


## The Past: Liturgical Timeline (3)



Fifteen years will now elapse, fifteen very unfavorable years for the Church in those “first world” countries where it was long-established, before the next significant event - a finger-sized hole punctured in the dam. Public Masses according to the 1962 Roman Missal were illicit during The Dark Years. Contrast this approach of prohibiting the sacred liturgy of 1370 years to that of *Quo Primum*. Many Catholics voted their disapproval with their feet and left the Church.

The “Indult” was an instruction letter (*Quattuor Abhinc Annos*) from Cardinal Mayer, Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship, to the bishops. It permitted them to allow (or not allow) the Latin Mass in their diocese. Conditions were attached to any permission granted for the “old Mass.” If they chose to allow it, it was not then “illicit”. (It was never “invalid” as a Mass and it was said by some priests (privately) and by certain monastic orders through The Dark Years.)

The *Vatican Norms of 1986* was a report commissioned by Pope St. John Paul II regarding the use of the TLM and Latin in the liturgy.

Because of the poor response from the bishops, the same Pope, four years later, basically said “you’re not listening to me” and established a papal commission - *Ecclesia Dei* - to oversee and encourage the use of the TLM. At the same time he authorized the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter to say only the TLM in those dioceses where they were invited by the local bishop for that purpose.

Nearly twenty years would elapse before Benedict XVI would remove the requirement for the local Bishop’s permission and restore the right of every Catholic priest to say the TLM with his *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*. Let's examine these four events, and one in 2001 not directly related to the TLM, but important nonetheless.

### The Past: 1984 Indult

Cardinal Mayer (as Prefect for the Congregation for Divine Worship) issues an instruction letter - *Quattuor Abhinc Annos* to the bishops, permitting the TLM as an “Indult” (emphasis mine):

“Since, however, the same problem (“of priests and faithful holding to the so-called ‘Tridentine’ rite”) continues, the Supreme Pontiff, in a desire to meet the wishes of these groups, grants to diocesan bishops the possibility of using an indult whereby priests and faithful, who shall be expressly indicated in the letter of request to be presented to their own bishop, may be able to celebrate Mass by using the Roman Missal according to the 1962 edition, but under the following conditions: ...

This concession, indicative of the common Father's solicitude for all his children, must be used in such a way as not to prejudice the faithful observance of the liturgical reform in the life of the respective ecclesial communities.”

Consider that twenty years before this document was issued, the TLM was THE Mass of the Latin rite and had been for over 15 centuries.

After banning it in 1970, the undying love for the “old Mass” is here labeled “the same problem”. It required a special privilege or “Indult” from the local bishop to say it legally. And note the insistence that the malcontents “be expressly indicated in the letter of request”. Among the conditions enumerated were two rather onerous ones:

a) “That it be made publicly clear beyond all ambiguity that such priests and their respective faithful in no way share the positions of those who call in question the legitimacy and doctrinal exactitude of the Roman Missal promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1970.” (So, if they want a TLM, their loyalty is suspect?)

b) “Such celebration must be made only for the benefit of those groups that request it; in churches and oratories indicated by the bishop (not, however, in parish churches, unless the bishop permits it in extraordinary cases); and on the days and under the conditions fixed by the bishop either habitually or in individual cases.” (In other words, find some out of the way place (or vary the place) and time (or vary the time) to do this, lest it catch on.)

The closing sentence to a document that purportedly manifests the desire of the supreme pontiff “to meet the wishes of these groups” provides every bishop with an excuse to continue the prohibition. All he has to assert is that allowing the TLM will “prejudice the faithful observance of the liturgical reform.” (i.e. the *Novus Ordo*)

In this city, the Archbishop allowed the “Indult Mass” only on the first Saturday of the month, only at St. Agatha, and it did not fulfill your Sunday obligation.

### The Past: 1986 Norms

Ad Hoc commission of nine cardinals (Ratzinger, Mayer, Oddi, Stickler, Casaroli, Gantin, Innocenti, Palaz-zini, and Tomko) told Pope St. John Paul II that the Traditional Latin Mass had not been officially suppressed, any priest could say it without permission privately. They (8) also recommended that the “honor due” to the Latin language meant that at least one Latin Mass in the old or the new form should be said in any important city in a diocese every Sunday. The Pope did not act on this recommendation, unofficially called the “Vatican Norms of 1986.”

When the *Novus Ordo* was originally promulgated, many places continued to use Latin for the parts of the Ordinary of the Mass that had been chanted by the choir in the TLM High Masses. Specifically, the “Lord have mercy / *Kyrie eleison*” the “Glory to God in the highest / *Gloria in excelsis Deo*” the “Creed / *Credo*” the “Holy, Holy, Holy / *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*” and the “Lamb of God / *Agnus Dei*.” However as time passed, guitar Masses and newly-composed saccharine hymns in the vernacular replaced Latin and chant. This commission’s recommendations were an attempt to reverse this trend in the *Novus Ordo* and also promote the TLM.

Unfortunately, it took the Pope two more years to do anything further.

### The Past: 1988 Motu Proprio

*Motu Proprio Ecclesia Dei* issued by Pope St. John Paul II – (emphasis mine):

“To all those Catholic faithful who feel attached to some previous liturgical and disciplinary forms of the Latin tradition I wish to manifest my will to facilitate their ecclesial communion by means of the necessary measures to guarantee respect for their rightful aspirations. In this matter I ask for the support of the bishops and of all those engaged in the pastoral ministry in the Church.”

This document represents progress in the restoration of the TLM. While still requiring an “indult,” the Holy Father has acknowledged that the Catholic who wants to attend one has a right to do so, and he urges the bishops to make it so. Unfortunately, many of them still refused to do so.

### The Past: 1988 Motu Proprio

“Taking account of the importance and complexity of the problems referred to in this document, by virtue of my Apostolic Authority I decree the following:

c) moreover, respect must everywhere be shown for the feelings of all those who are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition, by a wide and generous application of the directives already issued some time ago by the Apostolic See for the use of the Roman Missal according to the typical edition of 1962.”

In many cases derision, not respect, was shown for the “feelings of all those who are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition...” By way of example, the now retired (2008) bishop of the Springfield - Cape Girardeau diocese refused

multiple requests and never permitted it in his diocese. (But his replacement bishop was the pastor of the TLM parish in Knoxville and has permitted it.)

## The Past: 2001 *Liturgiam Authenticam*

With this document, Rome's Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments reasserted its authority over translations of the *Novus Ordo* into vernacular languages.

On June 15, 2006, Bishop Arthur Roche, Bishop of Leeds (England) and Chairman of the International Commission for English in the Liturgy (ICEL), spoke to the American Bishops prior to the vote telling them that their vote was

“a very important moment.... If the bishops of the English-speaking countries can agree on a single version of the Mass, what a sign of catholicity that will be.”

(more...)

This event does not apply to the TLM for reasons which will be clear, but its impact on the *Novus Ordo* in English was felt in local parishes in Advent of 2011.

The document, *Liturgiam Authenticam* indicated a “refreshing breeze”<sup>(1)</sup> blowing from Rome.

From *Liturgiam Authenticam*:

20.)....In order that such a rich patrimony (the Latin liturgical texts of the Roman rite) may be preserved and passed on through the centuries, its is to be kept in mind from the beginning that the translation of the liturgical texts of the Roman Liturgy is not so much a work of creative innovation as it is of rendering the original texts faithfully and accurately into the vernacular language. While it is permissible to arrange the wording, the syntax and the style in such a way as to prepare a flowing vernacular text suitable to the rhythm of popular prayer, the original text, insofar as possible, must be translated integrally and in the most exact manner, without omissions or additions in terms of their content, and without paraphrases or glosses.

76.)....For this reason (“the effective exercise of her universal solicitude for the Christian faithful”), it has been determined that in the future, the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments will be involved more directly in the preparation of the translations into these major languages.

80.)The practice of seeking the *recognitio* from the Apostolic See for all translations of liturgical book accords the necessary assurance of the authenticity of the translation and its correspondence with the original texts....

By Bishop Roche's own measure, what a sign of catholicity the TLM is. Consider also that there would have been no need for *Liturgiam Authenticam* if Latin had been “preserved in the Latin rites.”

<sup>(1)</sup> Bishop Fabian Bruskewitz, [A Welcome Instruction from the Holy See](#)

## The Past: 2001 *Liturgiam Authenticam*

Bishop Roche told the bishops that, following Vatican II there was, “an urgent feeling that the liturgy should be made available to the people as soon as possible, and the work was rushed.”

Many theologians, he said, think that through the hurried translation currently in use, much of the richness of the Church's Eucharistic theology has been “severely diminished.” This, he said may change with the new translation. Roche closed by telling the bishops:

“Of course, if you try to carry a cup of coffee across a room too quickly, much of the contents may spill. This time, we have tried to keep the coffee in the cup.”

This document made its appearance over thirty years after the debut of the *Novus Ordo*. Five years later in 2006 the bishops were still arguing over the English translation, which was a disaster. But at least some appeared willing to acknowledge it. The corrections were adopted. This was a “pro forma” vote – the corrections were coming, like them or not. Finally, in Advent of 2011, ten years after the publication of this document, a corrected translation was implemented in the English-speaking world. It took over forty years to get a reasonably accurate translation in place!

## The Past: 7/7/7

Benedict XVI issues the *motu proprio* *Summorum Pontificum*

With this document, Benedict XVI reasserted the Pope's control of the sacred liturgy. It is not up to the bishops to allow or forbid the Traditional Latin Mass. Every priest in the Latin r-i-t-e has the r-i-g-h-t to say the Traditional Latin Mass which was “never abrogated” i.e. never annulled or revoked.

WHY DID HE DO THIS?

From *Summorum Pontificum*:

"Up to our own times, it has been the constant concern of supreme pontiffs to ensure that the Church of Christ offers a worthy ritual to the Divine Majesty, 'to the praise and glory of His name,' and 'to the benefit of all His Holy Church.'....

"In more recent times, Vatican Council II expressed a desire that the respectful reverence due to divine worship should be renewed and adapted to the needs of our time. Moved by this desire our predecessor, the Supreme Pontiff Paul VI, approved, in 1970, reformed and partly renewed liturgical books for the Latin Church. These, translated into the various languages of the world, were willingly accepted by bishops, priests and faithful....

"But in some regions, no small numbers of faithful adhered and continue to adhere with great love and affection to the earlier liturgical forms....

"Following the insistent prayers of these faithful, long deliberated upon by our predecessor John Paul II, and after having listened to the views of the Cardinal Fathers of the Consistory of 22 March 2006, having reflected deeply upon all aspects of the question, invoked the Holy Spirit and trusting in the help of God, with these Apostolic Letters we establish the following:

"Art 1. The Roman Missal promulgated by Paul VI is the ordinary expression of the 'Lex orandi' (Law of prayer) of the Catholic Church of the Latin rite. Nonetheless, the Roman Missal promulgated by St. Pius V and reissued by Bl. John XXIII is to be considered as an extraordinary expression of that same 'Lex orandi,' and must be given due honour for its venerable and ancient usage. These two expressions of the Church's Lex orandi will in no way lead to a division in the Church's 'Lex credendi' (Law of belief). They are, in fact two usages of the one Roman rite.

"It is, therefore, permissible to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass following the typical edition of the Roman Missal promulgated by Bl. John XXIII in 1962 and never abrogated, as an extraordinary form of the Liturgy of the Church. ("Abrogated", perhaps not. Banned, definitely.)

To answer the question – **why did he do this** – we have to examine his thinking from the conclusion of Vatican Council II until 7/7/7.

(The next section will follow Joseph Ratzinger's liturgical thought from his time as Cardinal Prefect for the Congregation of the Faith through 2007, when, as Supreme Pontiff, he issued the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*.)