Instruction, and always respecting n. 31 of the same Instruction.

The Holy Father Pope Benedict XVI, in an audience granted to the undersigned Cardinal President of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei on 8 April 2011, approved this present Instruction and ordered its publication.

Given at Rome, at the Offices of the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, 30 April, 2011, on the memorial of Pope Saint Pius V.

William Cardinal LEVADA, *President*

Msgr Guido Pozzo, *Secretary*

NOTICE ON NEW INSTRUCTION UNIVERSAE ECCLESIAE

[An] Instruction on the application of the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum* (of 7 July 2007, entered into effect 14 September 2007) was approved by Pope Benedict XVI last 8 April and carries the date of 30 April in liturgical remembrance of Pope St. Pius V.

The Instruction, called *Universae Ecclesiae* on the basis of the first words of the text in Latin, comes from the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, to which the Pope also entrusted the task of monitoring the observance and application of the *Motu Proprio*. It therefore bears the signatures of its president, Cardinal William Levada, and secretary, Msgr. Guido Pozzo.

The document was sent to all the Bishops in the past weeks. Remember that “Instructions clarify the prescripts of laws, elaborating on and determining the methods to be observed in fulfilling them” (CIC, can. 34). As is said in n.12, the Instruction was issued “with the desire to guarantee the proper interpretation and the correct application of the Motu Proprio ‘Summorum Pontificum’”.

It is natural that, in its application, the Instruction follow the law contained in the Motu Proprio. The fact that this occurs now, three years later, is easily explained by recalling that in the Pope’s Letter accompanying the Motu Proprio, he explicitly said to the Bishops: “I invite you to send to the Holy See an account of your experiences, three years after this Motu Proprio has taken effect. If truly serious difficulties come to light, ways to remedy them can be sought.” The letter accompanying the Instruction thus bears with it the fruit of a three year trial of the application of the law, which was foreseen from the beginning.

The document is presented in plain wording and is easily read. Its Introduction (nos. 1-8) briefly recalls the history of the Roman Missal up to the last edition of John XXIII in 1962 and the new Missal approved by Paul VI in 1970 following the liturgical reform of Vatican Council II. It repeats the fundamental principle that there are “two forms of the Roman Liturgy, defined respectively as *extraordinaria* and *ordinaria*: they are two usages of the one Roman Rite, one alongside the other. Both are the expression of the same *lex orandi* of the Church. On account of its venerable and ancient use, the *forma extraordinaria* is to be maintained with appropriate honor” (n. 6).

The purpose of the Motu Proprio, expressed in the following three points, bears repeating: a) to offer to all the faithful the Roman Liturgy in its most ancient usage, considered as a precious treasure to be preserved; b) to effectively guarantee and ensure, for all who ask for it, the use of the *forma extraordinaria*; and c) to promote reconciliation at the heart of the Church (cf. n. 8).

A brief section of the document (nos. 9-11) recalls the tasks and powers of the Commission Ecclesia Dei, to which the Pope “has conferred ordinary vicarious power” on the subject. Among others, this has two very important consequences. First of all, this Commission can [1] decide on recourses

legitimately sent to it against eventual measures taken by bishops or other Ordinaries that seem to be in conflict with the dispositions of the Motu Proprio (while retaining the possibility of further challenging the decisions of the Commission itself before the Supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura). Moreover, it falls to the Commission, with the approval of the Congregation for Divine Worship, [2] to take care of eventual editions of liturgical texts for the *forma extraordinaria* of the Roman Rite (for example, it is to be hoped that, following the document, new saints and new prefaces will be added).

The properly normative part of the document (nos. 12-35) contains 23 brief points on different topics.

The competence of diocesan bishops to implement the Motu Proprio is reasserted, with the reminder that in cases of controversy regarding the celebration in the *forma extraordinaria*, the Commission Ecclesia Dei will adjudicate.

It clarifies the concept of *coetus fidelium stabiliter existens* (“where there exists a stable group of faithful”), whose desire to attend the celebration in the *forma extraordinaria* is to be willingly accepted by pastors. While leaving an evaluation of the number of persons necessary to constitute such a group to the prudent assessment of the pastors, it specifies that it not be necessarily constituted by persons belonging to a single parish, but can be composed of persons coming from different parishes or even different dioceses. Always keeping in mind respect for the widest pastoral needs, the Instruction proposes a spirit of “generous welcome” toward the groups of faithful who request the *forma extraordinaria* and the priests who occasionally ask to celebrate that form with some faithful.

Also very important is the clarification (n. 19) according to which the faithful who request the celebration of the *forma extraordinaria* “must not in any way support or belong to groups which show themselves to be against the validity or legitimacy of the Holy Mass or the Sacraments celebrated in the *forma ordinaria*” or against the Pope’s authority as Supreme Pastor of the Universal Church. Such would, in fact, be in obvious contradiction of the purpose of the Motu’s “reconciliation”.

Important indications regarding the “qualified priest” to celebrate the *forma extraordinaria*

are also given. Naturally, he should not have impediments from a canonical aspect. He should know Latin sufficiently well and know the rite to be celebrated. Bishops should, therefore, make adequate formation possible in the seminaries to such ends and the possibility is noted, if other qualified priests are unavailable, of the assistance of priests from the Institutes established by the Commission Ecclesia Dei (which normally use the *forma extraordinaria*).

The Instruction repeats that every priest, whether diocesan or religious, has the right to celebrate the Mass *sine populo* (without a congregation) in the *forma extraordinaria* if they so desire. Therefore, if it is a celebration with the participation of only one minister, the individual religious do not need the permission of their superiors.

Always in reference to the *forma extraordinaria*, there follow norms regarding the liturgical rubrics and use of liturgical books (such as the Ritual, the Pontifical, and the Ceremonial of Bishops), the possibility of using the vernacular for the readings (proclaimed either after the Latin language readings or even in alternative to them in "Low Masses"), the possibility for clerics to use the pre-reform Breviary, and the possibility of celebrating the Sacred Triduum of Holy Week for groups of faithful who request the ancient rite. As regards holy ordination, the use of ancient liturgical books is only permitted in the Institutes that are under the Commission Ecclesia Dei.

On finishing the letter, one is left with the impression of a well balanced text that intends to promote - as intended by the Pope - a serene usage of the pre-reform liturgy by priests and faithful who feel a sincere desire for their spiritual well-being: even more, a text that intends to guarantee the legitimacy and efficacy of such usage in keeping with what is reasonably possible. At the same time, the text is animated with trust in the bishops' pastoral wisdom and insists very strongly on a spirit of ecclesial communion that should be present in all - faithful, priests, and bishops - so that the purpose of reconciliation, so evident in the Holy Father's decision, not be hindered or frustrated but fostered and attained.

Fr Federico Lombardi, S.J., Director, Vatican Press Office

THE MEANING OF THE INSTRUCTION "UNIVERAE ECCLESIAE"

The liturgical Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* of the Second Vatican Council, affirms that "the Church, when the faith or the general common good is not in question, does not intend to impose, not even in the Liturgy, a rigid uniformity" (n. 37). It has not escaped the notice of many people that today the faith is in question, for which reason it is necessary that the legitimate variety of ritual forms must recover the essential unity of Catholic worship. Pope Benedict XVI accurately called this to mind: "In our days, when in vast areas of the world the faith is in danger of dying out like a flame which no longer has fuel, the overriding priority is to make God present in this world and to show men and women the way to God. Not just any god, but the God who spoke on Sinai; to that God whose face we recognize in a love which presses "to the end" (cf. Jn 13:1) - in Jesus Christ, crucified and risen" (Letter of His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI to the Bishops of the Catholic Church Concerning the Remission of the Excommunication of the Four Bishops Consecrated by Archbishop Lefevre, 10 March 2009).

Blessed John Paul II in his own turn recalled that "Sacred Liturgy expresses and celebrates the one faith professed by all and, being the heritage of the whole Church, cannot be determined by local Churches in isolation from the universal Church" (Encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, n. 51) and that "Liturgy is never anyone's private property, be it of the celebrant or of the community in which the mysteries are celebrated" (ibid. n. 52). In the Conciliar liturgical Constitution there is affirmed moreover: 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" (n. 4). Esteem for ritual forms is the presupposition of the work of revision from time to time becomes necessary. Now, the two forms, Ordinary and Extraordinary, of the Roman liturgy are an example of reciprocal growth and enrichment. Whoever thinks or acts to the contrary, undermines the unity of

the Roman Rite which must be tenaciously protected, does not carry out an authentic pastoral activity or correct liturgical renewal, but rather deprives the faithful of their patrimony and their inheritance to which they have a right.

In continuity with the Magisterium of his predecessors, Benedict XVI promulgated in 2007 the *Motu Proprio Summorum Pontificum*, with which he made more accessible to the Universal Church the riches of the Roman liturgy, and now has given the mandate to the Pontifical Commission "Ecclesia Dei" to publish the Instruction "Universae Ecclesiae" in order correctly to favor its application.

In the introduction to the document there is affirmed: "With such a *Motu Proprio* the Supreme Pontiff Benedict XVI has promulgated a universal law for the Church" (n. 2). This means that one isn't dealing with an indult, nor with a law for particular groups, but with a law for the whole Church, which, given the subject matter, is also a "special law" which "derogate from those legislative provisions, inhering in the Sacred Rites, issued from 1962 onward and incompatible with the rubrics of the liturgical books in force in 1962 (n. 28). Let it be remembered here the golden patristic principle on which the Catholic communion depends: "every particular Church must be in harmony with the Universal Church, not only insofar as the doctrine of the faith and sacramental signs are concerned, but also concerning to uses universally received from the uninterrupted apostolic tradition, which must be observed not only in order to avoid errors, but also to transmit the totality of the faith, because the law of the prayer of the Church corresponds to its law of the faith" (n. 3). The celebrated principle *lex orandi - lex credendi* recalled in this paragraph, is at the foundation of a restoration of the Extraordinary Form: Catholic doctrine of the Mass in the Roman Rite has not been changed, because liturgy and doctrine are inseparable. There can be in the one and the other form of the Roman Rite, accentuations, underscorings, clarifications which are more marked of some aspects in respect to others, but this does not undermine the substantial unity of the liturgy.

The liturgy was and is, in the discipline of the Church, a subject matter reserved to the Pope, while Ordinaries and Episcopal Conferences

have some delegated responsibilities, specified by Canon Law. Moreover, the Instruction reaffirms that there are now "two forms of the Roman Liturgy, defined respectively as Ordinary and Extraordinary: that is, two uses of the single Roman Rite (...) The one and the other form are expressions of the same *lex orandi* of the Church. Because of its venerable and ancient use, the Extraordinary Form must be preserved with due honor" (n. 6). The following paragraph quotes a key passage of the Letter of the Holy Father to the bishops which accompanied the *Motu Proprio*: "There is no contradiction between the two editions of the Roman Missal. In the history of the liturgy there is growth and progress, but no rupture. 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" (n. 7). The Instruction, in line with the *Motu Proprio*, does not regard only those who desire to continue to celebrate the faith in the same way by which the Church substantially did for centuries; the Pope wanted to help all Catholics to live the truth of the liturgy in order that, by knowing and participating in the old Roman form of celebration, they might grasp that the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* wanted to reform the liturgy in continuity with tradition.

Msgr Guido Pozzo, *Secretary of the Ecclesia Dei Commission*, Rome, 14 May 2011 (translated by Fr John Zuhlsdorf)

ROME ...

Bishop Rifan, head of the Apostolic Administration of St John Vianney in Campos, came to Rome in September 2010 for the visit *ad limina* of the Brazilian bishops. On Sunday September 26, he visited the parish of *Santissima Trinita dei Pellegrini*, served by the Fraternity of St Peter, and confirmed two boys during the principal Mass. Pontifical Low Mass with music substituted the usual Solemn Mass. The parish at Trinita was created precisely to provide, in the old rite, not only daily Mass and regular confessions, but also the sacraments which are normally celebrated in

the parish church: baptism, confirmation and marriage. Over the last year, the number of weddings and baptisms has risen: the confirmations by Bishop Rifan were only the most public manifestation of how the parish is fulfilling the purpose for which it was created by the Vicariate of Rome on behalf of the Holy Father.

Meanwhile, two priests have arrived to join the parish clergy. Fr William Barker is assigned to the parish full-time by the Fraternity. Don Marco Cuneo, of the diocese of Albenga-Imperia is also resident and assisting the parish priest, Fr Joseph Kramer. Fr Barker's presence as full-time assistant is indispensable, given the departure of one of the original parish team and the extra-parochial commitments of Fr Almir de Andrade. Don Almiro, as he is known, is serving as a permanent official of the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission and also pursuing higher studies in liturgy under Fr Paul Gunter OSB.

... AND ABROAD

I have a new room (again). I'll try not to do this for every new issue. No iron bars this time, and my window looks out, not to the sloping roof of the Trinita apartments, but to branches laden with late autumn apples, and behind them, the white wall of the Wigratzbad chapel and (further off) the bemusing structure of the 1970s sanctuary church.

To its pilgrims, "Wigratzbad" means the Marian sanctuary, now 75 years old. To most people familiar with the Fraternity of St Peter, it means the seminary. But there is more to it than that. In the reign of Fr Devillers, Fr Axel Maussen was appointed superior of the German-speaking District, with headquarters in Wigratzbad, not in the seminary but on the other side of the sanctuary church, next door to the earlier chapel.

The Distriktshaus is now home. I often celebrate an early weekday Mass and a Sunday mid-morning Sung Mass which are the responsibility of the District, and help with confessions in the sanctuary church. Meanwhile, I am working to complete my thesis for the licence in Sacred Scripture at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. Two or three times a week I go over to the seminary to teach classes. There will be more of that next term, when I have classes with the German-speaking students as well as the French-speakers.

My students range from those just starting philosophy to others nearing the end of their theology cycle. That some do not already have a grounding in theology is challenging, in addition to the fact that most depend on translations for their knowledge of the sacred text. At the same time, the study of Scripture outside the context of systematic theology serves as a useful reminder that the *content* of the Church's dogmas precedes the philosophical categories which the Councils later used to explain it. For example, John's Gospel never uses the terms "Person", "essence", or "relation", yet (among other New Testament texts) it lays the foundations of Trinitarian dogma. In that connection, Pope Benedict's apostolic exhortation *Verbum Domini* (September 30, 2010) contains some splendid reflections on the theology of St John's prologue, which, of course, is part of daily liturgical life in the Missal that we use.

Fr Brendan Gerard
Wigratzbad, Kapellenweg 5
D-88145 Opfenbach
Germany

JESUS OF NAZARETH: PART TWO

It is good finally to have the Pope's new book on the shelf and to be able to refer one's students to it. That John's Gospel alludes to the Eucharist in its last supper narrative, that John's Passion chronology is historically correct, that the synoptic Gospels present the supper as a Passover meal not because it was the Jewish Passover (that did not start until Good Friday evening) but because Jesus gave himself as the true Lamb - all these positions are lucidly set out in the second volume of *Jesus of Nazareth*.

Even when one occasionally disagrees or has reservations (Benedict writes here as a scholar, not with the authority of his office), his synthesis is always rewarding. Treating the events of Holy Week and Easter as the four Gospels present them, he extracts the essential from the debates of Scripture scholars, offers judicious solutions and expounds the theological sense of the events. The pearl of this volume is perhaps the chapter on the Resurrection. Benedict's discussion explains, taking more time than a catechism can, what the Catechism means by calling the Resurrection an "historical and transcendent event." He writes:

"Resurrection is not the same kind of historical event as the birth or crucifixion of Jesus.

It is something new, a new type of event. [...] Perhaps we could put it this way: Jesus' Resurrection points beyond history but has left a footprint within history. Therefore it can be attested by witnesses as an event of an entirely new kind".

Whether the first Christians continued to take part in Temple worship, why the empty tomb is a necessary part of the Easter message, why the term "many" occurs in the eucharistic words - all these questions find answers characterized by faith, scholarship and common sense. One expectation still not met is the discussion of the Gospel Infancy narratives promised in the first volume. The author means to keep that promise "and to prepare a small monograph on this subject, if I am given the strength". If readers spare a prayer for that intention, it will not go amiss.

BG

Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI), *Jesus of Nazareth*. II. Holy Week. From the Entrance into Jerusalem to the Resurrection, transl. P. J. Whitmore (London: CTS - San Francisco: Ignatius Press 2011) h/b, 362 pp.

LUKE: EVANGELIST OF THE YEAR

St Luke (like Matthew and Mark) dominates the cycle of readings once every three years in the lectionary that came after our ancient one-year cycle. But that is not what I mean by "evangelist of the year". Nor do I mean that Luke (alongside Matthew) is very much present in the Sundays of the *tempus per annum* in the ancient liturgy.

Rather, Luke is "evangelist of the year" because of his singular influence on the liturgical calendar itself. If Matthew is predominant in the *tempus per annum*, while John is privileged at the most intense moments of the cycle (from Lent to Pentecost), it is Luke who provides most of the landmarks of liturgical time. The Midnight and Dawn Masses of Christmas both have Lukan Gospels: only Luke has an actual narrative of the birth of Jesus, and only he gives us the visit of the shepherds. The Presentation in the Temple (February 2) is uniquely Lukan. So too the Annunciation (March 25) and the Nativity of John the Baptist (June 24). While not alone in attesting the Ascension, only Luke (in his second volume) specifies when it happened: 40 days after the Resurrection (Acts 1,3), with the descent of the Holy Spirit ten days later, at Pentecost (Acts 2,1).

Luke has also left his mark on the sanctoral: the Visitation (2 July) is, again, uniquely Lukan, while the book of Acts provides the lesson for the feast of Saints Peter and Paul

(June 29).

Luke's Infancy Narrative canticles also structure the day in the Divine Office: *Benedictus* at Lauds, *Magnificat* at Vespers, *Nunc Dimittis* at Compline. It is also remarkable how much of the Rosary is Lukan: all the Joyful Mysteries, and the mid-point of the Glorious cycle, the event of Pentecost.

The Evangelist, his Gospel and the Gospels

From Luke's prologue we learn:

1. that this is not the first Gospel narrative to be composed (1,1)
2. that the author received the Gospel tradition from people who were eyewitnesses from the beginning (v. 2), implying that he himself is not an eyewitness
3. that he considers that he has "followed everything carefully from the beginning" (v. 3)
4. that his intention is to write an orderly account, allowing the exact truth to be known (v. 4).

An accomplished storyteller

Luke's orderliness is an important part of his literary procedure. Along with his high competence and versatility in the Greek language, Luke's ability to organize his narrative is part of what makes him a particularly accomplished storyteller. Among the tributes paid to his skill is the choice made by the writers of the excellent model-animation film *The Miracle Maker* (2000). The screenwriters make use of all four Gospels, but when they have a choice among parallel texts, they usually follow Luke.

Luke's sources

The earlier Gospel accounts known to Luke may have included some lost non-canonical written Gospels. Among the canonical Gospels, most scholars conclude that Luke has made use of the Gospel according to Mark. Does he also depend on Matthew? Most commentators think not. Luke has plenty of material not found in Mark but which has parallels in Matthew. However, where Luke and Matthew run parallel, but with differences, most exegetes conclude that they have each used a common source.

This hypothetical source (Q, from the German *Quelle*) is often considered to have been an anthology of Jesus' sayings. For example, Matthew and Luke each have their own version of the beatitudes and of the Lord's prayer:

Mt 5,3: Blessed are the poor **in spirit**, for the kingdom of heaven is theirs.

Lk 6,20: Blessed are you poor, for the kingdom of God is yours.

Mt 6,9: Our Father in heaven, may your name be hallowed.

Lk 11,2: Father, may your name be hallowed.

In both instances, Luke is thought to give an earlier form of these sayings of Jesus. The more ample text in Matthew would then be the result of Matthew's interpretation, or perhaps of ecclesiastical usage. On this view, then, Matthew and Luke have made independent use of the same text, or at least, independent use of the same tradition.

At the same time, Matthew and Luke have each drawn upon sources that no one else has used. For example, only Matthew has the flight into Egypt; only Luke has the

presentation in the Temple.

There is, however, a vigorous minority of “Q-sceptics” who doubt that Q ever existed. In *The Case Against Q* (2002), Mark Goodacre argues that Luke is dependent on both Mark and Matthew. Where Luke runs parallel to Matthew, but diverges from him, this is explained as Luke’s adaptation of Matthew. For example, in the first beatitude, Luke reduces the expression “poor in spirit” to “poor”. Luke is particularly severe about the amassing of wealth (see for example, 12,13-21; 16,19-31). For him, it suffices to address the beatitude to the poor. The qualification “in spirit” is unnecessary.

Goodacre is right to insist that we should not suppose the existence of hypothetical documents if the data can be explained satisfactorily without them. He has also made a serious case for Luke’s knowledge of and use of Matthew. At the same time, not all his arguments have equal strength, and his case has not gained widespread acceptance so far.

Luke himself

Gospel manuscripts and patristic sources from the second century onwards give no name other than Luke to the writer of this Gospel and its sequel, the Acts of the Apostles. The evangelist is identified with the Luke named in the Pauline letter to the Colossians, where he is called “the dear physician” (Col 4,14), in the second letter to Timothy (4,11) and in the letter to Philemon (v. 24). The passages in Acts written in the first person plural appear to confirm that the author accompanied St Paul on some of his travels, including the final, arduous journey to Rome.

Modern scholarship has confirmed the ancient conviction that the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles have the same author.

However, the identity of the evangelist has been challenged. Some scholars have found it impossible to accept that the author of the Gospel and Acts could ever have known Paul. For instance, in Acts there is no reference at all to Paul’s prodigious letter-writing. Moreover, Paul’s speech at Athens in Acts 17, in which pagan religion is found to contain an opening onto the Gospel, is contrasted with the damning account of the Gentiles in Rm 1. However, the alleged divergence of “the Lukan Paul” from the Paul of the epistles has been exaggerated. In Acts 17, Paul is certainly shown taking a different theological tack from what we find in Rm 1. But in each case it is a question of strategy. Introducing pagan Greeks to Christian monotheism is one task. Writing to the Roman church to expound an argument against the Judaizers is quite another. Each requires a different approach. Anyone who denies that the same person could have written Romans and delivered the speech in Acts 17 would seem to have a low opinion of Paul’s rhetorical skills and pedagogical adaptability.

The “we” passages in Acts provide indications, not only of the author’s presence in Paul’s company, but also of his absence. It would appear that Luke was not present in the critical period of 52 - 57, when the apostle was writing his major letters.

The view that early ecclesiastical traditions about authorship are basically unreliable manifests an unwarranted scepticism. The statements of the second century authors may rather be regarded as being “in possession”, deserving to be taken seriously unless there are weighty reasons to question their testimony. In the case of Luke, the internal evidence of his writings is not really in conflict with the early identification of their author. Moreover, the attribution to Luke of the

Gospel and Acts is unlikely to have been invented. As J. M. Creed observed in *The Gospel According to St Luke* (1965, pp. xiii-xiv):

“Luke is not personally a prominent figure in the apostolic age . . . If the Gospel and Acts did not already pass under his name, there is no obvious reason why tradition should have associated them with him.”

The tradition which makes Luke a native of Antioch in Syria is not explicitly confirmed in his writings. However, it is consistent with the author’s interest in, and knowledge of, the church at Antioch (Acts 11,15). Is he Jewish? He is certainly familiar with the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures known as the Septuagint. Not only does he incorporate many quotations from it into his narrative, he is also capable of imitating the Semitized Greek of the Septuagint, especially in the Infancy narratives and in the early chapters of Acts. (He can also write in a highly polished Greek style: Paul’s speech in Acts 17, for example.) On the other hand, in Colossians Paul mentions his coworkers Aristarchus, Mark (cousin of Barnabas) and Jesus Justus, who are expressly said to be “of the circumcision” (4,10-11). Luke is not in this list, but is mentioned in v. 14 after Epaphras (v. 12) and before Demas (v. 14).

Luke, then, is more probably of Gentile origin. If so, he is none the less a Gentile Christian intensely interested in, and sympathetic to, the situation of the Jewish people as intended beneficiaries of God’s salvation in Jesus, a situation in painful contrast to the rejection of the apostolic preaching by many Jewish hearers.

Luke’s literary project

Not only do Luke’s Gospel and Acts come from

the same hand, they also appear to form a unified literary project. The Gospel sets up expectations that are not fulfilled until the second volume. The Infancy narrative presents Jesus as the “light for revelation to the nations” (2,32), and towards the close of the Gospel we read that “in his name repentance for the remission of sins must be preached to all the nations” (24,47). The execution of this command by the apostles is narrated only in Acts.

If Luke designed his work as a history in two parts, the thematic choices that he makes in the Gospel will sometimes find an explanation in his overall literary project: not only the “Christ-event”, but also salvation in Christ actualized in the Church’s evangelization, driven by the Holy Spirit from above, and under the leadership of the apostles.

Dating Luke’s work

Luke’s Gospel and Acts are commonly dated to the decade following the year 80. Such a date allows for a certain development of the Gospel tradition, and for its retelling by one who was not an eyewitness of Jesus’ acts. It would also account for Luke’s form of Jesus’ prophecies on the fall of Jerusalem in the year 70 (19,41-44; 21,20-24). The description in Lk 19,43 is said to show signs of borrowing from the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, an eyewitness of the catastrophe. Again, 21,20 (part of the eschatological discourse) refers to a military siege of Jerusalem, whereas the synoptic parallels (Mt 24,15-16; Mk 13,14) indicate rather the desecration of the Temple. This, it is argued, indicates that Luke’s account of Jesus’ prophecy is influenced by his knowledge of what happened in the event.

However, others argue that Luke does not necessarily depend on Flavius Josephus for

his language in these passages. The books of Jeremiah (6,6-1; 52,5), Ezekiel (4,1-3; 21,22) and, especially, Isaiah (29,3; 37,33) are proposed as a more convincing source. If Luke does not depend on Josephus, or on other information about the destruction of Jerusalem after the event, then his work could be dated before the year 70. Some elements in the Gospel and Acts are consistent with a date in the early 60s. The open-ended finale of Acts, which finishes without telling us the outcome of St Paul's case, could have been written before the case was finally decided. Likewise, if Luke's discretion about the whereabouts of St Peter is meant to protect him, this would point to a date at which Peter (and, for that matter, Paul) was still alive. After Peter escapes from prison under sentence of death, we are not told to what city he went, only that he went to "another place" (Acts 12,17).

However, the open ending of Acts can be explained otherwise. Luke may have left us with the picture of Paul freely preaching the Gospel to his visitors in order to show that the mission of worldwide evangelization had penetrated even to Rome, the heart of the empire. Moreover, the thesis of protective anonymity is challenged by the fact that we are told to whose house Peter went before leaving Jerusalem. It was to "the house of Mary, mother of John, also called Mark" (12,12). On the other hand, if Mary were out of danger (having left Jerusalem, or died) by the time that Luke wrote, his identification of her in this passage would be comprehensible. Certainly, Peter had passed beyond human reach by the completion of John's Gospel, which alone names him as the man who cut off the ear of the high priest's servant (Jn 18,10).

The lack of animosity to the Roman empire in

Luke's writings is also remarkable. In Acts, the Roman authorities are not necessarily hostile, and may even be benevolent. The narrative seems untouched by the persecutions which caused the imperial regime to be painted much more darkly in the Apocalypse of John.

The earliest possible date for the completion of Luke's writings is therefore in the early 60s, the time of St Paul's house arrest in Rome. Since Luke's Gospel appears to be earlier than the Gospel of John, it is unlikely to have been written much later than 90.

Fr Brendan Gerard

THE 20TH CENTURY CRISIS IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

In a previous paper, I proposed the idea of a Modernist Reformation in the Catholic Church in the post Vatican II period, with its roots in the false post-enlightenment thinking that faith and reason are incompatible. I suggested that this has been recognised, halted and is being reversed. Some three years on, that analysis seems reasonable although what is now clear is that the process of reversing this setback will be longer and more arduous than hinted at.

In this article, the concept of Reformation and the intriguing similarities between the Protestant Reformation and the events surrounding Vatican II, are further examined. The mechanism of the attack on the Church and the necessary corrective measures are

explored more closely. The analogy of Reformation is extended to Counter Reformation.

May I explain that I am a Catholic, a layman, by profession a scientist and industrial manager and that I have no formal training in history or theology. As such, some terms I use may be imprecise, a practice I have also noticed as being quite common amongst professional theologians. In particular I consider the terms Modernist, Neo-Modernist, Relativist and Secularist while no doubt containing variations, are effectively interchangeable, for this level of discussion.

Professionalism apart, retirement has allowed me to do what my early training has fitted me for and that is to observe, analyse and draw conclusions based on experience over a period of 45 years in three different European countries, and my comments are drawn from the same period.

Seen from the perspective of the forty five years since the close of the Second Vatican Council, it is beyond doubt that something in the nature of a catastrophe has afflicted the Western Catholic Church. The remaining, numerically reduced Catholic laity are now widely heterodox in doctrine, have in many cases adopted a secularist mores, with attitudes to current issues, such as contraception, abortion and even the sanctity of the Sacrament of Marriage, increasingly in line the secular society.

But it is not just the laity who give cause for concern. Pope Benedict XVI in his notable March 2008 speech identified secularisation in the Hierarchy. Disturbingly, and unlike the Scottish Cardinal who has publicly challenged Secularist values on a number of occasions, the Hierarchy of England and Wales, and no doubt others in Europe, seem incapable of

responding in any effective way. This criticism has been highlighted recently by the noted Catholic journalist Dominic Scarborough who in an article published in December 2010 edition of the Catholic World Report attacks the secularist leanings of the Hierarchy, in particular, of England and Wales whom he sees as stagnating in a mind-set of secular compromise, resisting Benedict's vision of orthodox Catholicism as a counter-force to secularism and thereby failing their flocks, while the work of restoring Catholic Orthodoxy is left to the traditionalist movements. Worryingly, he questions whether this can go on much longer without rupture.

To those who may regard the idea of a Modernist (or Secularist) Reformation as far-fetched, I would offer the following quote, not as it might seem likely, from Leo X and directed against Martin Luther et al in 1517, but from Paul VI speaking in Holy Week 1969, of Modernism in the Church:

"The Church suffers from the abandonment by so many Catholics of the fidelity that centuries old tradition merits", "favoured sons engage in destructive criticism, and by their defections [are equally destructive] ", and he spoke of "practically schismatic ferment that divides and sub divides the Church".

And in March 2010, Pope Benedict, addressing, with considered hindsight, a General Audience at the Vatican said:

"Following Vatican Council II some people were convinced that all was new, that a new Church existed, that the pre-Conciliar had come to an end and that there would be another, completely different Church, an anarchic utopia".

It is now some 45 years since the start of the post-Conciliar disruptions, but it took about 100 years before the Protestant Reformation was recognised as such. The parallels with

present crisis and the Protestant Reformation are strong. The gestation intervals from Wycliffe to Luther, and from the emergence "Modernist" concepts in the mid 18th century to the first stark warning by Pius X in *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, are approximately the same. In that encyclical the Pope warned about the incursion of Relativistic thinking already deeply established within the Church, just as Protestant thinking was by the time of Luther. We may not resort now to the broadsword and halberd to settle such matters, but there is still a bitter conflict going on in certain Catholic circles, both lay and theological, resulting in much disillusionment uncertainty and confusion within the laity, just as there was during in the last Reformation.

Pius X issued the "anti-Modernist Oath" in September 1910, thereby suppressing such ideas until restrictions were lifted in the mid 20th century, but when they did re-emerge before, during, and after Vatican II, their impact was sudden and devastating. As Fr Thomas Crean OP has written, "this later Modernism might be compared to a great flood of water pouring into a house with devastating effects". Fr Aidan Nichols OP, has in turn identified four variations of this, now Neo-Modernist heresy, which are alive and well in the Church in the 21st Century.

It is not yet clear if this movement, encompassing relativistic thinking, and rejecting the immutable and unchanging teaching of the Church, was intuitive and unstructured in nature, or whether it was organised and deliberately subversive. That is for future historians to say. But that it returned and still exists within the Church, is beyond question. Prominent personalities such as Luther, Calvin and Zwingli may well be matched by future historians with liberals

such as Bugnini, Schillebeeckx and Rahner. But leading names apart it was, in both cases, a host of theologians, minor clerics, officials and periti who were instrumental in effecting the devastating changes.

The Initial Attack

The Reformers made a calculated attempt to influence the Vatican II documents to bring about a rupture with the established teaching of the Magisterium. In this they were unsuccessful, unsurprisingly, since as a General Council of the Church, the documents carried the guarantee of the Holy Ghost, and therefore expressed Truth. What they did manage to do however, was to introduce many ambiguities, so that some texts while containing and expressing Truth, were also capable of other interpretations. Schillebeeckx has publicly admitted to this ploy. Vennari quotes him as saying, "We have used ambiguous phrases during the Council and we know how we shall interpret them afterwards". In the light of this, Fr Aidan Nichol's comment that "I take it that we have gone beyond the stage of Conciliar fundamentalism which can admit no flaws at all in the Councils wording" is but a statement of the obvious and a view which finds support as far back as 1969 by one, Joseph Ratzinger, referring to the "Pelagian terminology" of *Gaudium et Spes*.

This recent and refreshing openness to discussion has now reached a new degree of significance with the call by Bishop Schneider at a conference in Rome in December 2010, organised by the Franciscans of the Immaculate, for a Syllabus, infallibly condemning the (post-Conciliar) "misinterpretations of the Vatican Council II". As he pointed out this could only be done

either by a new Ecumenical Council, unlikely, or by the Pope himself!

The Main Attack

Having failed to build discontinuity into the Council documents, the Reformers switched tactics. When it came, the attack was three pronged in character and devastating in effect. Their objectives centred on the liturgy, as a means of changing Catholic belief, on the Catholic education system, as a means of diminishing Catholic belief, and on Catholic Spirituality, as a means of separating Catholics from the real world, the Supernatural World, towards which we all travel.

Liturgy is the way in which we express our beliefs. What the Reformers grasped, with great insight, is that by changing liturgy they could change belief and in this, they succeeded. To quote one of the Reformers, Bugnini, in 1974, said that the reform of the liturgy had been "a major conquest of the Catholic Church", which begs the question, conquest by whom? Here it is apt to note what, the then Cardinal Ratzinger, had to say on this subject:

"I am convinced that the ecclesial crisis in which we find ourselves today depends in great part upon the collapse of the liturgy, which at times is actually being conceived of *etsi Deus non daretur*: as though in the liturgy it did not matter any more whether God exists and whether He speaks to us and listens to us".

It is now clear that the Reformers attempted as follows.

The Traditional Latin Mass. The Traditional Latin Mass, the Mass of our Catholic ancestors, "the Roman Universal Mass", contains and expresses the essence of

Catholicism drawing on two millennia of the flow of Grace from the Risen Christ to his Mystical Body on Earth.

This had to go, and it was one of the first targets of the Reformers. It was rapidly and unlawfully suppressed and nearly eliminated, just as in the previous Reformation, save for a few loyal individuals, communities and Orders who carried on saying the Mass until the indult of 1971, which allowed limited practise, extended by the world-wide indult of 1984 granted by Jean Paul II. The situation was clarified and the Mass fully restored by Benedict XVI in *Summorum Pontificum* in 2007.

This illicit action against the established and sacred Catholic Mass was in direct contradiction of the wishes of the Council, which in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* stated,

"in faithful obedience to tradition the Council declares that Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully recognised rites to be of equal right and dignity, that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way (article 4)".

The Mass as a Redemptive Sacrifice. The 1970 Mass of Paul VI as prescribed probably went beyond the wishes of the Council, but the way in which it was implemented was a profound distortion of the Council's wishes. Latin was abolished, the priest turned from God to the people and the Mass became an inclusive social gathering, a meal with active participation by readers, bidders and distributors of Holy Communion, with much hand shaking and waving at the sign of peace. Chatter before and after Mass became, and still is, common. Sacred music disappeared.

Many liked it, but the concept of the Mass as a Redemptive Sacrifice receded. Mystery and transcendence were replaced with banality, and even vulgarity.

The Real Presence. If you treat the Consecrated Host as a piece of bread then sooner or later you will believe it to be a piece of bread, and I suggest this was their intention. The practice of reception from a priest, kneeling, by mouth was effectively abolished. No alternate discipline of reception was proposed, so the custom of taking the Host while standing and walking away while popping it in the mouth soon became commonplace. Altar rails defining the sacred space of the sanctuary were removed. Central reserved tabernacles were frequently removed and altars were reduced to tables. Pius X's call for frequent Communion was realised in a way which would have deeply disturbed him as in the current universal reception of Communion, as of right, with congregations, including infrequent Mass goers, and even non-Catholics, filing past now disused confessionals. The sense of sin receded or disappeared, with all that that implies for the Redemptive Sacrificial Death and Resurrection of Christ.

The Protestantisation of the New Mass. The format of the Novus ordo was changed to bring it into line with Protestant custom. As Bugnini said, "The underlying purpose of the new rite was reconciliation with Protestantism."

The intention of the Reformers was surely to create a lowest common denominator "Christian" service to suit all, in line with their Relativist thinking which rejected ultimate meaning. Anyone who doubts this need only listen in to a radio broadcast of a Presbyterian communion service to see the structural similarity with the Novus Ordo. As for hymn singing some Catholic congregations now outdo their Protestant brothers. I have counted as many as six hymns sung at a Catholic Novus Ordo Mass.

The Ordained Priesthood. To diminish or eliminate the concept of the Ordained Priesthood appeared to be a prime target of the Reformers, as it was with the Protestant Reformation. Priests were easily eclipsed by the sheer weight of lay "participation" at Mass. The term "Father", implying leadership of a flock, became obsolete. The belief in the common priesthood of the faithful was exaggerated to downplay that of the Ordained Priesthood. By way of example, I have witnessed a priest, of liberal persuasion, at a meeting chaired by a layman discussing the shortage of clergy, stand up and suggest that he, the lay chairman, should stand in and say Mass in the absence of an Ordained Priest.

The Pope has as usual ably highlighted this point during a speech to the Brazilian bishops when he said, in September 2010, "do not secularize the clergy or clericalize the laity"

Catholic Education. This is the means of transmission of the Faith from generation to generation, and it had to go. Religious education in the Catholic state schools in the pre-Vatican II period had achieved a high degree of excellence. In the 1950s, a child leaving primary school aged 12 would have a clear understanding of the basic Catholic Doctrine e.g., the Real Presence, the Seven Sacraments, sin and redemption, heaven and hell. On leaving senior secondary school at seventeen, Church history, and principles of Apologetics would have been taught.

In the 70s into the 80s, as liberal reform swept through the system, Catholic education in Catholic schools went through a period of initial confusion, followed by collapse. What followed was a syllabus of comparative religion and "be nice to your neighbour", little different from the secularist teachings in non-denominational school. Sadly so many Catholic parents failed to realise what was

happening and assumed that religion was being taught as soundly as in their own time. The result is that so many Catholics from that period have but a vague knowledge of their religion.

Catholic Spirituality. The Mass apart, there exist a whole culture of Catholic Spiritual practice which has grown over the ages which assists our prayer and union with Christ, Our Lady and his angels and saints. This was suppressed.

Benediction, Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, Stations of the Cross, devotions to Our Lady, all these were discouraged in the two decades after Vatican II. We can only wonder why this was done. It was partly a concession to a false spirit of Ecumenism since such practices were seen by many of our Protestant brethren as superstition. There was also a downgrading of the Catholic liturgical year with the reduction in Holydays of obligation and the removal of others to Sundays, a practise which still continues with the recent moving of the Epiphany to the earlier Sunday. This has produced the absurd situation that the Church in UK now celebrates the "eight " days of Christmas while the secular world still holds to twelve.

But I suspect that the Reformers were only too well aware of the efficacy of traditional Catholic spiritual practices in the "raising up of the mind and the heart to God", and therefore they had to go.

The Counter Reformation?

Returning to the undoubted similarity with the Protestant Reformation, the Counter Reformation started from the end of the Council of Trent in 1563, some 46 years after Luther's 95 Theses. If, as I hypothesise, we are experiencing a Counter Reformation to the

Modernist, or Secularist Reformation, a term I suspect which might be preferred by Benedict XVI, then it surely started from his address to the Roman Curia in December 2005, some 40 years after the start of the Council, in which he rejected a hermeneutic of rupture in favour of one of continuity in interpreting the documents of Vatican II.

The Jesuits were the shock troops of the first Counter Reformation but it is perhaps too early to see who will lead this one. The Dominican Order is showing great promise in analytical but orthodox thinking, and some new movements, such as the Faith movement and Opus Dei, and a number of youth movements are leading the renewal.

But since the major attack by the Reformers was inflicted via the liturgy, it is by way of the Liturgy that recovery must come, and this is already underway. Those orders which have preserved the Ancient Mass during its period of illicit suppression will continue to expand their work, which in the light of their high recruitment rate into the priesthood means that they cannot but figure prominently in the restoration in the coming decades. Indeed, given the age profile of the present clergy and the continuing very low rate of recruitment in the main seminaries, these loyal orders, together with the growing number of parish priests who are training in the Traditional Form of the Mass will constitute a major factor which our bishops and laity, liberal and conservative alike, will be unable to disregard in the coming decades.

The Traditional Latin Mass. As is now clear, our Catholic Mass, the Mass of Ages, was not and could not have been abolished. Benedict has made this clear in his Summorum Pontificum of July 2007:

"As for the use of the 1962 Missal as a *Forma extraordinaria* of the liturgy of the Mass, I

would like to draw attention to the fact that this Missal was never juridically abrogated and, consequently, in principle, was always permitted", and,

"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".

The ancient Catholic Traditional Latin Mass is now, under Papal Authority, fully restored and free of any juridical impediment. Any priest is free to celebrate the Traditional Mass in his parish. Permission from a bishop is not required although courtesies ought to be preserved, and suitable explanations to the laity are in order. The Holy Father sees the Traditional Mass as one of two co-equal forms of the Roman Rite of the Sacrifice of the Mass, mutually enriching each other.

In the process of re-sacralising the liturgy, the Traditional Mass may be considered the yardstick by which progress will be judged.

The Ordinary Form of the Mass. Within the Novus Ordo, we now have a movement known as the Reform of the Reform, and it is based on a true appreciation of the intent of Vatican II. It is concerned with restoring the Mass to, and possibly beyond that of Paul VI, to what was intended by the Council, but it will take time. The effects are slowly but steadily becoming noticeable in many Catholic parishes.

In April 2010 Cardinal Llovera of the Congregation for Divine Worship, with the overwhelming support of the Congregation submitted a document to Benedict XVI. In essence this calls for a re-sacralising of the Mass with the restoration of the Latin language, the re-orientation of the priest ad Deum and reception of Communion kneeling and by mouth, as the norm. By implication the restoration of the altar rails and the

concept of restoring the Sanctuary are implied.

Other rulings have made it clear that Gregorian chant and traditional musical formats will be restored and that optional practices such as the "sign of peace" and excessive use of what are termed, but are not, ministries, such as distributors of Holy Communion will be reviewed and used only in cases of real necessity where Deacons and Acolytes are not yet available. The new ICEL translation of the will ensure that in the vernacular parts of the Novus Ordo, a more accurate wording is used.

This will ensure a return to a proper appreciation of the Ordained Priesthood as those who stand before God, in the place of Christ, leading the prayer of the Faithful, in worship, and for salvation.

Catholic Education. The primary place for Catholic Education is in the home, but this presupposes informed Catholic parents, willing to pass on the Faith. For that reason the continuation of formal Catholic religious education in Catholic schools is essential, but it must drastically change and improve.

The underlying principle of Catholic education is that the Catholic Church is the one true Church, instituted by Christ, under the guardianship of Peter and his successors, for the salvation of Mankind, and that all other churches or religions are to a greater or lesser degree, in error.

To support this, a thorough teaching in Catholic belief and doctrine as set out in the Catechism, as well as Catholic history, are necessary, and to back this up, a sound course in Apologetics is essential so that young Catholics understand their Faith, and are in a position to defend it against the World. But the Catholic education system in the U K has been grievously wounded and misdirected over the past three decades and it will take time

for this to be set right.

In the meantime, and perhaps indefinitely, the Priesthood must resume the role of teaching Catholic doctrine as an integral part of the Sunday sermon process, and this has to include specifics such as the Sacrificial nature of the Mass, the Real Presence, Transubstantiation, the conditions for receiving Communion, sin, and the Four Last Things.

Catholic Spirituality. Traditional Catholic spiritual practices are steadily being restored in parishes, although the attendance after so many years of neglect is only slowly improving. Benediction, Exposition, Stations during Lent and the Rosary have slowly returned to our parishes over the last decade. In some cathedrals, Vespers have been re-established. Personal practises such as the Sign of the Cross, genuflection, bowing at the proper time during the Credo, silence after Communion are returning.

What is also required, to complement this, is a willingness to extend this culture to our social contact with the outside world, in a suitable and considerate way. In other words we should be Catholic, be seen, by our friends and colleagues, to be Catholic and be confident in that identity.

That is part of the Council's call for the laity also to evangelise and spread the message of the necessity of growing closer to God.

As the Catholic Philosopher John Haldane has pointed out, the concepts of Faith, Spirituality and the sense of the Supernatural have to be recovered, if Catholicism is to contribute to Western Civilisation in the coming centuries.

Conclusion

Steps have been taken by Jean Paul II and now by Benedict XVI to repair the damage of

the last four decades. The recovery is undoubtedly under way and is seen increasingly in parishes throughout the UK. But it will take time, and will be measured in decades rather than years. We will have to wait until many of those committed to, or influenced by, Neo-Modernist interpretations of reform, have faded away.

Pope Benedict is a gentle man and the process of Reform of Reform will be by example and persuasion. He wishes to bring all Catholics along with him and is anxious to avoid the creation of breakaway Secularist Catholic sects, as happened in the previous Reformation. The harsh tactics which followed Vatican II will have no place in his way of doing things.

We may have to, as Benedict XVI has said, accept a smaller Church in the decades or centuries ahead. If so, it will not be for the first time. The Church has suffered and survived such calamities before, as in the Islamic conquests of the 7th century, the barbarian invasions of the 8th to the 13th centuries, and after the Protestant Reformation. But then we should not be surprised or dismayed at this. After all Christ predicted this when he said, "thou art Peter ; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

So if the Reformation and Counter Reformation hypothesis is correct and broadly analogous, then it might well be another half century before the Counter Reformation prevails, as prevail it will, and the Barque of Peter is once again upright, cleared of debris, repaired, and is able to again set a steady course, under the direction of Christ's Vicar on Earth, our Pope, and the guidance and protection of the Holy Ghost.

A Parishioner



Christmas Midnight Mass, Edinburgh



Easter Sunday Mass, Wigratzbad 1990. Cardinal Ratzinger celebrates Pontifical High Mass in the traditional rite.

of the new rites, but their “legitimacy” (in a theological rather than narrowly legal sense) is precisely what is in question, In other words, nostalgia is not the reason for the come-back of the old liturgy. Benedict knows this: he wants well grounded theological debate to flourish; norms which tend to suppress that debate are now out of place.

Para. 17.2 is remarkable: no number is mentioned; clearly, the idea is to allow the celebration of the old rite for even a handful of the faithful. The acorns will now be allowed to grow!

Para. 28 is vastly significant. No more problems with communion in the hand, or with priests (we have read of one just recently) who insist upon imposing altar girls or Extraordinary Ministers of Communion upon old rite congregations. These innovations, conflicting as they do with the rules of the 1962 liturgy, are revoked or repealed in favour of the 1962 rules by *Summorum Pontificum*.

Pope Benedict XVI has once again earned our grateful prayers.

Ad multos annos!



MASS TIMES AND PLACES

EDINBURGH: Mass is said on Sundays at 11:30 am and on Great Feasts at 6:15 pm at St Andrews Church, 77 Belford Road, Ravelston. During the week Mass is at 8:00 am (Friday 6:00 pm) at 6 Belford Park. (tel. 0131 332 3750)

STIRLING: Mass every first Sunday of the month at 5:00 pm at Holy Spirit Church, St Ninian's, McGrigor Road.

WEST CALDER: Mass every third Sunday of the month at 5:00 pm at Our Lady & St Bridget, West End (in place of St Thomas, Addiewell).

NORTH BERWICK: Mass every fourth Sunday at 5:00 pm at Our Lady, Star of the Sea, Law Road.

NEW! ST ANDREWS UNIVERSITY: Mass every second Sunday of the month at 5:00 pm at St James' Church, The Scores. Our particular thanks to Fr Andrew Kingham for permission to celebrate this Mass.

The Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter is a registered charity (no. 1083419). Any and all donations should be made payable to “The Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter” and sent to Freepost RLYB-TZSZ-ASKE, 6 Belford Park, EDINBURGH EH4 3DP, or use the PRE-PAID envelope provided. Please do not make cheques out in the name of an individual priest (except for Mass stipends), nor to *Videre Petrum*.

All other communications concerning this newsletter should be sent to Fr John Emerson, 6 Belford Park, Edinburgh EH4 3DP.

The FSSP in Great Britain has recently undergone an administrative re-organization. There is no longer a “district” as such, but simply two houses: Edinburgh (Fr Emerson’s address is given above) and Reading (Fr Armand de Malleray. 179 Elgar Road, Reading, Berkshire RG2 0DH).

VIDERE PETRUM is the newsletter of the Priestly Fraternity of St Peter in Scotland and Ireland. Its title recalls St Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians (1:15-19) where Paul relates how he responded immediately to the Lord’s call to become an apostle, yet after three years he came to Jerusalem “to see Peter” (in the Latin Vulgate, *videre Petrum*), thus exemplifying obedience to God and communion with the Vicar of Christ.

