

THE ROMAN RITE: OLD AND NEW

DON PIETRO LEONE

dedicated to his father, with love

UT QUID, DOMINE, REPPULISTI IN FINEM: iratus est furor tuus super oves pascuae tuae? Memor esto congregationis tuae, quam possedisti ab initio. Redemisti virgam hereditatis tuae: mons Sion in quo habitasti in eo. Leva manus tuas in superbias eorum in finem: quanta malignatus est inimicus in sancto! Et gloriati sunt qui oderunt te: in medio solemnitatis tuae. Posuerunt signa sua, signa: et non cognoverunt sicut in exitu super summum. Quasi in silva lignorum securibus exciderunt ianuas eius in idipsum: in securi et ascia deiecerunt eam. Incenderunt igni Sanctuarium tuum: in terra polluerunt tabernaculum nominis tui. Dixerunt in corde suo cognatio eorum simul: quiescere faciamus omnes dies festos Deo in terra.

O GOD, WHY HAST THOU CAST US OFF UNTO THE END? Why is thy wrath enkindled against the sheep of thy pasture? Remember thy congregation, which thou hast possessed from the beginning: the sceptre of thy inheritance which thou hast redeemed: Mount Sion in which thou hast dwelt. Lift up thy hands against their pride unto the end: see what things the enemy hath done wickedly in the sanctuary. And they that hate thee have made their boasts, in the midst of thy solemnity. They have set up their ensigns for signs: and they knew not both in the going out and in the highest top. As with axes in a wood of trees, they have cut down at once the gates thereof: with axe and hatchet they have brought it down. They have set fire to thy sanctuary: they have defiled the dwelling place of thy name on the earth. They said in their heart, the whole kindred of them together: Let us abolish all the festival days of God from the land.

Ps.73, 1-8.

Preface

Historical Introduction

Catholicism and Protestantism

 In Official Church Documents

 The Old Rite

 The New Rite

 In the Rites Themselves

 The Offertory

- The Canon
 - Eucharistic Prayers
 - Silence
 - The Formulae of Consecration
- The Real Presence
- The Sacrificial Priesthood
- The Ends of the Mass
- Latin
- The Orientation of the Celebrant
- Altar and Table
- Intelligibility and Participation
- The Church
- Public Testimonies
 - Catholic Testimonies
 - Protestant Testimonies
- An Ecumenical Motivation

The Cult of God and the Cult of Man

- A General Comparison
 - The Orientation of the Celebrant
 - Gravity
 - The Sacred
 - The Rubrics
 - A Perfect Work
 - Contemplation and Devotion
- A Comparison of the Propers
 - The Collects
 - The Gospels and Epistles
 - i. The Gospels
 - ii. The Epistles

Mistranslations

Motivation: *Rapprochement* with the World

Conclusion

Epilogue: Shortcomings of the *Novus Ordo Missae*

- The Faith is Misrepresented
- The Cult of God is Compromised
- The Faithful are Alienated
- Graces are Reduced

God is Dishonoured

Preface

The liberalization of the Old Roman Rite by the Supreme Pontiff in September 2007 has stimulated a variety of reactions. Polemicists on the side of modernity have labelled it as “something for nostalgics”¹ or as incomprehensible and therefore to be rejected²; while polemicists on the side of Tradition have labelled the New Rite (as they always had) as invalid³ or sacrilegious.

Pacifists, by contrast, have either attributed the preference for one rite or the other to “sensibility” alone⁴, or have ascribed an equal value to both rites⁵, speaking for example of “respective strengths”, such as a greater “verticality” in the Old Rite and a wider range of readings in the New⁶. If such persons have any reservations concerning the New Rite, they claim that it suffices to celebrate it well and reverently.

To this background, the present essay aims to evaluate the two rites scientifically: more precisely to compare them in regard to their theology of the Mass. In so doing, it seeks neither to make peace nor war, but simply to establish the truth, by examining the relevant facts and drawing the necessary conclusions.

The essay consists in large part of a synthesis, a re-ordering, and in the second part a certain development, of the relevant material taken from the book “Pope Paul’s New Mass” by Michael Davies⁷. It relies greatly on the Critical Study of the *Novus Ordo Missae* by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci and on the later studies made by *Una Voce* and by Lorenzo Bianchi (*op.cit.*) on the changes to the propers.

It aims to give the reader a synthetic overview of the subject, both in regard to the ordinary, (or “common”) of the Mass, that is to say those parts which are common to all Masses, and in regard to the propers, that is to say those parts which are proper to any given Mass. The first half of the essay analyzes the common of the Mass, the second half analyzes *inter alia* the propers of the Mass.

Historical Introduction

The Old Roman Rite is the most ancient rite of the Catholic Church, as Mgr. Klaus Gamber writes in his preface to the “Reform of the Roman Liturgy”: “At all events it represents the oldest rite”⁸.

In the first three centuries after the death of Christ, the Mass fell into two main parts: the first was a Liturgy of the Word with prayers, reading, and sermon; the second was the Eucharist, celebrated by the bishop according to fixed formulae. As yet, no liturgical books were used at the Mass apart from the Bible from which the lessons were read. The Mass, as it subsisted at this period, is described in the celebrated *Apologia* of St. Justin Martyr (died c.164 A.D.), where all the essential elements of the Old Roman Rite can already be discerned.

Once the practice of writing down the liturgy had been established in the fourth century, the pattern evident in the Mass up to this date became crystallized into four parent rites from which all others descend. Three of these four rites issue from the three ancient patriarchates of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch; the fourth, the Gallican rite (which may in its turn issue from the Antiochan rite), formed the basis of the liturgies of north Italy, Gaul, Germany, Spain, Britain, and Ireland.

By the 5th century, the parts of the liturgy said by the priest at the altar began to be collected into books called Sacramentaries. Towards the end of the 8th century, Charlemagne obtained a copy of a Sacramentary, named the Gregorian Sacramentary, from Pope Adrian I, in order to obtain a more uniform liturgy within his empire. He entrusted it to Alcuin of York for its completion. The Sacramentary was Roman, and, as such, sober and dignified. It was completed from Gallican sources, which lent it a more exuberant, emotional tone. The resulting book became the first official missal for Europe.

In the early 13th century the Franciscans adopted this missal “according to the rite of the Roman Curia” for their order. In the later 13th century, Pope Nicholas III imposed a modified form of it on the diocese of Rome, which is, “in all important respects, the form found in the missal of Saint Pius V” (Chapter 1, Michael Davies).

In the course of the middle ages, various divergences had arisen in liturgical usages and customs in lands such as France, Germany, and Africa, which showed a need for a uniform Roman rite, a need all the more pressing in the wake of the Protestant eucharistic heresies. For these reasons, a reform of the Roman rite was decreed by the Council of Trent, and promulgated seven years after its conclusion (in 1570) with the Bull *Quo Primum* of St. Pius V. This rite, which was imposed on the whole Church of the Roman discipline is not viewed by the Pope as a New Rite but as a consolidation and codification (“*statuimus et ordinamus*”), and as a return to the ancient norm and rite of the Holy Fathers (“*ad pristinam sanctorum patrum normam et ritum*”).

This brief historical sketch may serve to show that there were not a series of rites that culminated in the rite of Saint Pius V, or, much less, that the rite of Saint Pius V was the product of the Council of Trent’s thinking (as the New Rite is arguably a product of the Second Vatican Council’s thinking)⁹. Rather, it is the definitive form of the Roman rite of Mass, which has known a certain development, particularly in the first half of its existence, and a certain variation in the second half of its existence.

From the promulgation of the Roman missal in 1570, the Old Roman Rite remained substantially unchanged for almost four centuries until the reform of the Holy Week in 1955-6¹⁰. This was carried out by a Commission including the men were later to become Paul VI, Cd. Bea¹¹, and Mgr. Bugnini, together with Fr. Carlo Braga (of whom we shall have occasion to speak later).

Fr. Carusi comments: “Beginning with Palm Sunday, a ritual of *versus populum* is created, so that the back is turned towards the altar and the cross. On Maundy Thursday, the laity are made to enter the sanctuary. On Good Friday, the honours rendered to the Most Blessed Sacrament are reduced as is the veneration of the Cross”. On Holy Saturday, (which Fr. Braga described as “the head of the battering-ram which pierced the fortress of our hitherto static liturgy”), “the symbolism relating to Original Sin and Baptism as the door-way into the Church is demolished ... and the Gospel passages on the institution of the Holy Eucharist are edited out”. On Palm Sunday, and on Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week, the institution of the Holy Eucharist, which previously was always linked to the account of the Passion on these days, thus showing, *inter alia*, the sacrificial nature of the Mass, was similarly edited out.

Subsequent to these changes, the next innovation made to the text of the Mass was the introduction of St. Joseph into the Canon by Bl. John XXIII, which disturbed the symmetry of the Canon and constituted the first change in it since the time of St. Gregory the Great.

But from the prescriptions of the Second Vatican Council documents *Sacrosanctum Concilium* in 1963 to that of *Missale Romanum* in 1969, a series of changes were made to the Roman rite which were so wide-ranging and profound as in effect to destroy that rite entirely and to substitute it with another.

Later, we shall consider the character of this New Rite; for the moment, let us quote certain liturgical experts as to the destruction of the Old. Fr. Joseph G lineau S.J., a Council *peritus* and liberal apologist for the new liturgy, states in his book “*Demain la Liturgie*” (1976 MD p.77-8): “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... [the former edifice]... appears to-day either as a ruin, or the partial substructure of a different building.¹²” In a similar vein, Cd. Ratzinger, in his autobiography “My Life” writes: “The old building was taken down and another was built, largely from the material of the previous building of course and also using the old design... but it was a new building.¹³” As he had stated in his introduction to Mgr. Gamber’s “Reform of the Roman liturgy”: “This is not a development of living liturgy, but substitutes this with a fabrication following the pattern of technical production: the ready-made product of the moment.¹⁴” Mgr. Gamber writes (*op. cit.*): “instead of a fruitful renovation of the liturgy, the destruction of liturgical forms that had grown up organically over a period of many centuries.¹⁵”

I

Catholicism and Protestantism

We proceed to set forth and compare the theology of the Mass of the Old and the New Roman Rite, first as contained in official Church documents, then as contained in the rites themselves.

A. In Official Church Documents

1. The Old Rite

Catholic Dogma on the Blessed Eucharist is set forth definitively in the Council of Trent. The Council declares: **“And so this Council teaches the true and genuine doctrine about this venerable and divine sacrament of the Eucharist... The Council forbids all the faithful of Christ henceforth to believe, teach, or preach anything about the most Holy Eucharist that is different from what is explained and defined in the present decree.”** (Session 21, Introduction).

If we ask ourselves how this theology corresponds to the theology of the Old Rite, we must reply that it is identical, since the principal reason for the definition of Eucharistic dogma as for the reform of the Roman rite was to provide “a bastion of the true Faith against Protestant heresies”: a bastion at once dogmatic and liturgical (MD p. 8). In the same vein the Critical Study of Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci (September 1969) speaks of “the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass as it was formulated in Session 22 of the Council of Trent, which, by fixing definitively the “Canons” of the rite, erected an insurmountable barrier against any heresy which might attack the integrity of the mystery.” The identity of the theology of the Old Rite with the dogmas of the Council of Trent is, in fact, a particularly eminent instant of the principle “*Lex orandi, lex credendi*”.

In order briefly to expound the theology of the Mass as expressed in the Old Rite, we shall proceed to quote three principal eucharistic declarations of the Council of Trent:

“If anyone were to say that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice were not offered to God, or that what is offered were anything other than Christ to be consumed by us, Anathema Sit.” (Session 22, can. 1)¹⁶

“One and the Same is the victim, and He Who now offers the sacrifice in virtue of the priestly ministry, is the Same Who offered Himself then on the Cross, only the mode of offering being different.” (Session 22, ch. 2)¹⁷

... the sacrifice by which that bloody one (sacrifice) which was to be made once on the Cross was to be made present, and its memory was to remain till the end of time, and its salutary power for the remission of sins which are daily committed by us was to be applied.” (Session 22 ch.!)¹⁸

In conclusion then, the Mass is a Sacrifice, the Sacrifice of Christ, because Christ is the victim and priest in the Mass as He is at Calvary. The relation between the Sacrifice of Calvary and the Sacrifice of the Mass is that the Sacrifice of Calvary is made present, recalled, and its fruit applied in the Sacrifice of the Mass.

In the next section we shall describe in detail the sacrificial character of the Old Rite, turning now to the theology of the New Rite, as expressed in official Church documents.

2. The New Rite

We shall briefly consider two such documents: *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963) and *Missale Romanum* (1969), the first and the last of the series of documents that govern the New Rite. In the words of Michael Davies (p. 22): “The most important passages in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* were the ‘time-bombs’. These were apparently harmless phrases which could be used as a mandate for a revolution after the Council.” Amongst these phrases are those referring to the promotion of union of all Christians (Art. 1); to Christ being present in different ways in the Mass (Art. 7); the priesthood of the faithful (Art. 14); the presidency of the priest over the assembly - *coetui praeest* - (Art. 33); the greater use of the Holy Scriptures - *abundantior, varior, et aptior lectio sacrae Scripturae* - (Art. 35); the wider use of the vernacular (Art. 36); and inculturation (Art. 37, Art. 40-41).

So much then for the implicit intentions of at least a number of the Council Fathers. As far as the explicit intentions of the Fathers in general is concerned, it must be said that the reform of the liturgy greatly exceeded them (“*elle va bien au delà*” in the words of Fr. Gélinau, *op.cit.* MD p. 82).

Now the document which expresses most clearly the theology of the *Novus Ordo* is the *Instructio Generalis* to the *Missale Romanum*. This was a General Instruction accompanying the new Roman Missal and presenting the Eucharistic doctrine which it expresses.¹⁹ “It can be described as a mandate for undermining Catholic teaching, but with an orthodox phrase thrown in here or there” (MD p. 282). We shall limit ourselves to quoting only one of its articles, the controversial Article 7.

“The Lord’s Supper, or Mass, is the sacred assembly or meeting of the People of God, met together with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. For this reason, the promise of Christ is particularly true of a local congregation of the church: where two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in their midst.”

Article 7 may be criticized both in regard to what it expresses and in regard to what it suppresses.

In regard to what it expresses, its theology, anticipated obliquely in the *SC*, is entirely compatible with Protestant theories of the Mass: Cranmer described his 1549 rite as “the Supper of the Lorde and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse” (MD p. 285), where the essence of the Lord’s Supper is considered to be the coming together of the people; the “priest” is viewed as simply a president devoid of sacramental or sacrificial power; and where Christ is present only spiritually in the assembly and not in His Real Presence²⁰.

As to what Article 7 suppresses, we remark that neither here nor anywhere else in the Instruction is it asserted that the Mass is the Sacrifice of Calvary, a propitiatory sacrifice, offered by an ordained priest in the Person of Christ independently of the presence of the congregation. The Critical Study states with respect to Article 7 that the deliberate omission of every one of the dogmatic values essential to the Mass “amounts, at least in practice, to their denial.”

The Protestant character of the 1969 version of the Instruction caused wide-spread indignation within the Catholic Church, leading to a revision published the following year. In this revision, certain Protestant teachings were eliminated such as the teaching that the Last Supper (rather than the Sacrifice of the Cross) is made present at the Mass (Article 48); while other Protestant teachings are qualified by their juxtaposition to Catholic teachings. In Article 7, for example²¹, the priest is said to preside over the people and “act[s] in the person of Christ”.

This revised version, while less overtly Protestant in character, is no clear statement of Catholic doctrine either, as it would have been with the use of traditional terminology, as required by *Mysterium Fidei* of Pope Paul VI. Rather, it is a mixture of Protestant and Catholic doctrine, both confused and confusing, and as such at least conciliatory towards Protestant eucharistic heresy.

But whatever may be said of the virtues of the 1970 revision, its importance can only ever be minimal, for the overtly Protestant 1969 version is, as we have said, that which expressed the theology of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, which was itself never revised. In the classic French critique of the New Rite “*La Nouvelle Messe*” Prof. Salleron writes (p. 191): “*Il ne faut pas oublier que c’est la rédaction primitive qui servait d’introduction au nouvel ordo missae, lequel n’a pas été modifié* : We should not forget that it is the original edition which served as the introduction to the *Novus Ordo Missae*, which was not modified.”

B. In the Rites Themselves

We proceed to examine the theology of the Old and New Rites as contained in the rites themselves. Since our aim thereby is to manifest the Protestant character of the New Rite, we shall present the relevant material first in the Old Rite, then in the Protestant reformed rite(s), and then in the New Rite.

We shall start by considering two parts of the Mass, we shall then consider various of its general features. In regard to the Protestant reformed rite(s) and the New Rite, we may say with Michael Davies (p. 285, quoting Dr. Francis Clark's comment on Cranmer's rite) "It was not what was expressed but what was suppressed that gave significance to the whole."

In fact what was suppressed was almost everything pertaining to the very essence of the Mass, that is its sacrificial nature. It is in this light, then, that we shall compare the theology of the two rites. §1 on the Offertory concerns the anticipation of this Sacrifice; §2 on the Canon concerns the making present of the Sacrifice; §3 on the Real Presence concerns its object, namely Jesus Christ Himself; §4 on the Sacrificial Priesthood concerns the minister empowered to make the Sacrifice; §5 on the Ends of the Mass concerns the finalities of the Sacrifice; §6 on the Latin concerns the language which befits it; §7 on the Orientation of the Celebrant concerns the orientation appropriate to it; §8 on the Altar and Table concerns the altar of sacrifice; and §9 on Intelligibility and Participation concerns their principal object, namely the Sacrifice itself.

The two parts of the Mass that we shall examine are "the two particular Protestant *bêtes noires*" (MD p. 9): namely the Offertory and the Roman Canon.

1. The Offertory

The Offertory is the oblation of the bread and wine in a mode "intrinsically ordered" to the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Consecration. In the words of Alan Clark (MD p. 312): "The Mass, liturgically speaking, is one protracted Act of Oblation by the Church of the Sacrifice of Christ", an act of oblation which is "anticipated" prior to the consecration and "postponed" after it. This anticipation of the consecration is common to numerous ancient liturgies: e.g. the Ambrosian, Gothic, Mozarabic in the West, and in the Divine Liturgy of Saint James and that of the Armenian Church in the East. The former Eastern liturgy contains the prayer: "... the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, Christ our God comes forward to be sacrificed." And the latter: "let us welcome the King of Heaven and Earth whom legions of angels escort unseen."

In the Old Roman Rite the celebrant offers the unleavened bread to God with the following words: "Receive O Holy Father, Almighty Eternal God, this Immaculate Host which I, Thy unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, my living and true God, for mine own countless sins, offenses, and negligences, and for all here present; as also for all faithful

Christians living and dead, that it may avail for my own and for their salvation unto life everlasting. Amen.” Fr. Pius Parsch remarks (MD p.316): “This prayer, so rich in doctrine, could serve as the basis for an entire treatise on the Mass.”

The prayer of the oblation of the wine and the supplication of the Holy Trinity after the individual oblations of the bread and wine, are comparable in their depth and their sacrificial tone.

From the Protestant point of view the Offertory is unacceptable because of its sacrificial character. Martin Luther refers to “all that abomination called the Offertory, and from this point almost everything reeks of oblation”²². Thomas Cranmer suppresses all the Offertory prayers.

The authors of the New Rite suppress almost all the Offertory prayers but for fragments which “can be interpreted as referring to the self-oblation of the people, symbolized by the bread and wine” (MD p. 324). They substitute the prayer of offering of the bread with the following prayer: “Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation. Through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which Earth has given and human hands have made. It will become for us the bread of life.” They substitute the offering of the wine for a comparable prayer. These prayers are often accompanied by a procession of the people.

What has happened is that the Oblation of the Divine Victim to God by the Church has been replaced by the oblation of bread and wine to God by His people. In effect, then, the Offertory (in any meaningful sense of the term) no longer exists.

Luther of course substitutes the idea of sacrifice with that of a meal, as he expresses for example in his comment: “‘Eat and drink.’ This is the only work that we are told to do in the Eucharist.”²³ Similarly in the prayers which have replaced those of the old Offertory in the new rite, the idea of the sacrifice has not only been suppressed, but has been replaced by the idea of a meal, because the new prayers are ordered towards the bread and wine becoming “the bread of life” and “our spiritual drink”.

2. The Canon

The Canon constitutes the very heart of the Mass, which extends from the *Sanctus* to the *Pater Noster* exclusively. In the words of Michael Davies: “There is not the least doubt that, apart from the Gospels, the Roman Canon is the most precious treasure in the heritage of the Latin Church” (p. 327). As the *De Sacramentis* of Saint Ambrose proves, it had already come very close to its present form more than sixteen hundred years ago. The Council of Trent teaches

(S.22 *cap.4*) that: **“Holy things must be treated in a holy way and this Sacrifice is the most holy of all things. And so that this Sacrifice might be worthily and reverently offered and received, the Catholic Church many years ago instituted the sacred Canon. It is free from all error and contains nothing that does not raise to God the minds of those who offer the Sacrifice. For it is made up from the words of Our Lord, from apostolic traditions, and from devout instructions of the holy pontiffs.”**

Cd. Gasquet explains that in the 16th century “Luther swept away the Canon altogether and retained only the essential words of Institution” (MD p. 328). Cranmer substituted a new prayer of about the same length as the old Canon, leaving in it a few shreds of the ancient one, but divesting it of its character of sacrifice and oblation.

As far as the *Novus Ordo* is concerned, the *Consilium* that created it “originally intended to forbid the use of the Roman Canon but... Pope Paul VI insisted on its retention²⁴” (MD p. 329).

We shall now examine three points relating to the changes in the Canon: the eucharistic prayers, the silence, and the formula of consecration.

i. **The Eucharistic Prayers**

The *Consilium* proceeded to compose three new “eucharistic prayers” as alternatives to the Roman Canon. These prayers are remarkable for their suppression or reduction of sacrificial content: the distinction between the sacrificial priesthood and the people has been suppressed in all of them; in the second one the word *hostia* (victim) is no longer used, the Greek word *hierateuein* (which means to act as a priest, and is, as Michael Davies points out (p.342), “the one word of this anaphora that most strongly suggests sacrificial action...”) is translated by the ambiguous Latin word “*ministrare*”, and the reference to Holy Communion shifts the attention, as it has done in the new Offertory prayers, from the Sacrifice to the meal.

The upshot is that this second canon can be celebrated with a clear conscience by a priest who believes neither in transubstantiation nor in the sacrificial nature of the Mass and, for that reason, it would also lend itself very well to the celebration by a Protestant minister (see Critical Study VI).

In respect to the motivation of the person[s] responsible for creating the second Eucharistic prayer, we may say with Michael Davies (p. 335): “if liturgical *experts* composed a Eucharistic Prayer compatible with Protestantism, then surely it is reasonable to presume that this was what they intended”.

ii. Silence

The Council of Trent (Session 22, can. 9) anathematizes anyone who condemns the silent Canon (that is, the canon recited in a low voice). We may regard the *rationale* of the silent Canon as two-fold: first, in the words of Fr. Gühr it “betokens the Consecration and Sacrificial Act to be an exclusively priestly function” (p. 381); second, that it befits the ineffable mysteries enacted on the altar: that is, the rendering present of the Sacrifice of Calvary.

As the Council of Trent teaches of the silent Canon and other features of the Old Rite (S.22 *cap.5*): **“All these things are used to point up the majesty of this great sacrifice and to raise the minds of the faithful through these visible signs of religion and piety to the contemplation of the very exalted things hidden in this sacrifice.”**

It is the same *rationale* which explains the silent Canon in the Eastern liturgies, and the fact that the celebrant is veiled by a curtain at this point, or withdraws behind the iconostasis, in order to recite it.

From the Protestant point of view, by contrast, which does not admit of a sacrificial priesthood nor of the Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass, the silent Canon is unjustifiable. This explains why Cranmer ordered his entire service to be said “plainly and distinctly” (MD p. 381).

Four centuries later, the *Instructio Generalis* declares: “The nature of the presidential prayers (i.e. the Eucharistic prayer and the orations) demands that they be spoken in a loud and clear voice....” (MD p. 383).

Some may claim that the intention of the *Consilium* was to make the Canon more intelligible, but in reply it should be said that if this is true of each individual word that it contains that it is not true of the Catholic theology which it expresses, to understand which an adequate theological formation is required. Rather, the average church-goer, who lacks a theological formation, is inclined to think, when he hears the words of Consecration being proclaimed, that an account of the Last Supper is being narrated in memory of Christ. In other words, what he understands is not a Catholic, but a Protestant, theology of the Mass.

We shall now see how this Protestant theology is manifest in the new formula of Consecration (following the Critical Study IV 4).

iii. The Formula of Consecration

a) The Formula is now entitled “narrative” - *narratio institutionis*. The passage from the narrative to the sacramental and affirmative mode is no longer signalled by a full stop and capital letter, and by the sacramental words

in larger characters in the centre of the page²⁵ and in a different colour. Furthermore, the words *hunc praeclarum calicem* (this excellent chalice) become in the new prayers simply *calicem* (the chalice), which also favours the heresy that the consecration is only a narrative, since it suppresses the reference to the one and unique Sacrifice of Calvary being rendered present timelessly upon the altar.

b) The Pauline “Anamnesis” with which the consecration now ends: “*hoc facite in meam commemorationem*: do this in memory of Me”, shifts the accent from the sacrificial action (expressed more clearly in the original words) to Christ Himself, so that the congregation’s understanding of the whole consecration is coloured by the concept of the Commemoration of Christ with which it concludes.

c) The Pauline phrase “*quod pro vobis tradetur*”, which has been added to the formula for the consecration of the bread, is protestantizing: first, because like the phrase quoted in (b) above, it manifests a preference for biblicity over apostolic Tradition; second, because it may be interpreted solely in a subjective sense, as Luther remarks in “The Shorter Catechism” (MD p. 339): “the word ‘for you’ calls simply for believing hearts”; thirdly, because it is the very phrase adopted by Luther and Cranmer in order to break with the Roman rite.

Michael Davies notes that this phrase not only occurs in the three new Eucharistic Prayers, but has also been inserted into the Roman Canon and states: “No, there is only one credible explanation. The words of consecration in the venerable Roman Canon were brought into conformity with the Cranmerian version for ecumenical reasons. This constitutes a scandal, an outrage without precedent in the history of the Roman Church.... It verges upon blasphemy to so much as suggest that the Roman Canon required improvement” (MD p. 355).

In regard to the preference for biblicity over apostolic tradition, St. Thomas Aquinas remarks in his commentary to I Corinthians 11.vv.25-6, that some say that any of the consecratory forms found in the Holy Scriptures is valid, but it seems more probable to say that only those words are valid which have traditionally been used by the Church²⁶.

One should remark at this point that it is not possible to question the validity of the new formula of Consecration since the Church has approved the New Rite, but that it is possible to question the motivation of the innovators in this regard.

d) The phrase *Mysterium Fidei*, which has been pronounced in the Old Rite after the Consecration of the wine since the 6th century²⁷, has been removed from all the canons (including the Roman Canon) from this context to a place immediately following the canon, where it serves to introduce the “Acclamation”.

In the Old Rite the phrase was a profession of the priest's Faith in the mystery of the Consecration: the Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of Calvary; in the New Rite it becomes a profession of the people's Faith in what they proceed to acclaim: the Death, Resurrection, and Second Coming of the Lord, Holy Communion, and the Redemption (depending on which of the three forms of acclamation is used), all of which takes their attention away from the mystery of the consecration (see Critical Study IV 4).

Mgr. Bugnini is pleased to declare, in opposition to St. Thomas Aquinas²⁸ and the Council of Trent itself²⁹, that the Consecration of the bread is "notably incomplete from the point of view of the theology of the Mass: *E' per se stessa notevolmente incompleta dal punto di vista della teologia della messa*" (*Riforma Liturgica* 29.3 p.448), giving as one of the reasons for changing it the desire to avoid disappointing many bishops, pastors, liturgists, and theologians.

This innovation is protestantizing not only in that it takes attention away from the mystery of the Consecration, but also because it corresponds to the Protestant doctrine of the non-sacramental priesthood. In the words of the Lutheran theologian Ottfried Jordhan (MD p. 344): "In this acclamation the priestly concelebration of the whole congregation at the Lord's Supper finds a particularly clear expression."

We now proceed to compare certain general features of the Mass in the Old and the New Rites.

3. The Real Presence

We have already quoted the Council of Trent to the effect that Christ Himself is offered in the Mass. In the 4th canon of the 13th Session, the doctrine of the Real Presence is expressed in the clearest terms: "**If any-one were to deny that in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ and therefore the whole Christ; but were to say that he is present in it only as a sign, a figure, or a power: Anathema sit** ³⁰".

In the Old Rite this dogma is expressed clearly in the text of the Mass by phrases such as that which follows the consecration: "... the pure Victim, the holy Victim, the immaculate Victim, the Holy Bread of eternal life and Chalice of everlasting salvation³¹."

Respect for the Real Presence is expressed by the many genuflections, the purification of the celebrant's fingers in the chalice, the avoidance of contact with any profane object before they are purified, the purification of the sacred vessels on the corporal immediately after their use, the use of a pall to protect the chalice, the internal gilding of the

vessels, the consecration of the immobile altar, the use of the *pietra sacra* and relics in the mobile altar and on the *mensa* when the Mass is said in a sacred place, of three altar-cloths, the reception of Holy Communion and the thanksgiving while kneeling (as opposed to the former standing and the latter sitting), the reception of Holy Communion on the tongue, the prescriptions in the case of a consecrated host falling to the ground, the prohibition that faithful and mass-servers touch the sacred vessels (see Critical Study IV 2).

The Reformer Martin Bucer, mentor of Thomas Cranmer, expressed the Protestant consensus as to the Real Presence (to which only Luther did not subscribe in virtue of his doctrine of consubstantiation) in his *Censura* when he said: “It becomes our duty to abolish from the churches... with all purity of doctrine whatever forms of bread-worship they wish to have employed by the anti-Christians and preserved in the hearts of the simpler kind of people” (MD p. 463).

In the New Rite the Real Presence is no longer clearly expressed. The words denoting the *oblata*, in contradistinction to those quoted above (“a pure Victim...” etc.) become *panem vitae et calicem salutis*: the bread of life and the cup of salvation, or, at another point, *panis vitae...potus spiritualis*: the bread of life and spiritual drink, which, as the Critical Study states, “could mean anything” (III 3), and suggest a merely spiritual, rather than a substantial presence.

Moreover, all the signs of respect towards the Real Presence listed above have been abolished. We note particularly the abolition of the genuflections immediately following the consecration of the bread and wine.

In the years subsequent to the promulgation of the New Rite, further signs of respect were no longer enforced or obligatory³², such as Communion on the tongue distributed by the priest or deacon, kneeling for the consecration, and genuflecting and keeping silent in the church. Instead, Holy Communion is usually received in the hands (a practice which Bucer prescribed explicitly in order to deny belief in the Real Presence (see above), and which became one of the hall-marks of the denial of Catholic eucharistic teaching³³) and is often distributed moreover not only to standing communicants but also by lay ministers - where the New Rite has “out-Cranmered Cranmer” (MD p. 518).

We see in short how the Blessed Sacrament is “now consumed without any sign of adoration³⁴” and, what is worse, how the faithful, who are no longer taught not to communicate after having committed a mortal sin, communicate in increasing numbers³⁵. Indeed this ignorance is furthered by the creators of the new rite who have excised St. Paul’s admonitions against receiving Holy Communion in the state of mortal sin from the Mass of Maundy

Thursday and from the Feast of *Corpus Christi*, as we show in our discussion of the passages eliminated from the Epistles in the second part of this essay.

Furthermore, “the cult of the Blessed Sacrament, visits, solemn expositions, the Forty Hours and acts of reparation have fallen out of use and are now often avoided as deviant forms of piety.”³⁶ Rather, the faithful in church outside the Mass, and even during the Mass, act more and more as though they were in a public meeting-place: talking in a loud voice to each other or to absent *carissimi* on the telephone, shaking hands, applauding, and laughing³⁷. *Miserere nostri Domine, Miserere nostri*.

4. The Sacramental Priesthood

In the Old Rite the sacramental priesthood is clearly distinguished from the laity.

In the Offertory the priest speaks in the first person singular in the *Suscipe Sancte Pater* (the offering of the host) and in the other prayers.³⁸

In the Canon, the sacramental priesthood is distinguished from the laity by the words *minister* or *servus* in the first case and *familia* or *plebs sancta* in the second, and singled out by the phrases *qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium...* and *nobis quoque peccatoribus* (MD p. 345).

The same distinction is made by the double *Confiteor* at the beginning of Mass (repeated at the end, depending on circumstances), the first *Confiteor* of which is said by the priest, the second by the faithful. Here the priest also exercises his priestly ministry in acting as judge, witness, and intercessor, and by imparting the absolution. The priest is differentiated from the people also in the double Holy Communion, in the first of which “the High and Eternal priest and he who acted in His person were fused into the most intimate union” (Critical Study V 2).

The sacramental priesthood is also manifest to the ears and the eyes of the congregation: in the former case by the silence of the canon (as we have seen at 2 (ii) above) and in the latter case by the following elements: a) the seven vestments which the priest is required to wear when acting *in persona Christi* ; b) by the celebration at a distance from the people in an area separated off from them by altar-rails, which expressed his function as mediator; c) by his celebration in front of the tabernacle where the ideas are associated of Christ in His Real Presence and Christ in His minister; d) by his celebration alone, and not together with concelebrants where the uniqueness of the priesthood of

Christ is obscured; e) and by the fact that he distributes the sacred Hosts himself, as befits the one who has consecrated them (cf. St. Thomas Aquinas *Summa* III Q.82 A.13).

We have already seen that according to Protestant beliefs the priesthood does not have a sacrificial character deriving from the priestly ordination but is rather a property of all the faithful, and that during the liturgy the celebrant is considered to act solely as a president.

In the New Rite all the verbal distinctions between priest and laity in the Offertory and the Canon have been removed, with the exception of the *orate fratres* (which was retained despite opposition from the majority of the *Consilium* - MD p. 324). The double *Confiteor* and communion have been replaced by single ones, where there is no longer a distinction between priest and people, and the formula of absolution has been removed as it had been by the Protestants.

Some of the vestments have been suppressed; others made optional. In certain cases alb and stole are considered sufficient for celebration. The priest is usually no longer segregated from the people by his distance from them or by the altar rails; he no longer celebrates facing the tabernacle, and often not even near the tabernacle; frequently he concelebrates and does not distribute the Holy Communion himself, or does so in company with the laity (male or female). Furthermore, in the third Eucharistic prayer: the phrase “*populum tibi congregare non desinis, ut a solis ortu usque ad occasum oblatio munda offeratur nomini tuo*” intimates the priesthood of the people in harmony with the statement of the General Instruction: “*missa est sacra synaxis seu congregatio populi*”.

5. The Ends of the Mass

The Council of Trent declares (s.22 canon 3)³⁹: “**If any-one should say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving... and not a propitiatory sacrifice...and should not be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions and other necessities: Anathema Sit**”.

In other words the Council teaches that the finality of the Holy Mass is not merely praise (/ adoration) and thanks,⁴⁰ but also expiation and petition.⁴¹ This declaration was made in response to the Protestant denial that the Mass was a Sacrifice, and as such expiatory and petitionary in character.

In fact, since the Protestants deny that the Mass is a Sacrifice, the service with which they replace it is not only signally lacking in the finality of expiation but also in that of adoration.

The New Rite in its turn is also much impoverished in this regard. The finality of adoration, that is to say, the adoration of the Most Holy Trinity, has been all but totally suppressed. The *Gloria Patri* in the Introit has been removed, the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* is recited less frequently, and the Trinitarian formula *per Dominum Nostrum Jesum Christum...* which concludes many of the prayers in the Old Rite, has been dropped in all cases except for the Collect. The prayer at the Offertory, Receive O Holy Trinity, *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas...*, and the prayer at the end of the Mass, May It Please Thee, O Holy Trinity, *Placeat Tibi Sancta Trinitas...*, have been abolished, and the preface of the Holy Trinity is no longer recited every Sunday, but only once a year on the respective feast day.

The finality of expiation has also been much reduced. As the Critical Study explains (III), the accent has been shifted from the remission of the sins of the living and the dead, to the nutrition and sanctification of those present. The following elements have thereby been suppressed: the prayer that God might give us life (in the psalm at the foot of the altar); the prayers *Aufer* and *Oramus Te* in which the priest asks to be pardoned for his own sins; the *Confiteor* recited by the priest with a deep bow and with the faithful on their knees; the Offertory prayers that the Immaculate Victim offered for “my innumerable sins, offenses, and negligences may be accepted by God” and that the chalice may rise with “the odour of sweetness for our salvation”; all the prayers of humble supplication in the Roman Canon which no longer appear in the new canons; and the thrice-repeated prayer *Domine non sum dignus* prior to the Communion, both of the celebrant and of the faithful.

In the same vein, the memento of the dead and the mention of the souls suffering in Purgatory have been eliminated from the three new Eucharistic prayers, as well as the entire Requiem Mass in all its extraordinary catechetical power.

As the finalities of adoration and expiation retreat into the background, the finalities of thanksgiving and petition advance into the foreground (and the more charismatic the Mass, the more notably so), but with a certain detachment from their principal object, that is, the remission of sins through the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Indeed the term “Holy Sacrifice of the Mass” has been largely replaced by the term “Eucharist” (meaning thanksgiving), and a section of petitionary prayers, known as “the prayers of the faithful”, has been added to the Mass (often for merely temporal or material advantages), as if the Mass were not itself a prayer of petition.

In fact, it may be more accurate to say with the authors of the Critical Study, that the real finalities are suppressed and new finalities are invented: “the spirit of communion between those present and the spirit of a Charity banquet” (III), where again we witness the shift from the concept of a sacrifice to that of a meal.

6. Latin

The Latin language in its sacred, immutable, traditional, and universal character is perfectly adapted to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and to the doctrine it expresses, as to the Catholic Church, and more generally to catholicity itself⁴².

In being immutable, traditional, and universal, it constitutes a principle of unity for all Catholics of the Roman rite, not only of all nations but also of all times: a principle both of visible unity and of unity in the Faith.

Latin was abolished by Martin Luther for the *rationale* expressed as follows in the 24th of the “Thirty-Nine Articles”, in direct defiance of canon 9 of Session 22 of the Council of Trent⁴³: “It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God and the custom of the primitive Church to have public prayer in the Church or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.”⁴⁴ Dom Guéranger states that “we must admit that it is a master-stroke of Protestantism to have declared war on this sacred language” (MD p. 357).

It is clear, moreover, that what is lost in the Mass alongside the Latin language is a sense not only of the sacred, but also of immutability, of Tradition, and of universality.

In addition, with its translation into innumerable languages the Mass loses its catechetical uniformity and clarity⁴⁵; and once it is no longer the vehicle for Latin chant, created by the greatest composers that the world has ever known, it loses its power profoundly to touch the human heart on the contemplation of the mysteries of salvation⁴⁶.

In a word, with the loss of Latin the Mass loses a great part of its very catholicity.

The document *Tres Abhinc Annos* (“The Second Instruction” in 1967) granted permission for the whole Mass, including the Canon, to be said aloud and in the vernacular. This was contrary to the intention of the members of the Second Vatican Council as is shown by Article 36 of the Liturgical Constitution, which neither intended nor envisaged a vernacular canon, and as late as 1965 insisted that permission would never be given for this; which permitted the vernacular: i) only as a concession; ii) only in certain parts of the Mass; iii) and not in parts pertaining to the priest alone (MD p. 368).

The abolition of Latin was the work of the “liturgical experts”. Michael Davies comments (p. 368): “Cardinal Heenan testified that Pope John himself did not suspect what was being planned” by them, “There can be no doubt that the Fathers were deliberately misled...”

7. The Orientation of the Celebrant

“From the time Christians were first allowed to build churches, they constructed them along an east-west axis” (MD p. 405). The celebrant and congregation would worship towards the east which symbolizes the Heavenly Jerusalem and the coming of Christ, where the church entrance was situated in the eastern side of the church (as in the Basilica of St. Peter’s in Rome). The congregation would turn towards the east for the Canon of the Mass and turn towards the celebrant when he addressed them, for example, during the sermon. The Mass was never celebrated *versus populum*, either in the western or in the eastern tradition where the iconostasis would indeed have deprived it of any sense.

The sense of the Mass *versus Dominum* with the celebrant at the head of the congregation is that it expresses the fact that the priest offers the Mass with, and on behalf of, the people. The concept of a celebration deliberately orientated to face the people was an invention of Martin Luther (MD p. 400).

This practice was introduced into the Catholic Church by a series of documents. Article 124 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* recommends that new churches should be “suitable for the celebration of liturgical services and for active participation of the faithful”; the 1964 document *Inter Oecumenici* expands the scope of this provision to include old churches and adds that it is better (*praestat*) that altars should be freestanding; the 1969 General Instruction cites the latter provision as an alleged authority that “the main altar should be (” rather than it be better that it be “) constructed away from the wall, so that one can move around it without difficulty and so that it can be used for a celebration facing the people” (MD p. 408-10).

8. Altar and Table

The supreme function of the Church is to worship God, and the supreme expression of this worship is the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass on a consecrated altar in a church consecrated for this purpose. The altar represents Christ, Who sacrificed Himself on the altar of His Own body. The altar must be of stone because it represents Christ, Who is the living foundation and corner-stone of the Church. It must be covered with three linen cloths which represent the Church, and the cloths with which He was wrapped in the tomb. The altar should be elevated since it is a mystical Mount Calvary⁴⁷. It is incensed, and adorned with a cross, which enables priest and people frequently to gaze upon the image of the Crucified. It (and the tabernacle) is hung with frontal hangings which represent the saints with which the great King is clothed in glory. The altar contains the relics of the martyrs (cf. MD p. 389 - 393).

In contrast to this Catholic theology of the altar, Cranmer states (MD p. 413-14): “First, the form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord’s Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it: the use of a table is to serve men to eat upon.”

In regard to the Postconciliar liturgical revolution, Michael Davies notes that “not one of the mandatory requirements (such as those mentioned above) developed over two thousand years to ensure that the altar which represents Christ is of fitting dignity, has been retained by the Conciliar Church” (MD p. 395). And we observe that, in effect, in the vast majority of cases, the altar has been supplanted by a table, despite Pope Pius XII’s categorical prohibition of this in *Mediator Dei* (MD p. 416).

Michael Davies further remarks (p. 413) that “the Mass *versus populum* and the ... table are part of the same phenomenon, the Protestantization of the Catholic liturgy. It is a carbon copy of what took place at the Reformation.”

9. Intelligibility and Participation

Clearly any form of public action needs to be intelligible and participated. The Council of Trent decreed that the Holy Mass according to the Old Rite was to be rendered intelligible to the faithful, and the Catechism of Trent in its turn constantly stresses the obligation of the parish priest to explain the mysteries of the Faith in general, and of the Holy Mass in particular.⁴⁸

The Liturgical Movement under Dom Guéranger undertook to explain in detail its various texts and component parts. This work of catechism enabled the faithful to participate more fully in the Holy Mass: externally with the responses and chant, but above all internally⁴⁹ in the highest act of which man is capable, that is, the act of adoration which is the Holy Mass, and in particular, the act of oblation and immolation of the faithful in union with the Holy Sacrifice of Mount Calvary.

The celebration with which Martin Luther and the other reformers replaced the Mass also needed to be intelligible and participated in by the people. Since these celebrations were essentially communitarian, anthropocentric actions, the intelligibility and participation were achieved largely by translating the Latin into the vernacular and eliminating the silence (see above). The language became purely communicative and lost its “sacral stylization” that “forms an essential element of any official prayer language” in the words of Prof. Christine Mohrmann (MD p.362), a sacral stylization that is directed towards union with God.

⁴⁸

As far as the New Rite is concerned, a certain Fr. Peter Coughlan, a member of the Secretariat of the *Consilium*, remarked of the liturgical reform⁵⁰ that “its main thrust may be summed up under two heads: intelligibility and participation...they set in motion a process which has not yet ceased” (MD p. 28) - a prophetic utterance indeed, as Michael Davies rightly remarks.

At this point we may ask ourselves why, if the principal objective of the liturgical reform was to make the Holy Mass intelligible, it has failed in this task: for ignorance as to the nature of the Holy Mass is wide-spread, indeed almost universal.⁵¹ The answer must lie in the fact that the faithful understand the Mass as they experience it and as it is represented to them: not as the Holy Sacrifice of Calvary, but as an anthropocentric, communitarian action⁵²: in other words not according to Catholic, but according to Protestant, theology.

In regard to the intelligibility of the New Rite, language is no longer used for a sacred purpose, but for communication between man and man. Even the words of consecration, spoken aloud and subtly altered, become the medium of communication, of “narrative”: important in their reception and not in their utterance, in what they convey and not in what they actuate - as though *Fiat lux* had been said in order to be heard.

Speaking of the attacks on the Latin language in the Mass, Fr. Nicholas Gihl writes that “Such attacks originated principally in a heretical, schismatical, proudly national spirit hostile to the Church or in a superficial and false enlightenment, in a shallow and arid rationalism entirely destitute of the perception and understanding of the essence and object of the Catholic liturgy, especially of the profoundly mystical sacrifice” (MD p. 358).

In regard to participation in the New Rite, the congregation no longer unites itself spiritually with the unfathomable mysteries of the Mass, but usurps the functions of the clergy with forays into the sanctuary to read the lessons or prayers, to bring up the offerings, or to open the tabernacle, rummage around in it, and distribute Holy Communion, as the *mulier idonea*⁵³ makes her appearance in the liturgy for the first time (Critical Study V), breaking with three and a half millennia of Judaeo-Christian Tradition.

Over and above this liturgical participation should be mentioned the social participation: the hand-shakes (or other greetings as indicated by respective cultural norms or levels of emotion), applause, laughter, and even dance⁵⁴.

Having drawn a comparison between the Old, the reformed, and the New, Rites in nine distinct cases, we add a final subsection on a number of elements concerning the Church and offensive to Protestant ecclesiology, which have been eliminated from the Roman Rite (cf. Critical Study V 3).

10. The Church

The Church featured large in the Old Rite: Her three-fold nature: Militant, Suffering, and Triumphant, was clearly manifest, whereas in the New Rite She is hardly recognizable.

The Church Militant, whose goal is Grace, permanent and eternal, has been substituted by the pilgrim Church on the march to a purely temporal goal; Her Faith (as when we pray *pro omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus*) has been substituted by a search with sincere heart (*omnium qui te quaerunt corde sincero*).

The Church Suffering is no longer mentioned in the three new eucharistic prayers; the Requiem Mass has been abolished; the phrase *cum signo fidei et dormiunt in somno pacis* has been transmuted into *obierunt in pace Christi tui* with no mention of Faith; and a group of persons has been added: *omnium defunctorum quorum fidem tu solus cognovisti*, where two of the four characteristics of Faith, namely its unity and visibility, are lacking.

The Church Triumphant has been minimalized: angels and saints have been reduced to anonymity in the second part of the collective *Confiteor*, and have disappeared as witnesses and judges in the person of Saint Michael in the first part; the angelic hierarchies have been removed from the new preface to the second eucharistic prayer, and *Dominus Deus Sabaoth* (Lord God of the Heavenly Hosts) in the *Sanctus* has been translated as Lord God of Power and Might in the English, and *Dio dell'Universo*⁵⁵ (God of the Universe) in the Italian version⁵⁶.

The popes and martyrs have been removed from the *Communicantes*; the Blessed Virgin Mary, the apostles, and all the saints from the *Libera nos*; the holy apostles Peter and Paul and the other apostles no longer appear at all in the entire *Novus Ordo* (with the exception of the *Communicantes* of the Roman Canon); nor are the holy martyrs invoked at the beginning of the Mass.

We notice too that the clause *per Christum Dominum Nostrum* has been removed, which is the eternal guarantee that God will listen to the prayers of the Church.

The Church was also clearly manifest in the Leonine prayers: those that conclude the Low Mass. These consist of three *Aves*, the *Salve Regina*, the prayer: "O Lord, Our Refuge and Our Strength...", where, "by the intercession of the

glorious and Immaculate Virgin Mary Mother of God, of St. Joseph her spouse, thy Blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and of all the saints”, God is asked “mercifully and benignly to hear our prayers for the conversion of sinners and for the liberty and exaltation of Holy Mother Church”; the prayer to Saint Michael the Archangel; and three invocations to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. As Michael Davies says (p. 519): “Five prayers less compatible with Protestantism could hardly be imagined. They have been suppressed by the *Consilium*.”

C. Public Testimonies

Lest any doubt remains that the theology of the New Rite is not Catholic but Protestant, we proceed to quote various public testimonies: the first group Catholic, the second group Protestant.

1. Catholic Testimonies

The first testimony, which is also the most authoritative, as being that of Cd. Ottaviani, erstwhile prefect for the Congregation of the Faith - together with Cardinal Bacci - is found in the letter with which he presents the Brief Critical Study of the *Novus Ordo Missae* to Pope Paul VI, as well as in the Critical Study itself: “the *Novus Ordo Missae*... represents both as a whole and in its detail a striking departure [*impressionante allontanamento*] from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass, as it was formulated in the 22nd Session of the Council of Trent, which by establishing definitively the “canons” of the rite, erected an insurmountable barrier against all heresy that could touch the integrity of the *magisterium*” (Letter 1). It is such “as to satisfy in many aspects the most modernist of Protestants” (Critical Study I).

The other testimonies are taken from the classical critiques of the New Rite in the German, French, and English languages.

Mgr. Gamber in the “Reform of the Roman Liturgy” (2nd Edition, 1981 ch.1) speaks of “a terrifying *rapprochement* to Protestant views which sails under the banner of a misconceived ecumenism⁵⁷”; and in “The Liturgical Reform in Question” (French version, 1992, p. 42): “The new organization of the liturgy and above all the profound changes of the rite of Mass...were much more radical than the liturgical reform of Luther - at least in that which regards the external rite - and took less account of the sensibility of the people.”

Prof. Louis Salleron writes in *La Nouvelle Messe (Collection Itinéraires*, p. 195): “Let it suffice to say that the new Mass is liturgically the “evangelical” Supper with its meal character, its vernacular language, its table, its celebration towards the people, its communion in the hand or under both species, and, in the words and the rites, the suppression of the representation of the sacrifice, of the Real Presence and the ministerial priesthood.⁵⁸”

Michael Davies, in his book from which the majority of the material of this first part of the essay is taken, a book which together with the two other volumes of the trilogy “Liturgical Revolution” must rank as the most scholarly and detailed of all the critiques of the New Mass to date, writes: “there cannot be the least doubt that sacrificial language in the *Novus Ordo Missae* has been deliberately minimized so that it is compatible with the Protestant theory of sacrifice” (p. 520 of the last chapter of this book in which he compares the Old Rite with the New Rite in the light of Cranmer’s “communion service”).

2. Protestant Testimonies

Max Thurian, speaking of the New Rite in *La Croix* (May 30th1969 quoted in *La Nouvelle Messe* p.193), writes: “One of its fruits will perhaps be that non-Catholic communities will be able to celebrate the holy supper with the same prayers as the Catholic Church. Theologically it is possible⁵⁹”

Dr. Ramsay, Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, remarked in a visit to America in 1972: “I have experienced Roman rites which are really very Anglican. If you wish to find rites that are really Roman, visit some of our old-fashioned Anglo-Catholic shrines.” (MD p.274)

The Protestant *Hoeheres Konsistorium der Kirche der Augsburgischen Konfession von Elsass-Lothringen* published in the *Dernières Nouvelles d’Alsace* (14th December 1973) stated: “To-day it should be possible for a Protestant to recognize in the Catholic eucharistic celebration the Supper instituted by the Lord... the new Eucharistic prayers make it easier for us to rediscover an evangelical theology.⁶⁰”

After an ecumenical meeting in the Catholic Academy in Stuttgart-Hohenheim, a participant wrote (to the *Rheinischer Merkur* no.11 of March 26th1976) that a Protestant parson had celebrated the new Catholic Mass. A Catholic priest, asked how he found it, replied: “It was too Catholic for my liking⁶¹”. In a subsequent letter (*RM* no.14), another participant replied to the letter explaining that in fact the “Catholic Mass” had been a Protestant service,

close to Luther's "German Mass", which, he added, would be considered too Catholic by many Catholic priests today.

D. An Ecumenical Motivation

The Ecumenical intent behind the New Rite is clearly manifest in the contribution made by the Protestant Observers present at its creation. This contribution was officially denied, for example, by Mgr. Bugnini, the Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, and of the *Consilium*, who stated in the July-August 1974 issue of "Notitiae" (the Congregation's official journal): "What role did the 'observers' play in the *Consilium*? Nothing more than that of - 'observers'." It was similarly denied by the Director of the Vatican Press Office on 25th February 1976 with the words "the Protestant Observers did not participate in the elaboration of the texts of the new Missal" (MD p. 586).

By contrast, Mgr. (later Cd.) Baum had observed in the course of an interview with "The Detroit News" 27 June 1967: "They are not simply there as observers, but as consultants as well, and they participate fully in the discussions on Catholic liturgical renewal" (MD p. 586). In order to establish the truth on this issue, Michael Davies contacted a certain Canon Ronald Jasper, one of the six Protestants present. The latter explained that the observers were present at the official debates in the morning, where they were not allowed to speak. In the afternoon, however, they had an informal meeting with the *periti* where they were certainly allowed to comment and criticize and make suggestions.... These informal meetings were a complete free-for-all, and there was a very frank exchange of views" (MD p. 587). The result was "exactly the type of liturgy and the type of renewal that could have been expected, in view of what they represented." (Jean Madiran quoted in MD p. 259)

Michael Davies (p. 263-6) gives evidence of a "concerted scheme for different denominations to reform their respective liturgies in the direction of an eventual united Christian rite." He cites the example of the Anglican "Series III Communion Service", which comprises elements also added to the New Roman Rite, such as "Christ has died, Christ has risen, Christ will come again" after the consecration, with the apparent purpose of *rapprochement* with evangelical Protestants. The Ecumenical thrust is all the clearer in virtue of the leading role of Canon Jasper in the compilation of Series III.

And yet, we must agree with Mgr. Gamber (see above) that this type of ecumenism is "misconceived" because it comprises no union *in re* but only in appearance: the Catholics, the High Anglicans, and the Evangelicals may celebrate the same rite, but they would produce a different effect. The Catholic priest makes Christ and the Sacrifice of

Calvary really Present; the Anglicans and Evangelicals do not. As Mgr. Lefèbvre predicted, this ecumenism “will not attract a single Protestant to the Faith, but will cause countless Catholics to lose it, and will instil total confusion in the minds of many more who will no longer know what is true and what is false” (MD p. 273)⁶².

We have argued that the theology of the Old Rite is Catholic and that the theology of the New Rite is Protestant. It follows that only a Protestant (or someone with a Protestant spirit) could coherently wish to substitute the Old Rite with the New - or some-one, of course, who wished to damage the Church, either by debasing the rite or by destroying the Mass itself.

If his intention were the latter, he would not, however, have succeeded, because, as Michael Davies explains, the Church has the authority to validate a rite of Mass, and has done so in the case of the *Novus Ordo*⁶³.

Michael Davies entertains the idea that this latter intention was behind the creation of the new rite. He explains how information was placed in the hands of Pope Paul VI to the effect that Mgr. Bugnini was a Freemason, that the latter was “then dismissed and his entire congregation dissolved”, whereupon he was sent as *nuntius* to Iran.⁶⁴

II

The Cult of God and the Cult of man

We proceed to search more deeply into the motivation for the New Rite. We do so by searching more deeply into its theology, namely Protestantism. Now the essence of Protestantism is subjectivism, as has been clearly demonstrated by Jacques Maritain in his book “*Les trois Réformateurs*” (Plon, 1925) in the chapter “*Luther ou l'avènement du moi: Luther or the Coming of the Self*” and by Paul Hacker in his book “*Das Ich im Glauben bei Martin Luther. Der Ursprung der anthropozentrischen Religion: The Self in the Faith of Martin Luther: The Origin of*”

Anthropocentric Religion” (*nova & vetera*, Bonn 2002). And subjectivism in the realm of liturgy amounts to the cult of man.

The Mass is the cult of God, the highest form of cult that exists, and both rites render this cult to Him. But whereas the Old Rite renders it in a way that expresses in a sublime manner this cult of God, the New Rite renders it in a manner that expresses the cult of man.

That the theology of the Old Rite relates to the cult of God and the theology of the New Rite relates to the cult of man is evident at the outset in the central conception that each has of the Mass: the conception of sacrifice in the first case, and the conception a community meal in the second. For this sacrifice is “the sacrifice of God, by God, to God” (in the words of St. John of the Cross), and this meal is the celebration of the community by itself.

We shall now compare these two different forms of cult on various general counts, and then in regard to the proper of the Mass.

A. General Comparison

1. The Orientation of the Celebrant

In the first part of this essay we have examined this theme in relation to Protestantism, we shall now do so in relation to the Cult of man.

In the Old Rite the priest celebrates towards the crucifix and (typically) towards the tabernacle as well. With very few exceptions (see the corresponding section in Part I above) he faces the same direction as the people, who are situated behind him. This orientation expresses the fact that he performs a cult to God for, and on behalf of, the people.

In the New Rite, the priest celebrates towards the people. Man faces man and “the circle is closed” (in the words of Cardinal Ratzinger in “The Spirit of the Liturgy”). This orientation nourishes the misconception that the Mass is being offered exclusively or primarily for those present, whereas it is in fact offered in the first place for God, in the second place for the entire Church, and only in the third place for particular intentions and for those present.

This misconception has led to the elimination of the *salutationes*, the final blessing, and the *Ite Missa est*, where the priest celebrates without a server; it has led to the reformulations of *Orate Fratres*/Pray Brethren (referring to the

Church) as “pray brother(s) and sister(s)” or “pray sister(s)”, according to circumstances; it leads to some priests not celebrating Mass if there is no-one present, for example on their holidays.

This orientation encourages the priest to act as a performer, it expresses or prompts the desire on the part of the congregation to be looked at individually, to be addressed, to see and hear everything, to understand everything immediately. It fosters an anthropocentrism which culminates in taking God Himself into their own hands.

The tabernacle is situated outside the circle⁶⁵, as is the (real) altar, and the divine character of the Mass, that is the Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice, is thereby obscured, so that God is excluded from the celebration, or at most relegated to second place. Moreover, the celebrant typically celebrates the Mass with his back to the tabernacle⁶⁶, which is the clearest expression of the shift from the cult of God to the cult of man.⁶⁷

The Mass, in a word, becomes the celebration of the community by itself, where “the word ‘celebration’ evokes a party atmosphere rather than the due performance of a public, (primarily religious) ceremony” (MD p. 145). Priest and congregation greet each other with secular formulae in contrast to the Old Rite, where the celebrant, after kissing the altar which represents Christ, greets them with *Dominus Vobiscum* without looking at them, so expressing his role as mediator between God and man.

In the New Rite again, members of the congregation greet each other (at the “sign of peace”), and phenomena characteristic of public entertainment enter the scene as we have noted above: laughter, applause, and even dance.

2. Gravity

We see how the gravity appropriate to the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Death of the Lord gives way to joyfulness. What is the source of this joyfulness? The sense of a community meal recalling the *agape* gatherings in the early Church? But, as Cd. Ratzinger explains, these gatherings, which in the earliest times were joined to the celebration of the Mass, were soon afterwards recognized to be substantially different from the Mass and were consequently separated from it.

Or does this joyfulness derive from a sense of the Last Supper? But as Romano Amerio points out in *Iota Unum* (ch.270), the Last Supper is informed rather by a spirit of tragedy.

Or does it derive from the commemoration of the Resurrection, since the Mass is also this? And yet the Mass is not essentially the commemoration of the Resurrection, but essentially the commemoration (in the sense of rendering present) of the Sacrifice of Calvary.

It is probably the commemoration of the Resurrection which is the source of the joyfulness of the New Rite (in line with the remarks in the following paragraph), but if this is so, then we must admit that it is not a form of joy that befits the Resurrection, because it is often merely superficial when not positively infantile, whereas what befits the Resurrection is a profound spiritual joy, as manifest in the Easter hymns *O filii et filiae*, or *Haec dies* (the former paraliturgical, the latter liturgical): a spiritual joy in the latter instance which we may describe as equally profound as the sorrow that the Church has experienced at the Death of the Lord.

This “obsessive paschalism” (Critical Study V 3) may be seen in the shift from black vestments to violet vestments in the liturgy of Good Friday and in the Requiem Mass⁶⁸; it may be seen in the suppression of the prostration of the sacred ministers at the beginning of the former and the suppression of all the most profound prayers and sequences of the latter, to the extent that the Requiem Mass may be said no longer to exist. It may be seen equally in the lighting of the Paschal candle at the modern funeral Mass, and the chanting of the Alleluia of the Easter Mass in almost all sung Masses throughout the year which contain the Alleluia verse - even in Lent and at Christmas⁶⁹.

3. The Sacred

We have already referred to the suppression of the sacred language in the Offertory and in the Canon of the Old Rite, and to the suppression of prayers expressing the finalities of adoration and expiation. We have also referred to the suppression of the Latin, the silence, and of the many signs and gestures of reverence towards the Real Presence. When discussing the dissolution of the sacred, as the cult of God shifts towards the cult of man, we should also mention the drastic reduction of genuflections, bows, and signs of the cross on the part of the celebrant over the *oblata*, the sacred species, and with the sacred species. For example, all the seven signs of the cross over the *oblata* immediately preceding the consecration of the chalice have been excised in accordance with the instruction *Tres Abhinc Annos* of 1967 (MD p. 39) in exact parallel to the excisions made by Cranmer in his communion service of 1552.

4. The Rubrics

The rubrics determine the manner in which the Mass is celebrated. The rubrics of the Old Rite determine (*inter alia*) the celebrant's movement from one part of the altar to another; the three depths of bow he makes according to whether he recites the *Confiteor*, says the doxology or the Holy Name of Jesus, the name of the saint of the day, or greets another participant in the liturgy, and so on; they determine the direction of the bow: to the tabernacle, the crucifix, the missal, or an image of a saint; they determine the position of his hands on the altar, their height and distance apart when he prays, their height when he raises the *oblata*.

Behind these rubrics lies the truth taught infallibly by the Church that the Mass is the cult of God, and in particular makes present the unique Sacrifice of Calvary by the action of Our Lord Jesus Christ. As the cult of God, the liturgy of the Mass needs to be determined by rules and duly ordered; as a rendering present of the unique Sacrifice of Calvary, it needs to be uniform through time and space; as an action of Jesus Christ it requires self-effacement on the part of the celebrant: his person is not important, but the person of Jesus Christ in Whom he acts: he himself is not important as a person but as an instrument.

The rubrics of the Old Rite have been suppressed in the New Rite⁷⁰ (including all those mentioned above). Many parts of the *Novus Ordo Missae* are now optional; readings can be changed at will; the celebration has become informal, casual, and more free. The person of the celebrant has taken on a great importance. In a word, it is no longer duly ordered, uniform, and celebrated with self-effacement as befits its objective nature.

What is the reason for this? Is it not the aversion of "the man of to-day" to the objective order in general - be it dogma, the moral law, or rubrics? a shift from the objective to the subjective, from theocentricism to anthropocentricism, and in the present context from the cult of God to the cult of man?⁷¹

5. A Perfect Work

In the previous section we have stated that the Mass is the cult and action of God. As such it is a perfect work which man has always sought to celebrate in a perfect manner (*humano modo*): with the highest degree of beauty of which he is capable: in the architecture, sculpture, paintings, frescoes, and music: all created by the greatest masters that the world has ever known; in the sacred vessels, vestments, incense, and flowers; and in the solemn ceremonies that behove the court of the King of Kings. Nowhere can this be seen more clearly than in the Papal Mass as it was before the liturgical changes: the Papal Mass, which has been named "the highest achievement of Western

civilization”, the Mass which in all its glory served as the model for every other form of Mass down to the simple low Mass with one server.

With the introduction of the New Rite, the pursuit of perfection and beauty has been by and large abandoned. It has been replaced by a form of reductionalism or minimalism; by a rationalism which views the Mass as the mere performance of a function or the conveying of a concept.

As for the aesthetic consequences, one need only think of the architecture, art, altars, stained-glass windows, and sacred vessels of modern churches, the man-made fibres of the vestments, and the music which has descended from the sublime heights of Gregorian chant to the level of folk-song⁷².

At the same time, beautiful altars and altar-rails have been smashed into pieces⁷³ and thrown away like symbols of a past worthy only of being despised and trampled underfoot; and the Papal Mass in the form that it has known for two millennia has been abolished, and reconstructed on the model of the new simple Mass. We are witnessing a shift away from the canons of objective beauty hallowed by the Church’s Tradition to the canons of functionalism of a secular society. This is the shift from God to man which terminates in nihilism.

In so far as ideology is involved, it is the ideology of poverty, but a poverty not wedded to beauty and sacrality, as in the great monastic and mendicant traditions, but rather divorced from them, so that it no longer corresponds to the Divine nature of Christ, but only to a heretical image of Christ as mere man.

As Michael Davies says (p. 294): “the enemies of the Church have often contrasted the richness of Catholic churches with the poverty of the people in certain countries. It was Judas who condemned Mary Magdalene for anointing Christ with precious ointment which could have been sold to help the poor. It is frequently the poorest of God’s people who are the most generous in making sacrifices to ensure that their churches provide a fitting setting for the Holy Sacrifice - and in doing so receive solace which makes endurable a life that might otherwise have been more than could be borne”.

6. Contemplation and Devotion

The Council of Trent (Section 22 ch. 5) declares that Holy Mother Church has established “**ceremonies such as mysterious blessings, lights, incensations, vestments, and many other such things, to bring out the majesty of such a sacrifice and to awaken the mind of the faithful...to the contemplation of the sublime things hidden in**

this sacrifice.” We may observe that what is said of contemplation is true also of devotion, and conclude this section by considering briefly the effect of the respective rites on the minds and hearts of the faithful.

We have considered above the suppression of such elements as the signs of the Cross and beautiful vestments. Since such elements not only express and enhance the majesty of the Holy Sacrifice, but also serve to raise the minds and hearts of the faithful to God, it follows that their suppression has impoverished the Mass both in itself and in its effect on the faithful present.

As an important example of such elements, we take Gregorian chant. Gregorian chant for a sung Mass comprises both the setting of the parts of the proper (that is, the Introit, the Gradual, the Alleluia and verse, the Offertory and the Communion) as well as the *Kyriale* (that is, the *Kyrie*, *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei*). We shall see how a considerable part of this patrimony has been eliminated or mutilated, and how the rest has been badly adapted to the liturgy.

Since many texts of the proper have been changed in the New Rite (cf. the next section) and the Gradual has been entirely abolished, the respective Gregorian compositions have in effect been eliminated⁷⁴. In regard to the *Kyriale*, the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* are no longer obligatory (according to the rubrics of the Old Rite) and hence more rarely sung, and the *Kyrie* has been mutilated (as we shall see shortly).

Moreover, Gregorian chant does not in general adapt well to the new rite, either spiritually (as we are contending in this second half of the essay) or liturgically.

In regard to the latter point, this chant has not been integrated into the body of the Mass. While in the Old Rite the celebrant performs liturgical actions during the singing of the Introit, *Kyrie*, Offertory, Gradual, Alleluia, *Sanctus*, *Agnus Dei*, and the Communion, in the New Rite this is impossible. He must say each prayer out loud, then pause while the choir sings it, and only thereafter continue to celebrate the Mass.

We shall now examine in particular the sequences *Dies Irae* and *Libera Me* from the Requiem Mass, and the prayer *Kyrie Eleison* from the Common.

The first two sequences rank amongst the greatest treasures of western civilization: Mozart said that he would have willingly given his entire musical *opus* in exchange for the opening bar of the former of them. In the liturgical reform both sequences were suppressed.

The prayer *Kyrie Eleison*, established with a three-fold repetition a thousand years ago, was replaced by a two-fold repetition, thus mutilating not only the liturgical text but also its setting in Gregorian chant⁷⁵. What liturgical principle, may one ask, is operative here? That of suppressing elements “reduplicated in the course of the centuries or added

without particular utility” (SC 50)? Or that of composing “rites resplendent with a noble simplicity, clear in with approval their brevity, avoiding repetitions” (SC. 34)? - two passages quoted by Mgr. Bugnini in “*La Riforma Liturgica*” (I.4). If so, the reformers seem to be unaware (quite apart from the Trinitarian significance of the three-fold form of the *Kyrie Eleison*) of the liturgical principle of repetition, whether in order to instruct, as in the one-year cycle of readings, or in order to move the heart, as here. They rather seem to regard liturgy, as contended above, as simply a matter of performing a function or conveying a concept.

We see how it is that profoundly moving texts in a sublime musical expression conveying to God man’s anguish, suffering, misery, and sinfulness, and bringing him profound consolation⁷⁶, have been suppressed or mutilated. Man’s insistence on his unworthiness to receive The King of Kings under the roof of his soul has been silenced. This is no longer the cult of God where man’s heart is touched by texts, music, and repetition, but the cult of man: a shallow cult where the existence of suffering and sinfulness is not even acknowledged.

If it is indeed true that the spirit of the *Novus Ordo Missae* is the cult of man, then it follows that the more blatant liturgical abuses that we have witnessed in recent times, such as those described by Michael Davies in his chapters on “The President as Actor” (ch. 8), “The Children’s Directory” (9), “Send in the Clowns” (10), and “Bring on the Dancing Girls” (11), are not accidental to this, but rather a consequence of its internal dynamic and a manifestation of its very spirit⁷⁷: a spirit which culminates in liturgy conceived as though God did not exist: “*etsi Deus non daretur*.”⁷⁸

B. Comparison of the Propers

We shall now compare the Propers of the Old and New Rites, that is to say, the orations known in the Old Rite as the Collect, the Secret, and the Postcommunion; as well as the Gospel and Epistle Readings.

Fr. Anthony Cekada in his work “The Problems with the Prayers of the Modern Mass” (1991) writes that the orations date back in part as far as the fifth century, and that Tradition dates the nucleus of the Collects back to Pope St. Damasus (366-384). He shows the extent of the changes made to the orations: the Missal of the Old Rite contains 1,183 orations; 760 of these were completely abolished, and half of those remaining were altered so that now no more than 17 % of the original orations survive.

In the rest of this section we shall concentrate on the changes made to the Collects on the basis of the work *Liturgia - Memoria o Istruzioni per l'Uso?* by Lorenzo Bianchi (Piemme, 2002), although similar changes were made to the other orations as Fr. Cekada shows.

1. The Collects

Lorenzo Bianchi considers the Collects of Sundays and of the Feasts of Obligation as being those prayers most frequently heard by the faithful (p. 122). He explains (particularly on pp. 128-9) that the Collects of the Old Rite portray the human condition of sin, of the dangers coming from internal and external enemies, and of God's personal compassion and love; whereas the Collects of the New Rite have retained less than half of such themes - in the proportion of 122:57, while they have doubled references to Grace, gift, and love (*gratia, donum, dilectio*, etc.) - in the proportion of 9:17.

The result is that the New Rite no longer presents a vision of Grace and sin like the Old Rite, where man implores God's mercy in a concrete struggle between life and death; but rather presents man's life as a state of affairs, "a condition automatically given", where man is called to make a commitment (*impegno*), for which God's help is asked, so that man may attain salvation.

The New Rite is no longer concerned with dangers, enemies, and a personal response on the part of God, but merely seeks God's help as a form of "generic universalism". In effect, the creators of the New Rite separate Grace from sin, and in the final analysis (in a Pelagian move) from the human condition itself, so that it becomes no more than "an unnecessary adjunct" (*un soprammobile, appunto*). What has become important is "commitment" (*impegno*), with its social, activist, moralist thrust, and in relation to an ideal not immediately given (p. 25).

Bianchi argues this thesis in greater detail in regards to the Collects of Advent, Christmas, and Lent, and additionally in regard to the Offertory and Postcommunion prayers of Advent, in the prayer of the Blessing of the Water in the Easter vigil, and in the translations of the Collects. We shall conclude this section with a brief summary of his analysis of the Collects of Advent, Christmas, and Lent (p. 131-3).

i.) Out of the seven Collects of Advent and Christmas, the New Rite has retained only the two (namely those of the Midnight and Dawn Masses of Christmas) in which "sin" or related concepts, such as "*purificatis mentibus, liberet, vestusta servitus, mentis nostrae tenebras, indulgentia* (: with purified minds; might free, ancient servitude, the darkness of our mind, indulgence)" are absent, substituting such concepts in the other Collects by phrases evoking commitment such as: "*iustis operibus occurrentes* (1st Sunday of Advent): advancing with just works"; and "*in tui*

occursum Filii festinantes nulla opera terreni actus impediunt (2nd Sunday of Advent): hastening to meet your Son, we are not hindered by any works of earthly action”.

ii.) Whereas the word “Grace” is always related to the human condition of sin in the Old Rite, as in the 3rd Sunday of Advent: “*mentis nostrae tenebras...gratia tuae visitationis* (: the darkness of our mind... the Grace of your visitation)” and the 4th Sunday of Advent: *per auxilium gratiae tuae... nostra peccata* (: with the help of Thy Grace...our sins)” this is not the case in the New Rite, as in the new version of the Collect for the 4th Sunday of Advent: “*gratiam tuam, Domine, mentibus nostris infunde* (: pour into our minds Thy Grace , O Lord)”.

iii.) Whereas in the Old Rite the imperative is used with great insistence: “*excita, veni, aurem tuam precibus nostris accomoda, illustra mentis nostrae tenebras, da, concede, succurre* (: arouse, come, lend Thy ear to our prayers, illuminate the darkness of our mind, grant, concede, succour)”, in the New Rite the conjunctive predominates, so that there is a shift from forceful entreaty to descriptive phrases⁷⁹.

iv.) While the Collects of the Sundays of Advent have, for the most part, been displaced into the week-day Masses, those of the 5th Sunday of Lent have been entirely eliminated. The same principles that had governed the displacement of the former govern the elimination of the latter. Out of all the Sunday collects in Lent according to the New Rite, there is a connection made between man’s sin and God’s mercy only on the 3rd Sunday. Otherwise all “negative” terms appearing in the Old Rite have been suppressed: such as “*peccatum, adversitates, pravae cogitationes, humiles, affligi* (: sin, adversities, depraved thoughts, humble, afflicted).”

2. The Gospels and Epistles

We proceed to compare the Gospels and Epistles of Sundays and Feast Days in the Old Rite with those of the New Rite. The intention of the Second Vatican Council (SC 21) was “to set more richly the table of God’s Word.” The *Consilium* realized this intention by increasing the number of readings from two to three, and by increasing the one-year cycle of Gospels and Epistles to a three-year cycle. In the process, they abolished a liturgical structure of readings which dated back to the 4th and 5th centuries, manifesting again their preference for biblicity over Tradition which we have seen above in regard to the changes made to the formula of Consecration.

We proceed to analyze first what has been added, then what has been excised.

⁷⁹ In addition, as Romano Amerio remarks (280 p.618): “There is certainly a tendency in modern languages to avoid organizing one’s thought in a strongly synthetic structure, and to break up thoughts into a string of short statements instead. But this mode of expression also reflects a distaste for ontological or metaphysical theories of causation: a real connection between one thing and another is replaced by a mere succession of one thing after another.”

What has been added is a greater quantity of Bible passages. This was done, as Mgr. Bugnini reveals in ch. 26 of the Liturgical Reform, in consultation with non-Catholics, and, as Mgr. Gamber observes, is the work of exegetes rather than liturgists⁸⁰. It is, in short, of Protestant inspiration, and as such falls prey to obscurantism, for as Romano Amerio remarks in *Iota Unum* (ch.288), the Bible “is a *difficult* book”, and most of the faithful lack the knowledge necessary for understanding many of the new readings.⁸¹

What has been excised shall be examined in detail because it pertains directly to the theme treated in this second part of the essay.

In the transition from the Old to the New Rite, a number of readings were retained, and a number eliminated; and of the readings retained, a number were abbreviated, or could be abbreviated if the celebrant so desired.

We shall now set forth the principles which governed the elimination and abbreviation of the readings, first in the Gospels and second in the Epistles, on the basis of the studies of Rudolf Kaschewsky: “*auf dasz der Tisch des Gotteswortes reicher bedeckt werde*”, *Una Voce Korrespondenz* I 1982 and III 1986, respectively.

i. The Gospels

Out of 58 gospels, only 22 remain. The 36 that have been eliminated, and the passages that have been removed from the remaining Gospels, treat of the following themes: the Second Coming of the Lord, Judgment, sin and its effects, the contrast between the Kingdom of God and the World, the fact that Satan is the prince of the world, and that the world rejoices while the just man weeps; together with the earnest words, the warnings, and admonishments that the Lord spoke to His disciples, and therefore also to us.

Mgr. Klaus Gamber comments⁸² that the passages removed from the remaining Gospels speak above all of “the God Who judges and punishes: *vom richtenden und strafenden Gott*”.

As far as the abbreviations are concerned, we may distinguish abbreviations at the beginning, at the end, or in the body of a given Gospel passage. As an example of the last we refer to the Feast of the Guardian Angels, from which vv. 6-9 of Mk. 18 have been removed, which warn of the punishments for those who give scandal to “one of these little ones”: and state that it is better to go into life maimed, lame, or with one eye, than to be cast whole into everlasting fire. We note that a synoptic parallel is only optional for the 6th Sunday in ordinary time (Year A). In this

connection we note also that the Lord's word about a place of "wailing and grinding of teeth" has been made optional each time it occurs (on the 16th, 17th, 28th, and 33rd Sundays of Year A).

ii. **The Epistles**

Kaschewsky demonstrates that the following themes have been suppressed in the Epistles: I. World, Sin, and Judgment; II. Putting Christianity into Practice; III. Sacred Symbolism. The first category comprises the following topics: 1) not as the Heathens; 2) the World and the Flesh; 3) Lust, Sin, and Devil; 4) Sin and Punishment; 5) Angels, Judgment and Damnation. The second category comprises: 1) Works pleasing to God; 2) Suffering for the sake of Christ.

Let us give examples of suppressed passages, according to Kaschewsky's schema:

I.1 Not as the Heathens

In the Epistle of the 18th Sunday in Ordinary Time (Year B), that is to say Eph.4. vv.17, 20-24, the following verses (18-19) have been suppressed: "Having their understanding darkened: being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their hearts, who, despairing, have given themselves up to lasciviousness, unto the working of all uncleanness, unto covetousness." Fr. Georg May in his work *Der Glaube in der nachkonziliaren Kirche* (: Faith in the Postconciliar Church) Düsseldorf 1984, (p. 148), asks whether these verses have perhaps been suppressed because they are contrary to ecumenism, or to the ideology of the anonymous Christian.

I.2 The World and the Flesh

The Epistle of the 13th Sunday in Ordinary Time (Year C) consists of the Letter to the Galatians 5.13-18. The subsequent verses 19-26, which formed the Epistle of the 14th Sunday after Pentecost in the Old Rite, no longer appear. They include verse 24: "And they that are Christ's, have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences" - the 'foundation of any authentic Christian asceticism' in the words of Fr. B. Deneke FSSP.

I. 3 Lust, Sin, and the Devil

Three passages on the Devil (1 Peter 5. 6-11; Eph. 4. 23-8; Eph. 6. 10-17) previously occurring on the 3rd, 19th, and 21st Sunday after Pentecost respectively, have been removed. We may observe that this corresponds to the elimination of the prayer to St. Michael after the Low Mass, and Fr. May remarks that it corresponds to a general tendency in the Postconciliar Church manifest in the elimination of the exorcisms in the New Rite of Baptism and in the New Rite of extreme Unction. The same may be said of the emasculated new *benedictionale*. Can we regard this tendency as anything less than irresponsible in an age where the Devil enjoys greater liberty than ever over the world? - indeed, such suppressions surely only contribute to this liberty.

I.4 Sin and Punishment

St. Paul's warning against Holy Communion in the state of mortal sin (1 Cor. 11. 27-9, and referred to above) "...he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself..." has been excised from the Maundy Thursday epistle as from the Feast of Corpus Christi (Year C).

In this same subsection we mention the suppression of the account of Judas' tragic end in the 7th Sunday of Easter (Year B) with the excision of vv. 18, 19, and 20b from Acts 1.15-20. This excision corresponds to that of the parallel passage in the Palm Sunday Gospel of the Passion according to Saint Matthew (Passion A).

I.5 Angels, Judgment, and Damnation

The most striking of all the suppressions must be that occurring on the 7th Sunday of Easter (Year C). Here the passage Apc. 22.12-20 has been abbreviated in the following manner: first, v.15 has been excised: "without [the Holy City] are dogs and sorcerers and unchaste and murderers and servers of idols, and every-one that loveth and maketh a lie", then vv. 18-19 have been removed: "For I testify to every-one that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book: if any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the Holy City, and from these things that are written in this book." Michael Davies observes (p. 151): "Clearly verse 15 had to be omitted for the negative implication that not all men will necessarily be saved, and, having omitted verse 15, verses 18 and 19 had to go, for the negative implication that those who tamper with the Scriptures will be excluded from Heaven."

II. Putting Christianity into Practice

Here we simply refer to the suppression of the epistle on Septuagesima Sunday 1 Cor. 9. 24-7 which contains the words: “and everyone that striveth for the mastery refraineth himself from all things” (25a) and “I chastise my body and bring it into subjection” (27a).

III. Sacred Symbolism

We conclude with the suppression of vv. 1-4, 11b, and 14-16 from the first chapter of the Apocalypse on the Feast of St. Michael the Archangel, whereby the description of the Son of man in his Divinity is diluted, to the impoverishment of the catechetical force of these verses.

In regard to the changes made in the Gospels and Epistles, we remark with Mgr. Gamber in “The Reform of the Roman Liturgy” (ch. 5), that “what is in part a fifteen-hundred-year Tradition has been interrupted without anything better being put into its place.” We conclude that if, in relation to the Council’s desire to “set the table of God’s Word more richly”, the new readings are richer quantitatively, they are poorer qualitatively: that is, in their doctrinal content. *In fine* Mgr. Bugnini’s criticism of the readings of the Old Rite may, as Fr. Bernward Deneke acutely observes, be more readily applied to the New Rite readings: for here the Word of God has been “*alterata...mancante, deformata, scheletrita*: altered, represented in insufficient measure, distorted, skeletalized” (*La Riforma Liturgica* p. 59).

C. Mistranslations

Before moving on, we shall make certain brief comments on the translations to be found in the New Rite. We have already noted that one of the advantages of the Latin language is its universality. Once the Mass is translated, the sense of the vernacular may not correspond exactly to the sense of the original, or it may indeed be entirely different from that sense. It is the latter case that we wish to examine here, in six different examples.

1. The most blatant example is the translation of “*Pro multis*” in the Consecration of the Mass with “for all men” in English, “*fuer alle*” in German, “*per tutti*” in Italian, and so forth. These words, which break with a 1,500-year tradition, have no precedent in any previous liturgical text, but rather derive from modern theological theories⁸³. The Church teaches that Christ died with the intention of saving all men, but that not all men accept the fruit of His death. The new words conform to Church teaching if they are understood of Christ’s intention; they do not do so, if they are understood of the fruit of His death. The new words are infelicitous, first because they constitute a mistranslation, second because they may readily be understood in the non-Catholic sense.⁸⁴

2. Another example is the French translation of “*Consubstantialem Patri*” in the Creed with “*de même nature que le Père*” (see “*La Nouvelle Messe*”, Louis Salleron, ch.I.2). Here the formulation of the Council of Nicea in 325 is substituted by a phrase that is vague, and therefore open to heresy. Prof. Salleron compares the new phrase with the formulation of the Council of Constantinople in 360, which opened the doors to Arianism.

The new French version of this article of the Creed is infelicitous first because it is a mistranslation, second because it is vague and therefore open to heresy, and third, because as Cd. Journet remarks (as quoted in p. 25 of *La Nouvelle Messe*), it does not present “*ce mot béni et si profondément traditionnel de consubstantial* (: this blessed and so profoundly traditional word consubstantial)” in an age where *inter alia* the dogma of the Divinity of Christ is bracketed out. Indeed, Prof. Salleron goes further and suggests that the change represents a hatred for dogma itself⁸⁵.

3. Another significant mistranslation, or pair of mistranslations, concerns the prayer preceding Holy Communion: “*Domine non sum dignus ut intres sub tectum meum, sed tantum dic verbo et sanabitur anima mea.*”⁸⁶ This is translated into English with: “Lord I am not worthy to receive you, but only say the word and I shall be healed”; and into Italian with: “*Signore non sono degno di partecipare alla tua mensa, ma di soltanto la parola e io sarò salvato*”⁸⁷.

Here the desacralization that we have already observed in the fact that this prayer is no longer repeated three times as it is in the Old Rite, is also manifest in the translations of *anima* as “I” or “io”, and in the distancing from the eucharistic dogma that in Holy Communion God Himself enters the soul, the inmost self of man. For in the English “receive Thee under my roof” becomes simply “receive you”, and in the Italian it is replaced by the idea of “a mere sharing at the same table, a simple friendship⁸⁸”, where we observe, yet again, the movement towards a Protestant, meal-centred theology.

We add two examples taken from the Collects (from the book “*Liturgia*” quoted above) which are eloquent, even if less important.

4. On Monday of the first week of Lent in the Old Rite there is a mention of *ieiunium*: fasting; in the New Rite it becomes *opus quadragesimale*: lenten work; and in the translation (of 1983) it becomes *impegno quadragesimale*, lenten commitment. The suppression of the reference to fasting is typical of the new prayers. As Fr. Cekada notes, this corresponds to its effective abolition with the Apostolic Constitution *Paenitemini* of 1966.

5. On Good Friday the universal prayer for the government in the Old Rite contains the prayer for *religionis integritas*: integrity of religion (in other words, of the Catholic religion). In the New Rite it contains the prayer for *populorum (gentium) prosperitas* and *religionis libertas*: the prosperity of peoples and the liberty of religion. In the Italian translations of 1970, 1973, and 1983, this is translated as *il progresso sociale e la libertà religiosa*: social progress and religious liberty.

6. As a final example of mistranslation in the broader sense of the substitution of one term for another, we refer to ch.1 of Bianchi’s work where the author considers the substitution of the name *Gesù Cristo* (or *Cristo Gesù*) in the (faithful) Italian translation of the Old Rite, with the names *Cristo* or *il Cristo* (the Christ) in the vernacular of the New Rite. The frequency of the mention of *Gesù Cristo*, (or *Cristo Gesù*) in proportion to *Cristo* in the Old Rite is 2,235 : 180; in the 1970 translation of the New Rite it is 353 : 1,114.

The frequency of *il Cristo* in the Old Rite is 35. In the 1970 Italian translation of the New Rite it is 40; in the 1973 translation it is 220; in 1983 it is 308.

Here we note a remarkable decrease in the name *Gesù Cristo* in the later translations, and a remarkable increase in the name *Cristo*. From 1970 onwards, we note a further remarkable increase of the name *il Cristo*: this may take place either by substituting the term *Cristo* in the Italian edition (as in the 1970 version of the prayer Good Friday) with *il Cristo* (in the 1973 version), or by introducing the term *il Cristo* when there is no equivalent in the previous text. As an example on Good Friday in the New Rite *salus mundi* (: the Saviour of the world) is translated as *colui che è la salvezza del mondo* (: He Who is the salvation of the world) in 1970, and as *il Cristo Salvatore del mondo* (: The Christ, Saviour of the world) in 1973.

In such phenomena we witness a movement from a personal name of the Saviour to a less personal and more abstract name, and then to an even less personal and even more abstract name.

We do not claim that all the mistranslations that there may be have the same ideological bias, but we simply wish to observe that all the above examples show a dislike for that which is proper to Catholicism: dogma; the Person of Jesus Christ; the Divinity of Jesus Christ; the limited number of the elect; and sin and mortification. They express “the general drift towards subjectivism and detachment from any fixed point of reference” (*Iota Unum* 280 p.618) in favour of humanist, materialistic values.

In summary then, in this second part of the essay we have seen in the general features of the Mass a process of desacralization on the one hand and of elevation of man on the other; in the Propers we have seen a corresponding tendency to eliminate the sense of God as King, as Judge, and as the executor of His Judgements on the one hand, and man’s sinfulness and his need to mortify himself on the other. The six mistranslations that we have considered manifest a similar ideology. All of these changes present the faithful with a “bland and superficial religion” (Fr. Cekada). Taken as a whole, they represent an abandonment of the cult of God in favour of the cult of man.

D. Motivation: *Rapprochement* with the World

In the first part of this essay, we considered the ecumenical motivation of the changes made to the Old Rite, in other words the motivation of *rapprochement* with Protestantism; in this second part, we consider the motivation of *rapprochement* with the world.

Evidence of such motivation may be found in the works of Mgr. Bugnini (“*La Riforma Liturgica*”), and of four of his collaborators, Fathers Augé (on the Collects), Raffa (on the Secrets), Fervetti (on the Postcommunions), and Braga (on the New Roman Missal and the Propers of the Saints): see the respective articles in “*Ephemerides Liturgicae*” 84 (1970).

Mgr. Bugnini speaks of “adaptations” (*La Riforma Liturgica* III 25.1 p.391⁸⁹); Fr. Augé speaks of abridging texts that were “too negative, moralizing, or polemical” (p. 298); Fr. Braga speaks of “not putting in difficulty the psychology of the man of to-day who has other problems, a different way of thinking, and also lives in a different material and disciplinary situation: *non porre in difficoltà la psicologia dell’uomo di oggi, che sente altri problemi, ha un diverso modo di pensare, vive anche in una situazione materiale e disciplinare diversa*” (p. 272).

The same liturgist, when justifying changes to the propers of the saints, speaks of ecumenical needs, adaptation to new positions that the Church has taken, the overcoming of “devotional aspects, or particular ways of venerating or

invoking the saints... to put in light new values and new perspectives: *aspetti devozionali o particolari modi di venerazione e invocazioni dei santi...per mettere in luce nuovi valori e nuove prospettive*" (p. 419).

Let us confine ourselves to discussing two of the principal concepts of the liturgical reformers: "negativity" and "the man of to-day."

In the *Ampleforth Journal*, Summer 1971, p. 59 (quoted by Michael Davies p.150), it is observed of "negativity" that: "attempts to define it in philosophical or theological terms tend to get nowhere." How are we to understand it, then? From the standpoint of the Faith, talking of realities such as sin and Hell is not negative, but positive, because it helps us to avoid them. Do we call a light-house negative? Or a hand-rail along a cliff path? Or, in other words, if we call it "negative" to talk of Hell, then it is surely more negative to be in Hell, so therefore it is positive to talk about it, in order to avoid it. In fact, sin and Hell and the other "hard sayings" (Jn. 6.61) of Our Lord are only negative from the standpoint of the World: from the standpoint of some -one who has no Faith. For if they do not correspond to reality, then it is clearly only depressing to think about them.

Who is the "man of to-day" so revered by the liturgical reformers? Man is the same to-day as he always has been: fallen, and in need of Grace and the ascetical life. The Mass according to the Old Rite is concerned with man understood in this way, it has been concerned with him for 2,000 years: it will be concerned with him forever. If the man of to-day does not share this view of himself, then he must change it because it is false: it is not for the Mass to change.

But does the man of to-day in fact have a different view of himself? Did he in fact even have a desire to reform the Mass? Michael Davies remarks (p. 83): "there was definitely no wide-spread desire for liturgical change in English-speaking countries before Vatican II among the laity, the parish clergy, or the bishops." It was not desired by the people: rather it was imposed upon them, taking less account of their sensibilities than had the reform of Martin Luther⁹⁰. This would explain the alienation of the faithful from the Mass in subsequent decades⁹¹.

No, the desire for change came rather from a minority of intellectuals. Evelyn Waugh wrote of the proponents of liturgical change in the "Tablet" (15th February 1964, MD p. 83): "we had looked upon them as harmless cranks who were attempting to devise a charade of second-century habits...suddenly we find the cranks in authority."

What spirit informs these intellectuals? Not so much that of "the man of to-day", but that of fallen man, and they have accomodated the liturgy to him. Both the Old and the New Rite address fallen man, then, but the Old Rite does

so in order to elevate him with Grace to the path of salvation, while the New Rite does so in order to flatter him and to re-assure him that he in his proper place.

Now the spirit of fallen man is the spirit of the World⁹², and the deliberate introduction of the spirit of the World into the Church is nothing short of a revolution. We refer to Chapters 2, 3, and 4 of Michael Davies' book "Pope Paul's New Mass", being the third volume in the trilogy "Liturgical Revolution". The chapters bear the respective titles: Revolutionary Legislation, Reform or Revolution? and a Successful Revolution. As he states (p. 81): "the purpose of a revolution is to overthrow the existing order", and shows how this existing order was destroyed and a new order created.

In relation to the destruction of the old order, we refer the reader to the introductory section of this essay, quoting at the same time the most damning indictment of this destruction: "Truly if one of the devils in C.S. Lewis' "The Screwtape Letters" has been entrusted with the ruin of the liturgy, he could not have done it better." (Dietrich von Hildebrand "The Devastated Vineyard", p. 71, MD p. 80).

In relation to the creation of a new order, we quote Mgr. Bugnini's words: "it is a question ... I can say almost [of] a recasting" (*La documentation catholique* 1493, 7th May 1967); "the liturgical reform is a major conquest of the Catholic Church (*grande conquista della Chiesa cattolica*) a sort of trail-blazer (*una specie di battistrada*)" (*Notitiae* 92, April 1974, p. 126, MD p. 81).

The reformers are revolutionaries then, the creators of a New Order: new men creating new things: *novi homines* creating *novae res*⁹³, and united in their scorn for the past: "*non hanno alcun amore*: they have no love," writes Cardinal Antonelli,⁹⁴ "*alcuna venerazione per ciò che ci è stato tramandato. Hanno in partenza disistima contro tutto ciò ch'è attualmente. Una mentalità negativa, ingiusta, e dannosa* : no veneration for tradition. From the outset they have scorn for all that exists in the present. A mentality that is negative, unjust, destructive."

They demolish "the old building" (in the image quoted in the introduction to the present essay), which was not just a building, but a house, and the house of God: His most ancient, His most glorious, and most sacred. They work in a way characterized by the "*incompetenza di molti, sete di novità, discussioni affrettate, votazioni caotiche pur di approvare al più presto*: the incompetence of many, thirst for novelty, hurried discussions, chaotic voting to have things passed as quickly as possible" (Fr. Nicola Bux p. 50 *La Riforma di Benedetto XVI, La Liturgia tra Innovazione e Tradizione*, summarizing the evaluation by Cardinal Antonelli).

They build a new house, which serves the same purpose as the old, but is no longer appropriate to that purpose. For like all revolutionaries, they are inspired not by Faith, but by the World, and in the centre of this World is not God, but man.

Conclusion

The conclusion of this essay is two-fold: one, that the theology of the Old Rite is Catholic, and the theology of the New Rite is Protestant; two, that the theology of the Old Rite is that of the cult of God, and the theology of the New Rite is that of the cult of man.

Epilogue: Shortcomings of the *Novus Ordo Missae*

As an epilogue, we wish to summarize the shortcomings of the New Rite that have been uncovered in the course of this study. In view of these, it is clearly impossible for us to ascribe an equal worth to both rites, that is in an unqualified sense. We may ascribe an equal worth to them in fact only inasmuch as both⁹⁵ render present the Sacrifice of Mount Calvary.

1. The Faith is Misrepresented

We have shown how the Mass is represented as a meal; how the Person and Divinity of Jesus Christ is obscured; how sin, Judgment, Hell, the Devil, the imitation of Christ, and the ascetic life are minimalized. Faith is no longer presented as the ultimate Truth, and the life of Faith as a spiritual battle with the powers of darkness, as a question of eternal life and eternal death.

Rather, Faith is presented as a collection of edifying stories, and the life of Faith as a commitment to some undefined, future goal. Nebulous terms such as “the people of God”, “community”, and “solidarity” replace those of

the Church and Charity, and even the Person of Jesus Christ Himself becomes transformed into an abstract and vague concept.

2. The Cult of God is Compromised

The Mass no longer manifests the deepest Truths of the Faith: the Presence of the Eucharistic Lord, His Death on the Cross of Calvary; it no longer answers to the deepest needs of the human heart: the desire to be loved by God with a perfect love, to receive God Himself into the soul, to love God with all one's being, to offer oneself up entirely to Him.

Genuflections, kneeling, and silence are discouraged; recollection is made almost impossible by the constant noise and the interaction between celebrant and congregation, all of which expresses no more than the celebration of the community by itself.

3. The Faithful are Alienated

With Faith and the Mass emptied of their content (subjectively speaking), there is no incentive to attend Mass, except for the devout. For the others, attendance becomes simply a matter of convention, of custom, or of purely cultural interest. A similar situation exists in relation to sacramental marriage and baptism. The falling-off of attendance at the Mass according to the new rite seems to represent an intermediary stage on its path to extinction.

4. Graces are Reduced

Graces are reduced because there are fewer Masses, because the prayers in these Masses are fewer, and because the devotion in these prayers is less.

There are fewer Masses on account of the multitude of concelebrations, where, since Our Lord Jesus Christ is the primary celebrant of the Mass, there will only ever be one Mass celebrated, however many concelebrants there are⁹⁶.

Moreover, since many prayers have been eliminated from the Old Rite, there will be many fewer graces also for this reason: less will be received by he who asks for less. As examples we take the suppression of prayers preparing for a devout Holy Communion, all the prayers to the Blessed Virgin Mary, to the popes, the martyrs, and the holy apostles Peter and Paul, as noted above. As a particularly egregious example we take that of the suppression of the

prayer to the Archangel Michael at the end of the Low Mass. How many millions of daily prayers by priests and faithful to curb the action of Satan have thereby been silenced? How can any-one with Faith not understand the growth of evil in the world in this light?

Finally, the dispositions of the celebrant and of those who attend the Mass determine the amount of graces received for the Church, for those for whom the Mass is offered, and for those present. The New Rite is less conducive to devotion, so that the quantity of these graces will be less.

5. God is Dishonoured

The gravest consequence of the New Rite is, however, the dishonour of God⁹⁷. The iconostasis of silence has been dismantled. The Lord is called forth in a vulgar tongue, in words composed by His enemies. His Presence is ignored, His Person is demeaned. He is handled clumsily: if He falls, it does not matter. He is placed on unblessed tables, segregated from His friends. His garments have been reduced. He, The King of Kings in the state of Immolation, is placed in vulgar, primitive vessels. As the people stand or sit, and think that they are listening to a mere tale, He is crucified and dies before their eyes. He is raised above their heads: "Behold the Lamb of God!": they stand and stare. He is delivered over to them: He, Almighty God, their Creator and their Highest Good. He is placed in their unclean hands. They receive Him into their darkened hearts, they brush Him off their hands, they trample over Him unwittingly, they take Him home. He is consigned to their caprice or their malice.

Pilate therefore went forth again and saith to them: Behold I bring him forth unto you, that you may know that I find no cause in him. Jesus therefore came forth bearing the crown of thorns and the purple garment. And he saith to them: Behold the Man⁹⁸.

1. as though all that can be said for it is that it is a thing of the past. This position is untenable because many of the supporters of the old rite are young. Nostalgia means the desire to return and it is impossible to return to a place where one has never been.
2. cf. the subsection on Latin below.
3. cf. section D.
4. in a subjectivist move
5. they view contemporary liturgical abuses as unconnected with the New Rite (see the beginning of the epilogue to this essay and the conclusion to section A of part II for a reply). Such are the pacifists in the field of the liturgy; in the field of doctrine they view the Second Vatican Council in continuity with Tradition and consider subsequent doctrinal abuses as unconnected with it.
6. cf. the subsection on the Gospel and Epistles.
7. Vol III of Liturgical Revolution, Angelus Press 1980.
8. “*Sie stellt auf jeden Fall den aeltesten Ritus dar*”.
9. as Mgr. Bugnini opines (at III 25.1 p.390 of his book *la Riforma liturgica*, op. cit): “*Ambedue sono scaturiti dalla volontà riformatrice e dai principi stabiliti da un concilio*”
10. cf. The Reform of the Holy Week in the Years 1951-1956 by Fr. Stefano Carusi on *Rorate Caeli* (internet).
11. known for his new version of the psalms which had been untouched since their translation by St. Jerome in the 4th century.
12. *c'est une autre liturgie de la messe.....le rite romain tel que nous l'avons connu n'existe plus....Il est détruit.*
13. “*Man brach das alte Gebaeude ab und baute ein anderes, freilich weitgehend aus dem Material des Bisherigen und auch unter Verwendung der alten Bauplaene...ein Neubau*”.
14. “*... nach dem Muster technischer Produktion das Machen, das platte Produkt des Augenblicks.*”
15. “*anstatt einer fruchtbaren Erneuerung der Liturgie, eine Zerstoerung der in vielen Jahrhunderten organisch gewachsenen Formen des Gottesdienstes*”. In virtue of such considerations we speak in this essay of two distinct rites, and not of two distinct forms of a rite. In this we follow Mgr. Gamber who entitles two of his liturgical works: *Ritus romanus und Ritus modernus and Neuer und alter Messritus*.
16. “*Si quis dixerit in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, aut quod offerri non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum, A.S.*”
17. “*Una eademque hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotium ministerio, qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa.*”
18. “*... sacrificium quo cruentum illud semel in cruce peragendum repraesentaretur eiusque memoria in finem usque saecula permaneret atque illius salutaris virtus in remissionem eorum quae a nobis quotidie committuntur peccatorum applicaretur*”.
19. We note Mgr. Bugnini’s comments on the “*liturgia del popolo di Dio,....sempre più delle “celebrazioni”,... una assemblea riunita per ascoltare e rispondere alla parola di Dio, partecipare al sacramento, fare memoria del Signore Gesù, rendere grazie a Dio Padre*” (*La Riforma Liturgica* I.4. p.53-4). We note also that Pope Paul VI asked him to have the Instruction approved by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, which, greatly to the Pope’s chagrin, he did not.
20. Since many faithful to-day seem to view the Mass as a “commemorative meal” or “feast” in line with this Protestant theory, we consider it useful briefly to examine this view: first in relation to the element of the meal or feast, then in relation to the element of commemoration. Now one of the names by which the Catholic Church calls the Mass is “Supper”, because it was “instituted during the salutary mystery of the Last Supper” as the Catechism of Trent explains (in the section on the names of the Mass at the beginning of

the treatment of the Blessed Eucharist), but it is not essentially a supper but a sacrifice, as we have shown above. In consequence of the definitions of Trent, the Mass may only be described as a supper if the sacrifice is identical with a supper. This in fact could accord with a problematical, minority theological opinion espoused for example by St. Robert Bellarmine, who argues that the Holy Communion of the celebrant constitutes the destruction of the Divine Victim. But clearly we are not justified to present as Catholic doctrine a minority view, and a minority view which is problematic at that; and much less are we justified in defining it in the very same terms as were used by the Protestant heresiarchs. The common opinion of the theologians, including St. Thomas Aquinas, is rather that the sacrifice consists in the Consecration alone (*Summa* III 82.10). As for the Holy Communion, St Thomas argues that is a participation in the effect of the sacrifice (*Summa* III 83.1). We may therefore conclude that the Holy Communion is an integral, rather than an essential, part of the Mass. We cannot define the Mass as a “supper” or a “meal” then; much less can we describe it as a “feast”, for a feast requires the participation of a number of people, whereas the Mass can be validly offered without the Communion, or even the presence, of the congregation or even the Mass-server. We note that the Protestants’ feast theory corresponds to their heretical rejection of the private Mass (cf. the Council of Trent S.22 ch.6, can. 8). In regard to the commemorative element of the Mass, the fact that it commemorates the Last Supper clearly has no bearing on its essence; and the Council of Trent declares that the Mass both commemorates and renders present the Sacrifice of Calvary (S.22 cap.1): “...*Sacrificium, quo cruentum illud semel in cruce peragendum repraesentaretur, eiusque memoria in finem usque saeculi permaneret...*”, but anathematizes any-one who should say that it is a mere commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross (S.22 can.3): “... *Si quis dixerit Missae Sacrificium... nudam commemorationem sacrifici in cruce peracti...Anathema sit*”.

21. where incidentally there is still no mention of transubstantiation (cf. Iota Unum s.272, p.602).
22. “*Et abhinc omnia fere sonant ac olent oblationem*” *Formula Missae et Communionis* (1523) WA 12,211, 14-22)
23. ‘*Comedite et bibite. Hoc est universum opus, quod in Eucharistia facere jubemur.*(*De Abroganda missa privata Martini Lutheri sententia* (1521)WA 8,439, 34-40.
24. Although the pacifists would feign believe that the Roman Canon is unaltered, so that they claim that celebrating the New Rite with the Roman Canon (combined for example with the celebration in Latin and *versus Dominum*) is in essence equivalent to celebrating the Old Rite, it must clearly be stated that (apart from all the changes in the remainder of the rite) the Roman Canon has indeed been altered: the silence has been abolished (as we shall see later in this section); the genuflections have been reduced (as we shall see in the following section); the signs of the Cross have been greatly reduced (*ibid.*); the bows and altar-kiss have been removed as well as the rubrics governing the closure of the celebrant’s fingers; brackets have enclosed the concluding formula *per Christum Dominum Nostrum* (cf. section 10 below) as well as a quantity of the saints’ names; directions for concelebration have been added; and even the wording of the Consecration has been changed, as we shall discuss in subsection (iii) on the formula of consecration below, with the introduction of the phrases *quod pro vobis tradetur* and *hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, and the displacement of the phrase: *mysterium fidei*.
25. although in more recent editions this usage may be reintroduced.
26. *Dicunt ergo quidam quod quaecumque formae horum verborum proferantur quae sunt scripta in canone sufficere ad consecrationem. Probabilius autem dici videtur quod illis solis verbis perficitur consecratio quibus Ecclesia utitur ex traditione Apostolorum structa. Evangelistae enim verba Domini recitare intenderunt quantum pertinet ad rationem historiae non autem secundum quod ordinantur ad consecrationem sacramentorum, quas in occulto habebant in primitiva Ecclesia, propter infideles.*
27. see Mgr. Gamber *zur Reform des Ordo Missae in der Reform der Roemischen Liturgie* (op.cit.).
28. see his commentary to I Corinthinas above.
29. see the extract from S.22 cap.4 quoted above at the beginning of this section on the Canon.
30. “*Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimae Eucharistiae sacramento contineri vere, realiter, et substantialiter, corpus et sanguinem unum cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi ac proinde totum Christum: sed dixerit, tantummodo esse in eo ut in signo vel figura, aut virtute: A.S.*”
31. *Hostiam puram, Hostiam sanctam, Hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae aeternae, et Calicem salutis perpetuae.*
32. whereas any-one rash enough to deny that adoration is due to the Blessed Sacrament incurs Anathema (Trent Session XIII can.6).

33. We observe at this point that Communion in the hand effectively diminishes belief in the Real Presence among Catholics. The principal evil of this practice, however, is that it dishonours the Eucharistic Lord, in placing Him in unconsecrated hands; in facilitating the removal of Hosts from the church for sacrilegious purposes, out of caprice or pure ignorance; and in allowing fragments of the Most Blessed Sacrament to drop or to be brushed off fingers, in which Christ exists totally and entirely ("*Totus enim et integer Christus sub panis specie et sub quavis ipsius parte...existit.*" Council of Trent S.13 *cap.3*) - see the last of the shortcomings of the New Rite enumerated at the end of this essay.

34. *Iota Unum* 269, p.594.

35. reflecting one or more of three distinct errors: that the Mass is a meal; that mortal sin is unlikely to occur in everyday life; that if it does, then a non-sacramental act of contrition will always suffice to cancel it.

36. *Iota Unum* 269. We observe, however, that since the publication of the work quoted, there has been a certain return to such practices.

37. All of the abuses listed in this section constitute a denial of the Real Presence, if not on the theoretical level, then certainly on the practical level.

38. Two exceptions are the offering of the wine, where he speaks in the plural because the prayer derives from that form of Mass where he would be assisted at this point by the deacon; and the prayer *in Spiritu Humilitatis*, where he prays that "our Sacrifice" may be pleasing to God, which, coming after the *Suscipe Sancte Pater*, refers to the oblation of the congregation together with the Divine Victim (MD p.323).

39. *Si quis dixerit, Missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis...neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: A.S.*

40. that is a *sacrificium laetiticum* and *eucharisticum*.

41. that is a *sacrificium propitiatorium* and *impetratorium*.

42. Pope Pius XI writes in *Officiorum Omnium* (1922): "... the Church, precisely because it embraces all nations and is destined to endure until the end of time... of its very nature requires a language which is universal, immutable, and non-vernacular." (MD p.377)

43. *Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiae Romanae ritum, quo submissa voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; aut lingua tantum vulgari Missam celebrari debere...Anathema sit.*

44. This *rationale*, which has re-surfaced in the contemporary liturgical debate, is both the most wide-spread and the most superficial argument against the Latin liturgy. To reject something simply because one cannot understand it is a conduct unworthy of a man. Let the arguments in favour of Latin enumerated here suffice to justify the minimal effort required to consult vernacular translations during the Sacred Mysteries.

45. Pope Pius XII writes in *Mediator Dei* (1947) that "the use of Latin prevailing in a great part of the Church affords...an effective safeguard against the corruption of true doctrine." (MD p.377)

46. Pope Paul VI in *Sacrificium Laudis* (1966) calls the Latin language "the richest treasury of piety." (MD p.378)

47. and also because it represents God as stable, eternal, and exalted (*Iota Unum* 290 p.644).

48. the Council of Trent, S. 22, ch.8 decrees: "...*mandat sancta Synodus pastoribus et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter inter Missarum celebrationem vel per se vel per alios. ex his, quae in Missa leguntur, exponant atque inter cetera sanctissimi huius sacrificii mysterium aliquod declarent, diebus praesertim Dominicis et festis.*" The Roman Catechism duly declares at the beginning of its treatment of the Sacrament of the Eucharist that "...parish priests must expound with the utmost diligence everything that can help to illustrate the majesty of the Eucharist..." etc.

49. cf. the Instruction on Sacred Music and Sacred Liturgy 22a (Sacred Congregation of Rites 1958, quoting *Mediator Dei* of Pope Pius XII 1947, with its reference to St.Paul): "This participation must in the first place be internal, actuated with a devout attention of the

mind and with the affection of the heart, by means of which the faithful, 'unite themselves most intimately with the High Priest...and with Him and for Him offer (the sacrifice) and give themselves with Him.' ”

50. in his book “The New Mass: a Pastoral Guide”(1969).
51. The author of this essay has given a number of lectures on the Holy Mass to young Catholics and to parishioners of *Novus Ordo* parishes: no-one has yet been able to tell him what it is.
52. as a commemorative meal, for example – see the earlier footnote on this misconception.
53. or *minus idonea*
54. Despite all these liturgical and social innovations, a number of faithful, after having attended the Old Rite for the first time, have confided to the author that they have been able to participate in it better than in the New Rite.
55. the same pantheistic-sounding title with which God is addressed in the oblation of the bread and of the wine.
56. where we also note an anti-militaristic tendency (cf. *Iota Unum* 281 p.620).
57. “...eine erschreckende Annaeherung an Vorstellungen des Protestantismus, die im Zeichen eines falsch verstandenen Oekumenismus segelt.”
58. “*Qu’il nous suffise de dire que la Nouvelle Messe, c’est liturgiquement la Cène “évangélique” - avec son caractère de repas, sa langue populaire, sa table, sa célébration face au peuple, sa communion dans la main ou sous les deux espèces et, dans les paroles et les rites, l’estompage de la représentation du sacrifice, de la Présence réelle, et du sacerdoce ministériel.*”
59. “*Un des fruits en sera peut-être que des communautés non-catholiques pourront célébrer la sainte Cène avec les memes prières que l’Eglise catholique. Théologiquement c’est possible.*”
60. “*es mueszte heute fuer einen Protestanten moeglich sein, in der katholischen eucharistischen Feier das vom Herrn eingesetzte Abendmahl zu erkennen... die neuen eucharistischen Gebete erleichtern es uns, eine evangelische Theologie zu wiederfinden.*”
61. “*Das war mir zu katholisch*”
62. In this context we may compare the following four forms of cult: the Protestant community meal presented as a community meal (as by the Non-conformists, MD p.414); the Protestant community meal presented as the Sacrifice of Calvary (as by certain High Anglicans); the Sacrifice of Calvary presented as a community meal (as in the new Roman rite); and the Sacrifice of Calvary presented as the Sacrifice of Calvary (as in the old Roman rite). As far as each form of cult aspires to be faithful to Christ’s words: “Do this in memory of me”, we may summarize these forms of cult respectively as follows: False presented as False; False presented as True; True presented as False; True presented as True.
63. Here we note that the Critical Study raises the question as to whether the words of consecration would be valid if an individual celebrant understood them only as a form of narrative in accordance with the spirit of the *Novus Ordo* (see above).
64. In this connection, we refer to “The Masonic Plan to Destroy the Holy Mass in Thirty-three Points” promulgated by the Masonic Grand Master and in effect from 1962 (*Editions Delacroix BP 18 35430 Chateauneuf*) which includes directives to sow doubts on the Real Presence and encourage ecumenism (3); to suppress the Latin liturgy (4), sacred organ music (7), altars in favour of tables (10); to remove tabernacles from altars and eliminate genuflections (11); to suppress the cult of the saints (12) and the statues and images of the angels (15); to introduce lay-ministers of the Eucharist (including women), Communion in the hand, the sign of peace (29), etc. We submit these elements to the reader without any interest in drawing particular conclusions.
65. either directly behind the celebrant on the high altar, unless (perhaps sometimes because of the inappropriateness of this position) it has been removed from this, the most honourable, place in the church (cf. *Iota Unum* 270 p.596), to some side area.
66. “This arrangement recalls the ‘abomination’ deplored in Ezechiel 8:16, where the priests sacrifice with their backs turned to the *Sancta Sanctorum*, the Holy of Holies...whereas in a Catholic church we are dealing with the *Sanctissimum*”(*Iota Unum* 291 p.646).

67. In fact the objection that in the Old Rite the celebrant celebrates with his back to the people should be met with the rejoinder that the deepest significance of all things is determined by their relation to God, and that in the Old Rite the celebrant faces God, whereas in the New Rite he has his back to God.
68. In more recent years, violet has not seldom given way to white as the colour for funeral vestments, corresponding to the heresy of universal salvation which we note in our discussion of the mistranslation of "*pro multis*" as "for all men" etc. below, and which often finds expression in funeral addresses suggesting that the dear departed (even if not a practising Catholic) has already attained Paradise.
69. Lack of logic is of course typical of radical subjectivism.
70. St. Theresa of Avila said that she would have been ready to die to preserve the least of the rubrics of the Holy Mass. How many times would she not have had to die in these years of change!
71. See the sections on human expressiveness (284), the principle of creativity (285), and the movement from the sacred to the theatrical (286) in *Iota Unum* as examples of this subjectivism.
72. "...those ineffable Gregorian melodies...the fruit of the most elevated and sublime Catholic inspiration; admirable melodies from which we have departed, only to fall into something barbarous, believing that it was possible to substitute the melodies so easily...or in order to throw oneself into a type of music which is completely profane, something which constitutes the most repugnant contrast in comparison to the sanctity of the place, the majesty of the words, and the holiness of the mysteries." Dom Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Institutions*.
73. In this brutal and indiscriminate destruction, reminiscent of the worst excesses of the iconoclasts, we clearly see the Devil's hatred for the Sacrifice of Christ offered on the altar and the Adoration of Him by the people offered at the altar-rails. What other explanation could there be for such gratuitous and irrational violence? - or, for that matter, for that with which the modernizing clergy opposes the return of the Old Rite?
74. or rather profaned (in the true sense of the word), because these compositions have been banished from the church onto tapes and discs so that they may be played to the accompaniment of any number of secular activities, when they are not performed in sterile public halls or in churches where the Blessed Sacrament is not infrequently left in the tabernacle and ignored -perhaps the clearest sign of their divorce from the cult of God for which they were created.
75. although sometimes the *Kyrie* enjoys a three-fold repetition despite the new Mass text. Similarly the prayer *Domine non sum dignus* immediately preceding Holy Communion, recited three times first by the celebrant and later by the people, was reduced to a single recitation spoken by all at once.
76. the author recalls how a bereaved mother was only able to come to terms with the death of her son after having participated in a Requiem Mass sung for the repose of his soul.
77. which is how we reply to the pacifists mentioned in the Preface above. Similar remarks may be made, *mutatis mutandis*, of the Second Vatican Council.
78. Cd. Ratzinger: *My Life*, p.174, German version.
79. In addition, as Romano Amerio remarks (280 p.618): "There is certainly a tendency in modern languages to avoid organizing one's thought in a strongly synthetic structure, and to break up thoughts into a string of short statements instead. But this mode of expression also reflects a distaste for ontological or metaphysical theories of causation: a real connection between one thing and another is replaced by a mere succession of one thing after another."
80. "*Die neue Ordnung ist ganz deutlich von Exegeten und nicht von Liturgikern gemacht.*" *Die Reform der roemischen Liturgie: Weitere kritische Bemerkungen zum neuen Meszordo und zur Lektionsordnung*.
81. "*den meisten Glaebigen das Verstaendnis fuer derartige Bibelabschnitte fehlt...wird auch die Mehrzahl der Werktagslesungen aus dem Alten Testament in der neuen Lektionsordnung ueber die Koepfe der anwesenden Glaebigen hinweg vorgetragen...*" (*ibid.*)

82. in *Neuer und alter Meszritus*, Regensburg, 1983
83. see Mgr. Gamber *Weitere kritische Bemerkungen zum neuen Meszordo*, ch.5 of *Die Reform der Roemischen Liturgie (op. cit)*.
84. As Romano Amerio states in *Iota Unum* ch.281, p.620: “ Since...the two versions are meant to be saying the same thing, it is obvious that there would have been no reason for introducing the unwonted and unhelpful change, if the translators had not been intending to get rid of even the slightest hint of the Catholic doctrine of predestination, and to insinuate the idea of universal salvation instead.”
85. Romano Amerio refers to a detailed analysis of the “*Missel Romain*” in which this mistranslation appeared: *Missale Romanum et Missel Romain*, J. Renié, Paris 1975, and comments: “This shows how the heterodox nuances of the French version reflect the heterodox beliefs of the French bishops, 20% of whom do not accept the divinity of Christ.”
86. “Lord, I am not worthy to receive Thee under my roof, but only say the word and my soul shall be healed”
87. Lord, I am not worthy to share at your table, but only say the word and I shall be healed
88. *Iota Unum* ch.282, p.622.
89. “*La tradizione, deve inserirsi nel contesto storico di ogni tempo, tenendo fede ai principi dottrinali, ma adattandosi sul piano pratico delle attuazioni.*”
90. see the quotation of Mgr. Gamber in Part I C above.
91. see the Epilogue to this essay.
92. Two characteristics of this spirit particularly manifest in the cult of man are pride and indolence (or *acedia*, spiritual laziness): exalting what is subjective and demeaning what is objective - if it requires the slightest effort.
93. the Latin term for revolution.
94. in N. Giampietro’s: “*Il cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli e gli sviluppi della Riforma Liturgica dal 1948 al 1970*”, *Pontificio Ateneo, Santi’Anselmo*, Rome 1988, p.258, quoted in “*Liturgia*” p.158-9
95. subject to the reservation expressed in the Critical Study IV, and mentioned above in section D of the first part of this essay on the ecumenical motivation of the New Rite.
96. cf. *L’Eucharistie, salut du monde* II ch.3.II.1, Fr. Joseph de Sainte-Marie ocd, *Editions du Cèdre DMM*.
97. This is the gravest consequence because the glory of God is the primary finality of all things, and because the glory given to God by the Holy Mass is the greatest glory that there is.
98. Jn.19.4-5.