

CHAPTER I

A Question of Rites

The Vatican II document *Sacrosanctum Concilium* on the Sacred Liturgy said that a new rite of Mass was **not** to be created – the Roman Rite was only to be “revised” (i.e. without drastic changes being made). However, in spite of this, what resulted within a few short years after Vatican II was the existence of what is clearly two different rites of Mass within the Roman Catholic Church: the immemorial Roman Rite and the “new rite of Mass” announced by Pope Paul VI on Nov. 19, 1969. This chapter briefly analyzes how the “new rite” differs from the Roman Rite in the essentials.

The Immemorial Roman Rite

In 1570, Pope St. Pius V promulgated the revised and codified Roman Rite of Mass with the Bull *Quo Primum*. He did not promulgate a new rite, but he merely restored and codified the immemorial Roman Rite.¹⁵ The Council of Trent had no intention to institute a new liturgy. “The Council of Trent (1545-1563),” Michael Davies observes, “did indeed appoint a commission to examine the Roman Missal, and to revise and restore it ‘according to the custom and rite of the Holy Fathers.’ The new missal was eventually promulgated by Pope St. Pius V in 1570 with the Bull *Quo Primum*.”

Pope Pius V did not institute a new rite of Mass. Davies has demonstrated this, citing eminent authorities: “... Father David Knowles, who was Britain’s most distinguished scholar until his death in 1974, pointed out” that:

The Missal of 1570 was indeed the result of instructions given at Trent, but it was, in fact, as regards the Ordinary, Canon, Proper of the time and much else a replica of the Roman Missal of 1474, which in its turn repeated in all the

essentials the practice of the Roman Church of the epoch of Innocent III, which itself derived from the usage of Gregory the Great and his successors of the seventh century. In short, the Missal of 1570 was, in all essentials, the usage of the mainstream of medieval European liturgy which included England and all its rites.¹⁶

Although the rite continued to develop after the time of St. Gregory, Father Fortescue explains that:

All later modifications were fitted into the old arrangement, and the most important parts were not touched. From, roughly, the time of St. Gregory we have the text of the Mass, in order and arrangement, as a sacred tradition that no one has ventured to touch except in unimportant details.¹⁷

So our Mass goes back without essential change, to the age when it developed out of the oldest liturgy of all. It is still redolent of that liturgy, of the days when Caesar ruled the world ... The final result of our enquiry is that, in spite of unresolved problems, in spite of later changes, there is not in Christendom another rite so venerable as ours.¹⁸

The Roman Rite of Mass, as Jungmann says,¹⁹ grew out of the apostolic traditions, and the Roman Canon, according to the Council of Trent, “is made up from the words of Our Lord from apostolic traditions, and from devout instructions of the holy pontiffs.”²⁰ The Roman Rite developed in such a manner that the basic structure of the rite came to be enriched and adorned with components borrowed from the Gallican liturgy. It was truly and fully a profession of the faith of the Catholic Church because it was the product, the offspring of that faith and therefore “The entire teaching of the Church is contained in the liturgy.”²¹ Whence it follows, that “the law of prayer establishes the law of belief.”²²

The Council Fathers of Trent never dreamed of creating a new rite of Mass, nor did the majority of Council Fathers of Vatican II:²³ They knew only too well that “Liturgies are not made, they grow in the devotion of the centuries.”²⁴ Elaborating on this theme, Davies

makes the important observation that:

At no time in the history of the Roman Rite was there ever any question of a pope setting up a commission to compose new prayers and ceremonies. The ceremonies evolved almost imperceptibly, and in every case, codification, that is the incorporation of these prayers into the liturgical books, followed upon their development ... particular prayers and ceremonies were found in the Missal because they were being used in the Mass and not vice versa.²⁵

This was pointed out by the Catholic Bishops of England in their *Vindication of the Bull "Apostolicæ Curæ"*:

That in earlier times local churches were permitted to add new prayers and ceremonies is acknowledged ... But that they were also permitted to subtract prayers and ceremonies in previous use, and even to remodel the existing rites in a most drastic manner, is a proposition for which we know of no historical foundation, and which appears to us as absolutely incredible.²⁶

Pope Leo XIII explained in his constitution *Orientalium Dignitas* that the Church "allows and makes provision for some innovations in exterior forms, mostly when they are in conformity with the ancient past." Clearly Pope Leo was referring mainly to restorations. Clearly, it is the duty of the pope to regulate the liturgy, but it does not pertain to his office to suppress it and create new liturgies. Pope Pius XI summed up what has always been the mind of the Church regarding the pope's responsibilities towards the liturgy when he stated in *Divini Cultus* (1928):

No wonder then, that the Roman Pontiffs have been so solicitous to *safeguard and protect the liturgy*. They have used the same care in making laws for the regulation of the liturgy, in *preserving it from adulteration*, as they have in giving accurate expression to the dogmas of the faith.

It is the duty of the hierarchy and especially the Pope to "safeguard and protect the liturgy" as well as "preserving it from adultera-

tion”. The Council Fathers of Vatican II expressed their intention to remain faithful to their pastoral duties regarding the liturgy, but the commission appointed by Paul VI, the *Consilium*, subverted the Council’s programme for legitimate liturgical revision, and brought about a new Protestant Reformation in the Church.²⁷

A “Brand New Rite”

Pope Paul VI created the commission of bureaucrats that destroyed the Roman liturgy when he established the *Consilium ad Exequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia* by his Motu Proprio, *Sacram Liturgiam*. “Thus,” says Michael Davies, “the notorious *Consilium* which destroyed the Roman Rite came into being ... Father Annibale Bugnini was appointed secretary of the *Consilium* ... it consisted of fifty bishops and two hundred consultants or advisers — the successors of the Council *periti*. (Father Peter Coughlin)”²⁸ The president of the *Consilium* was Cardinal Lercaro, who has been described as “Luther resurrected”.²⁹

Bugnini himself revealed his schismatical intentions to destroy the liturgy when he stated on May 7, 1967, “It is not simply a question of restoring a valuable masterpiece, in some cases *it will be necessary to provide new structures for entire rites ... it will truly be a new creation.*”³⁰ Joseph Gelineau S.J., “one of the most influential members of Archbishop Bugnini’s *Consilium*, which actually composed the New Mass”,³¹ spoke of the Roman liturgy saying, “Let them compare it with the Mass we now have. Not only the words, the melodies and some of the gestures are different. 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 (Le rite romain tel que nous l’avons connu n’existe plus). It has been destroyed (il est détruit)*. Some walls of the former edifice have fallen while others have changed their appearance, to the extent that it appears today either as a ruin or the partial substructure of a different building.”³²

Father John A. Kiley stated the obvious when he said, “The new liturgy ... is not a revision of the old Mass ... it is a brand new rite.”³³ Pope Paul VI himself acknowledged the fact the *Novus Ordo* was not

just a revision of the traditional rite when he announced in his general audience on November 19, 1969, that a change was “about to take place in the Latin Catholic Church”, and he announced the “introduction of a new rite of Mass into the liturgy”. During his discourse, the Pope commented, “We may well ask ourselves: how could such a change ever take place?” Indeed we may well ask ourselves how the Pope could ever allow such a change to take place, especially when we consider that the same pontiff acknowledged that the Church has professed the Mass to be “the traditional and un-touchable expression of our authentic religious worship”.³⁴

I say the Pope allowed such a change to take place in the Church because he himself did not mandate the change of rite: Paul VI only published the new missal with his *Motu Proprio* of April 3, 1969, *Missale Romanum*. The Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship promulgated the new missal in April of 1970. That promulgation only allowed for the use of the new missal. After the publication of *Missale Romanum*, there appeared other documents emanating from the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship: *Ordo Missæ* specifies the rubrics for the new rite, *Ordo Lectionum Missæ* presents the lectionary for the new rite, and there is also an instruction on October 20, 1969. All of this legislation is clearly invalid because it violates one of the most basic rules of law: *Inferior non potest tollere legem superioris* (an inferior cannot annul a superior’s law).³⁵ This truly fundamental principle is also formally enshrined in the 1983 Code, in can. 135, § 2, which states, “... a law which is contrary to a higher law cannot be validly enacted by a lower level legislator”.³⁶ The executive decrees of the Roman dicasteries do not have the authority to nullify the solemn decrees of *Quo Primum*.

Neither Pope Paul VI nor the Council nullified *Quo Primum*, and neither mandated the new rite, and therefore *Quo Primum* still has the force of law. Vatican II did not promulgate any new liturgical laws. It pertains to the very essence of law that “A law comes into existence when it is promulgated” (CIC 1983, c. 7), and therefore it is absurd for anyone to say that Vatican II is the basis for the authority of the New Missal or that Paul VI did not need to formally mandate

the use of the New Missal in order for it to have the force of law. Davies summed up the situation well when he wrote:

The problem faced by the Vatican as a result of the widespread support for the Tridentine Mass was that it had condoned its almost universal suppression without giving formal and binding legal sanction to this suppression; and furthermore, this illegal suppression has been given support in documents emanating from the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship.³⁷

The traditionalists' steadfast adherence to the Tridentine Mass has earned for them the indignity of being labelled as "schismatics" because they refuse obedience to non-existent laws:³⁸ laws which, if they did exist, would be essentially schismatic, according to the infallible teaching of the Church. "*The Novus Ordo*", wrote Cardinal Ottaviani, "represents, both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent,"³⁹ and constitutes a "grave break with tradition".⁴⁰

The doctrine reflected in the *lex orandi* (the law of praying) of the *Novus Ordo* is Protestant because the *lex credendi* (the law of believing) of its makers is Protestant. The definition of the Mass given in No. 7 of the *Institutio Generalis* of the *Novus Ordo* reads: "The Lord's Supper or Mass, is the sacred assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord".⁴¹ Thus the General Instruction to the *Novus Ordo* defines the Mass in such terms that specify its essence as a "memorial of the Lord": yet, the concept of the Mass as a mere memorial of the Lord is a solemnly anathematised heresy condemned by the Council of Trent.⁴² This definition also expresses the Lutheran heresy⁴³ that all Christians are priests who offer the Lord's Supper together with the priest presiding since it attributes to the Mass the essential characteristic of an "assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding".⁴⁴

Since the *Consilium* defined the Mass in strictly Protestant terms which constitute a denial of the propitiatory nature of the sacrifice, it

is no wonder that it systematically expunged from the liturgy nearly every reference to the *propitiatory oblation*, of which the Mass essentially consists.⁴⁵ The making of the new rite has followed the same pattern as the making of the Protestant liturgies. Professor J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P., observes:

It would be an exaggeration in most cases to claim that the Protestants composed completely new liturgical rites. They tended to adapt existing Catholic rites, but removed from them everything which was not compatible with the particular heresies they favoured.

In the above-mentioned *Vindication of "Apostolicæ Curæ"*, the Catholic bishops of England explained exactly how this was done:

To put the matter briefly, if the first Prayer Book of Edward VI is compared with the Missal, sixteen omissions can be detected, the evident purpose of which was to eliminate the idea of sacrifice ... even after that drastic treatment there still remained a few phrases and rubrics on which Gardiner could fasten, endeavouring to understand them as still asserting the real objective Presence and the True Sacrifice ...

With this in mind we can clearly see how the *Consilium* systematically mutilated the liturgy according to the same heretical pattern. The Roman Rite begins with the prayers at the foot of the altar. The priest says prayers to prepare himself to approach the altar (*introibo ad altare Dei*), and enter the Holy of Holies (*ut ad sancta sanctorum puris mereamur mentibus introire ...*)⁴⁶

The explicit mention of the altar and Holy of Holies clearly implies the reality of the propitiatory sacrifice about to take place. These prayers of the Roman Rite were replaced with a new introductory rite in the *Novus Ordo* in which the notion of oblation has been expunged:

Fratres, agnoscamus peccata nostra ut apti simus ad sacra mysteria celebranda.

The English translation of this formula (and the other vernacular

translations) suggests even more strongly the Lutheran heresy of concelebration with the laity:

My Brothers and Sisters, to prepare ourselves to celebrate the sacred mysteries, let us call to mind our sins.

Not only is the notion of the sacrifice absent from the new formula, but in the new formula the celebrants also appear to be the entire congregation; whereas in the traditional rite, it is the priest who goes up to the altar of God, and it is he who enters the Holy of Holies to offer the sacrifice of the New and Everlasting Covenant. In the Roman Rite, the congregation clearly assists while it is the priest who offers the sacrifice. In the new rite, the prayers suggest that it is the entire congregation that celebrates and the priest only presides. This is the way the *Consilium* intended it to appear, i.e. strictly according to the Protestant definition of the Mass as set forth in no. 7 of the *Institutio Generalis*.⁴⁷

There remains scarcely a trace of the Roman Offertory in the new rite, in spite of the fact that the Council specified that “care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.” The *Súscipe Sancte Pater* has been discarded in the new rite. “*Súscipe Sancte Pater*”, explains Pius Parsch, “‘Receive, O holy Father, almighty, eternal God, this spotless host which I, Thy unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, my living and true God, for mine own countless sins, offences and negligences, and for all here present: as also for faithful Christians, living or dead, that it may avail for my own and for their salvation unto life everlasting. Amen.’ This prayer — the richest in content of any of this part of the Mass — contains a whole world of dogmatic truth.”

Similarly the prayer for offering of the chalice has also been removed: “We offer Thee the chalice of salvation, O Lord, beseeching Thy mercy that it may be as a sweet fragrance before Thy divine majesty for the salvation of us and the whole world.”

The prayer for the ‘presenting of the gifts’, the rite that replaces the Offertory of the Roman Rite, reads:

Blessed are You Lord God of all creation. Through Your goodness we have this bread (or wine) to offer, which earth has given (fruit of the vine) and human hands have made. It will become for us the bread of life (or spiritual drink).

“This prayer”, Davies explains, “is ... acceptable not simply to Protestants but to Jews and would certainly fit in with the ethos of a Masonic hall.” In spite of the fact that Vatican II decreed that “The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as well as the connection between them, may be more clearly manifested”, the several prayers which clearly express the intrinsic nature and purpose of the ceremony have been removed, and replaced by a single new prayer that does not even offer a hint of the divine sacrifice that is about to take place.⁴⁸

The new prayers for the ‘Presentation of the Gifts’, are, as Jungmann points out, “reconstructed” ancient Jewish prayers. They are not even Jewish liturgical prayers, but are “probably the very words used at the blessing of bread and wine in a Jewish meal at the time of Christ”.⁴⁹ The Catholic emphasis on the oblation has been replaced with the Protestant emphasis on the supper, and it is quite obvious that the new prayers did not “grow organically from forms already existing” as paragraph 23 of the Liturgy Constitution requires.

It is not difficult to understand why the beautiful verses from Psalm 25 which constituted the *Lavabo* have been reduced to the following:

“Lord, wash me of my iniquity, cleanse me from my sin.”

Psalm 25 ‘had’ to go: it contained a reference to the altar of sacrifice: *et circumibo altare tuum Domine*.

The doctrinally rich SÚscipe Sancta Trinitas was likewise intolerable because of its reference to the “oblation”, and therefore had to be removed:

“Receive, O Holy Trinity this *oblation ...*”

The *Veni Sanctificator* was also removed. About this the *Critical Study*⁵⁰ comments:

The suppression of the invocation to the Third Person of the Most Holy Trinity that He may descend upon the oblations, as once before into the womb of the Most Blessed Virgin to accomplish the miracle of the divine Presence, is *yet one more instance of the systematic and tacit negation of the Real Presence.*

Bearing in mind the directive of the Council, “There must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them...”, Davies remarks: “It is surely more than coincidental that the good of the Church just happened ‘genuinely and certainly’ to require the discarding of almost every prayer which the Protestant Reformers had found unacceptable.” Why all those prayers were unacceptable to the Reformers is best expressed in the words of Martin Luther, for whom “all that abomination called the Offertory, and from this point almost everything stinks of oblation.”

The liturgical amputations in the Canon follow the same pattern as those earlier described. “The ancient formula of Consecration”, says the *Critical Study*, “was properly a *sacramental* not a narrative one.” It is, therefore, in virtue of the *modus significandi*, i.e. by the clear and unequivocal mode of signification of the words of Consecration, that the intention to confect the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ according to the rite of the holy Roman Church is expressed.⁵¹ In the *Novus Ordo*, “the narrative mode is now emphasised by the formula ‘*narratio institutionis*’ (no. 55d) and repeated by the definition of the *anamnesis*,⁵² in which it is said that “*Ecclesia memoriam ipsius Christi agit.*” The new *anamnesis*, “Do this in memory of Me” lends itself to be understood in the merely narrative mode, whereas the traditional formula clearly expressed the sacramental mode.

“In short”, the *Critical Study* concludes, “the theory put forth by the *epiclesis*,⁵³ the modification of the words of consecration and of the *anamnesis*, have the effect of modifying the *modus significandi*

of the words of Consecration. The consecratory formulae are here pronounced by the priest as the constituents of a historical narrative and are no longer *enunciated as expressing the categorical affirmation uttered by Him in whose Person the priest acts: 'Hoc est Corpus meum'* (not, '*Hoc est corpus Christi*').” **The pastoral consequence of having what clearly appears to be a narrative mode of expression for the words of Consecration is that the faithful no longer have the moral certitude that they are attending a valid Mass.**⁵⁴

Concerning the modification of the words of consecration, in the Roman Rite, the chalice is consecrated with the words:

**Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et
æterni testamenti: *mysterium fidei*: qui pro
vobis et pro multis effundetur in
remissionem peccatorum.**

The insertion, '*mysterium fidei*',⁵⁵ “was an immediate confession of the priest’s faith in the mystery realised by the Church through the hierarchical priesthood.” (*Critical Study*). In the New Mass, the words '*mysterium fidei*' have been removed from the consecration and they are said only after the elevation, where they no longer profess that the oblation on the altar is the Mystery of Faith, but, as a direct consequence of the displacement of the formula, they only profess belief in the historical salvific events of the passion, death and resurrection and future second coming. The former arrangement clearly reflects the entire mystery of faith as it is professed by the Catholic Church, both in history and on the altar, whereas the latter is a muted profession of faith, which clearly conveys only the non-Eucharistic aspect of the mystery of salvation as it is professed by Protestantism. The traditional formula is clearly an expression of the Catholic Dogma of the Mass, while the new formula lends itself to the Protestant idea of a mere narrative commemoration in which the Catholic dogmas of the propitiatory oblation and Transubstantiation have no place.

The Catholic understanding of the 'Mystery of Faith' has been elaborated by St. Thomas:

Transubstantiation:

The whole Christ is present in the sacrament: by the power of the sacrament, the substance of the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood, and by natural concomitance the soul of Christ and the Godhead are united to the body.^{55a}

Propitiatory Oblation:

Since this is the sacrament of the Lord's passion, it contains in itself Christ in His passion, whence, whatever is the effect of the Lord's passion, that in its entirety is the effect of this sacrament. For this sacrament is nothing else than the application of the Lord's passion to us ... where it is manifest that the destruction of death, which dying Christ destroyed, and the restoration of life, which He accomplished by rising, is the effect of this sacrament.^{55b}

The words '*Mysterium Fidei*' clearly designate the presence of this mystery on the altar in the Roman Rite. In the *Novus Ordo*, something else is intended: the signification of the formula is expressed in the acclamation that immediately follows:

1. Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again.
2. Dying You destroyed our death, rising You restored our life, Lord Jesus come in glory!
3. When we eat this bread and drink this cup we proclaim Your death Lord Jesus until You come in glory.

That which is signified in this acclamation of the mystery of faith is faith in the bloody redemptive sacrifice offered "once and for all" on Calvary, and the expectation of Christ's Second Coming. This is what the Protestants believe while they, in their heresy, deny the Catholic 'Mystery of Faith' expressed in the Roman Rite. Therefore the *Critical Study* correctly assesses the significance of the acclamation assigned to the people immediately after the consecration in the new rite: it "introduces yet again, under cover of eschatology, ***the same ambiguity concerning the Real Presence.*** Without interval or distinction, the expectation of Christ's Second Coming at the end of

time is proclaimed just at the moment when He is substantially present on the altar, almost as though the former, and not the latter, were the true Coming.” **Thus the *Novus Ordo* accommodates the denial of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.**

The removal of the *Mysterium Fidei* from the formula of consecration follows exactly the pattern of liturgical restructuring carried out by Martin Luther. “Luther”, explains Dr. Coomaraswamy, “added the phrase to the words of Consecration ‘quod pro vobis traditur’ and dropped both the *Mysterium Fidei* and the words *pro multis*.” This is identical to what has been done in the *Novus Ordo*.⁵⁶

It was also Luther who explained that food is served on a plate, but a sacrifice is offered on a corporal, and therefore he introduced the innovation of pronouncing the words of institution over the bread on the paten. This essentially Protestant innovation has been brought into the *Novus Ordo*, whose rubrics specify that the bread is to be similarly consecrated and placed on the paten.

Cranmer, in order to transform the Catholic Mass into the Anglican Communion Service replaced the altar with a table.⁵⁷ Bugnini’s *Consilium* has done the same. The General Instruction for the *Novus Ordo* constantly refers to the altar as *mensa* i.e. ‘table’. Even the name that the *Consilium* gave to the *Novus Ordo* is Protestant: *Mass or Lord’s Supper* — That is what Cranmer called his 1549 Protestant service: *Masse or Lord’s Supper!*⁵⁸

The *Critical Study* pronounces a terrible verdict: “It is evident that the *Novus Ordo* has no intention of presenting the Faith as taught by the Council of Trent, to which, nonetheless, the Catholic conscience is bound forever.” The *Novus Ordo*, therefore, is only the logical outcome of the labours of the *Consilium*, which defined the Mass in such a manner “that does not in the very least imply either the *Real Presence*, or the *reality of the sacrifice*, or the *Sacramental function* of the consecrating priest, or the *intrinsic value* of the Eucharistic Sacrifice independently of the people’s presence.” The *Novus Ordo*, therefore, is not only illicit insofar as it constitutes a break with tradition as a new rite, but it suffers the even more grave defect of not giving accurate expression to the dogmas of the Catholic Faith.

It is not sufficient that a liturgy merely be free from explicit error in order to be licit: the liturgy is not only an expression of worship, but it is also a profession of faith: Pope Pius XII explains:

“In the liturgy we make explicit profession of our Catholic faith; ... the whole liturgy contains the Catholic faith, inasmuch as it is a public profession of the faith of the Church ... This is the origin of the well known and time honoured principle: ‘the norm of prayer established the norm of belief’.”⁵⁹

In the Apostolic Constitution *Divini Cultus* (1928), Pius XI taught:

There exists, therefore, a close relationship between dogma and the sacred liturgy, as also between the Christian cult and the sanctification of the people. This is why Pope Celestine I thought that the rule of faith is expressed in the ancient liturgical formulations; he said that the ‘law of prayer establishes the law of belief’ (*legem credendi lex statuit supplicandi*).

Elsewhere⁶⁰ the same Pontiff explained, “It (the Mass) *is the most important organ of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium* of the Church”; and in his Encyclical, *Quas Primas* (1925) he explained that “people are instructed in the truths of the faith and brought to appreciate the inner joys of religion far more effectively by the ... celebration of our sacred mysteries than by any pronouncement, however weighty, made by the teaching of the Church.”