

SACRED MUSIC

Fall 2002

Volume 129 No. 3





Solemn High Mass (August 15, 2002), Tridentine Rite, Immaculate Conception Cathedral, Camden, N.J. celebrated in thanksgiving for the creation of Mater Ecclesiae Parish.

SACRED MUSIC

Volume 129, Number 3, Fall 2002

GUEST EDITORIAL	3
<i>Rev. Msgr. Richard J. Schuler</i>	
"THE REFORM OF THE REFORM" AND THE OLD ROMAN RITE	5
<i>Dr. Robert Spaemann</i>	
A VICTORY FOR THE MASS OF SAINT PIUS V	11
<i>Fr. Paul Aulangier, SSPX</i>	
REVIEWS	25
NEWS	25
CONTRIBUTORS	27

SACRED MUSIC Continuation of *Caecilia*, published by the Society of St. Caecilia since 1874, and *The Catholic Choirmaster*, published by the Society of St. Gregory of America since 1915. Published quarterly by the Church Music Association of America. Office of Publication: 134 Christendom Drive, Front Royal, VA 22630-5103.
E-mail: kpoterack@hotmail.com

Editorial Assistant: Christine Collins

News: Kurt Poterack

Music for Review: Calvert Shenk, Sacred Heart Major Seminary, 2701 West Chicago Blvd., Detroit, MI 48206
Susan Treacy, Dept. of Music, Franciscan University, Steubenville, OH 43952-6701

Membership, Circulation and Advertising: 5389 22nd Ave. SW, Naples, FL 34116

CHURCH MUSIC
ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA

Officers and Board of Directors

<i>President</i>	Father Robert Skeris	
<i>Vice-President</i>	Father Robert Pasley	
<i>General Secretary</i>	Rosemary Reninger	
<i>Treasurer</i>	Ralph Stewart	
<i>Directors</i>	Rev. Ralph S. March, S.O. Cist.	Stephen Becker
	Father Robert Pasley	Kurt Poterack
	Rosemary Reninger	Paul F. Salumunovich
	Rev. Robert A. Skeris	Brian Franck
	Susan Treacy	Calvert Shenk
	Monsignor Richard Schuler	Ralph Stewart

Membership in the Church Music Association of America includes a subscription to SACRED MUSIC. Membership is \$20.00 annually; student membership is \$10.00 annually. Single copies are \$5.00. Send applications and changes of address to SACRED MUSIC, 5389 22nd Ave. SW, Naples, FL 34116. Make checks payable to the Church Music Association of America.

Library of Congress catalog card number: 62-6712/MN

SACRED MUSIC is indexed in the Catholic Periodical and Literature Index, Music Index, Music Article Guide, and Arts and Humanities Index.

Cover: Basilica Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Crypt Church Organ, Washington D.C.

Copyright by Church Music Association of America. 2002.
ISSN: 0036-2255

SACRED MUSIC (ISSN 0036-2255) is published quarterly for \$20.00 per year by the Church Music Association of America, 134 Christendom Drive, Front Royal, VA 22630-5103. Periodicals postage paid at Saint Paul, Minnesota.
Postmaster: Send address changes to SACRED MUSIC, 5389 22nd Ave. SW, Naples, FL 34116.

GUEST EDITORIAL

“Fifth International Church Music Congress”

It has been nearly a half-century since the Fifth International Church Music Congress met in Chicago and Milwaukee, August 21-28, 1966, under the auspices of the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae* (Roma) and the recently organized Church Music Association of America. They were days of great expectations as musicians from all parts of the world came together at the invitation of the Holy See to begin implementation of the musical directives of the Second Vatican Council. Through lectures, discussions and performances of sacred music the way was charted for developments in the liturgy and sacred music for a century to come. These studies and performances were recorded in the minutes of the congress, published as *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II*.

The basic subject underlying both theoretical and practical consideration at the congress was what was meant by the fathers of the Council in their call for *actuosa participatio populi*, both internal and external, in the liturgy and particularly in its musical part. Not that the term was a new one, since it had appeared often in papal documents on church music for at least a century prior to the Council, and in the popes' continued call for active participation in the worship of God in the official liturgy.

To determine just what *actuosa participatio* meant to musicians was to be the main concern of the international meeting. Its deep theological connection with the mystery of the Redemption began the study. If the Church truly is Jesus Christ, living out His mystical life until the end of the world, and the liturgy is His mystical life in which we must all take part, then the basic study of the delegates must be to learn what that participation is and how it is achieved. To start, a distinction must be made between an external and an internal participation. Latin expresses that distinction more clearly and more easily than English. Latin has two words, *actuosa* and *activa*, for which English has but one, “active.” *Actuosa* expresses an internal action, while *activa* is an external action.

To be capable of exercising *actuosa participatio*, one must be a member of the Church, baptized and living a life of sanctifying grace. It is essentially an internal activity. *Participatio activa*, on the other hand, is external: singing, standing, moving in procession, listening and many other activities. Active participation may promote *participatio actuosa* in a person having the necessary qualifications. If he does not have those qualifications, then he cannot be said to have *actuosa participatio* even though he may be exercising a high degree of *participatio activa*. One might consider the following example to clarify the distinction.

An old lady, a Catholic, who can neither see nor hear, is a member of a Catholic parish where she spends hours sitting in church and contemplating her Faith. She does not sing and she is unable to take part in processions, but she has a high degree of sanctifying grace in her soul. She prays the Rosary and attends the Masses offered in the church. One day, a funeral is being conducted in the church, and our old lady sits in her place behind the pillar saying her beads. The undertaker, who is a Jew but very knowledgeable about the Catholic liturgy, walks in the procession, sings the hymns, stands and sits at the proper times, and generally is very actively taking part in the service. Of the two, which one is capable of *actuosa participatio*? The answer, of course, is the old lady, because she alone had the baptismal character making her capable of living the Christ-life, while the Jew, active and cooperative as he was, could not take part in the Christ-life, since he was not baptized.

Thus, participation in the liturgy requires that a person possess membership in the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church. Its chief activity is the liturgy, which the Church alone can order and direct. The Council undertook to do just that, and we, as members of the Church, must accept the orders given.

Unfortunately, the disastrous conditions so widely prevalent today have come about not because the directives of the Council were wrong; but rather, because they have not as yet been tried. A true understanding of *actuosa participatio populi* is not yet well grasped, and for that reason the role of music in the liturgy is not properly understood.

The published proceedings of the congress in Chicago and Milwaukee in 1966 contain several significant articles that will help one understand what the Council was demanding. The volume is entitled *Sacred Music and Liturgy Reform after Vatican II*. In it Father Colman E. O'Neill, O.P., writes about "The Theological Meaning of *Actuosa Participatio*." Cardinal Miranda, Archbishop of Mexico City, has an article, "Function of Sacred Music and *Actuosa Participatio*." Two famous musicologists, Karl Gustav Fellerer and Eric Werner, have articles, and Abbot Urbanus Bomm of Maria Laach spoke about "Gregorian Chant and Liturgical Singing in the Vernacular." And there are many others.

Hardbound, 290 pp., with photographs of important church musicians in the immediate post-conciliar period, there are copies available for \$10 plus postage and packing. It is a volume that will interest students who see a true renewal in church music about to begin. This is a volume seminarians should have as well as the parochial clergy.

Write SACRED MUSIC, 548 Lafond Avenue, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55103-1672.

Rev. Msgr. Richard J. Schuler

Editor's Note: I suppose I should explain briefly to my readership why I have reprinted an article by a Society of St. Pius X priest (Fr. Paul Aulangier). While on the one hand, I certainly do not wish to trivialize schism, on the other hand, given the Holy See's recent attempts at reconciliation, I do not think it inappropriate to "help the effort along." In any dialogue it is important to give a fair hearing to the opposite party even if one does not agree with everything they say. Interestingly, though, Fr. Aulangier's article takes a very positive view of the recent accord with the Campos traditionalists and though talks between the Vatican and the SSPX have stalled one can—and should—hope and pray for a successful accord.



Solemn High Mass (August 15, 2002), Tridentine Rite, Immaculate Conception Cathedral, Camden, N.J. celebrated in thanksgiving for the creation of Mater Ecclesiae Parish.

This is an address which was given at the Fontgombault "Liturgy Days," July 22-24, 2001.

"THE REFORM OF THE REFORM" AND THE OLD ROMAN RITE

In the following remarks, I will talk neither as a theologian—that I am not—nor according to my competence in philosophical matters, but as a simple lay Catholic having a little bit of good sense, and hoping to lean on seventy years of this *participatio actiuosa* which Pius X asked for. During my youth when in parish churches and in monasteries I knew nothing but such a form of "active" participation. What surpassed everything for me was Easter Sunday 1943—I was then fifteen years old—when I had to replace the monks of the Abbey of Saint Joseph in Westphalia (foundation of Bueron) by singing the Proper of Easter Sunday, starting with the *Resurrexi*. I had been baptized in this church of the abbey at the age of three. The monks had been expelled by the Nazis, but there was a Dominican Mass for the people of the village who sang, to the fullest extent that they could, the *Missa de Angelis*—especially the children! The priests had not yet told them that they were too stupid to learn Gregorian chant. Today, we also consider them incapable of learning that it really is the Body of our Lord that we are receiving in Holy Communion. The children do not know this when they receive their First Communion. At a moment such as this, a simple lay person starts reflecting, and here are some practical observations.

-I-

The point of view of someone who participates at the holy liturgy is different from the one of a specialist of the history of the liturgy. The specialist considers the rite of the

REFORM

Mass as a contingent step on a long path of continual development; whereas for the participant in *this* form of the ritual a real contact with an eternal order is accomplished at every moment which is the paschal mystery. By this eternal element the form itself is consecrated and loses its radical contingency. This is why Cardinal Newman said, in one of his sermons, that the Church has never banned a traditional rite, and she could never do so without causing grave harm to the piety of the Church.

This is the reason why today we have two Roman Rites: next to Paul VI's *Novus Ordo Missae* remains the "Roman Missal" according to John XXIII's *editio typica*. At the same time, we have two rites for the distribution of the sacraments, the ordination of priests in seven or two steps, the baptism of children with an exorcism—like in the first century—and the response of "Faith" to the question of the priest "What do you ask of the Church of God?" or—for the last 30 years—without exorcism and without this response (the new response is "Baptism"). We cannot deny that there are two rites. The Dominican ritual for example, or the Rite of St. Ambrose of Milan before the Reformation differed much less from the *Missale Romanum* than the *Novus Ordo* does. Nevertheless, they were looked at and recognized as rites that differed from the Roman Rite. And if, for example a Dominican priest said the Mass in a parish church, he had the right and obligation of celebration according to his rite. The little acolytes had to learn rapidly the other customs—this could be done in ten minutes—and the parish community was happy to experience the value of this liturgy of the Church. The differences were small, but it was still another rite. That a liturgy of the Mass without an Offertory, with a multitude of eucharistic prayers and the almost total suppression of the use of the Roman canon, with another calendar—with for example the suppression of "pre-Lent" (e.g. *Septuagesima*)—that such a liturgy would be another rite, is, I think, beyond doubt, especially if we consider not only the genotype, but also the phenotype of both liturgies: the orientation of the priest, the liturgical language, etc. An Orthodox friend once told me that he thinks the affiliation is greater between his liturgy and the Old Roman Mass, than between his liturgy and today's habitual Mass.

Given the fact of these two rites, the suppression of the old ritual was illegitimate, even if it was not illegal. As Cardinal Ratzinger put it, the Church in all of her history has never suppressed a ritual that is legitimate and sanctified by Tradition. Vatican Council II confirmed this by stating that the plurality of rites is not an inevitable evil, but a treasure of the Church, and our Holy Father, in his famous short speech to the monks of Barroux, applied this same principle in a formal fashion to the ancient rite.

The existence of two rituals on the same canonical territory is not an evil to be avoided. In the Ukraine, on the same territory, there are communities celebrating the Latin Rite and the Byzantine Rite. In Milan, where Mass is generally said in the Ambrosian Rite, there are also Masses said in the Roman Rite, for example in the church of the Catholic University. This does not bother anybody. If a priest of this ritual says Mass in a Milanese parish, nobody obliges him to say Mass in the Milanese Rite. So therefore, where is there a problem, except in the fact that this is an ideological struggle? Several years ago, I traveled from Rome to Milan on Ash Wednesday. The colleagues at the Catholic University invited me to dine with them that night. They noticed that I was not eating very much, and asked me if it was because it was Lent. In this case, I could have eaten heartily without scruple: in Milan, Ash Wednesday does not exist; Lent only starts with Sunday—which is by the way an older custom than the Roman custom. Why then is it not possible, that the Sundays during the time of the pre-Lent—for which Johann Sebastian Bach wrote several very admirable cantatas—continue to exist in the communities where the old Roman Rite is celebrated, even when they have disappeared in other communities?

We could have avoided this dualism of two Roman Rites if, in the liturgical reform, we had stayed within the limits of the principles formulated by the constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, as was the case until 1969. Instead we preferred a new rite in

place of the old one, and the struggle to uphold the old rite by a significant number of priests and lay people is the inevitable consequence.

Each Catholic has the right to defend a form of prayer consecrated by the prayers of his ancestors, of many saints, and of the entire Church for centuries. This right would disappear only in the case where a new form would be entirely better than the old one. This is almost impossible. And in the case of the last reform of the Roman liturgy it is today beyond doubt that there are painful losses. The Council said that changes are permissible only where there is no doubt that the advantages would override the disadvantages. One cannot ignore this principle and then complain about the resultant problems. The participants of this colloquium are—I presume—all in agreement that the quality of the *Novus Ordo Missae* does not justify the suppression of the old *Missale Romanum*. The fact that some supporters of the new rite are annoyed with the old is the strongest argument in its favor. Only a certain guilty conscience towards one's parents can explain the rejection of the commandment to honor them. Respect for those who continue to be attached to the old Roman Rite, asked for in categorical fashion by the Pope, is—I think—a presupposition necessary for the legitimacy of the new rite.

-II-

If there really are problems with the coexistence of two rites on the same territory, they are habitually exaggerated. If we are talking about the necessity of each Catholic to attend his parish on Sundays, this has never been the case. During my youth, there always were faithful who found their spiritual haven in a monastery church, even if it was a Dominican convent with another ritual. The pastor probably was not too happy with it, but nobody criticized these Catholics. *Salus animarum suprema lex*. My parents, for example, regularly went to Mass in another parish which was not our own because of the amount of *actuosa participatio*. But we live in a period of intolerance, so I ask the question only in order to overcome the few real problems which result from the coexistence of the two rites on the same territory. There are three possible solutions, of which only two are realistic. The unrealistic solution,—the simple removal of a ritual in favor of another one—is utopian.

This leaves us with: 1) the coexistence of the two rites for an undetermined amount of time; and/or 2) the union of the two rites; in other words, prudently trying to reform the old rite in such a way as to hold strictly to the letter of Vatican Council II, that is a reform of the reform, which would entail the ultimate abolition of the *Novus Ordo Missae* in favor of a Missal similar to the one of 1965.

I will allow myself only a few remarks on this last solution which does not seem realistic at present.

-III-

Whether or not there should be a general return to the Missal of 1965 is a question that divides people. In the past, in a letter to the monks of Beuron that served as a preface to the "Schott" Missal in 1965, the Vatican Secretary of State officially declared this Missal to be the definitive realization of the orders of Vatican Council II. Today, a return to this Missal is promoted by some despite the fact that it could lead to insuperable temptations. Also it is not needed because it would already be a big thing 1) if the celebration of the Eucharist according to the new rite was read everywhere directly from the books of the Church, 2) if the Roman canon were said at least as often as the other eucharistic prayers, 3) if the orientation of the priest *versus orientem* became universal, as also 4) the usage of the Latin language starting from the preface, and 5) if the universal Church clearly favored the receiving of the host on the tongue. There is still another point that deserves to be mentioned: 6) the *Confiteor*. I cannot see the "indubitable spiritual advantage" in the suppression of the names Saint Michael, Saint John the

REFORM

Baptist, and Saints Peter and Paul. But even if the advantage exists, the fact that the *Confiteor* could be said by the priest and the community together is nonsense. It is psychologically impossible to receive the request of a brother to pray for him, while I am talking, while asking of him the same thing. The *Vobis fratres* stays in the new rite without a real addressee. It seems to me that those who, for ideological purposes, inserted the sole *Confiteor* were never really interested in asking their brothers to pray for them; otherwise they would not have had this absurd idea.

The accomplishment of these six *desiderata* would guarantee the visibility of the connection between the tradition of the Latin rite and the *Novus Ordo Missae*, and would leave open the door for the future reunion of these rites.

-IV-

It would be a lot easier to adapt the old Roman Rite to the desire of the Council. In abbeys like Fontgombault and Barroux, we have seen experiments in this particular direction, in the hope of preparing important things for the whole Latin Church, but it is important to realize what we are preparing. We are certainly not preparing the reform of the reform, because the reform of the reform concerns the liturgy that has been reformed and not the old liturgy. If the reunion of the rites were according to the order of the day, it would be both of the rites that would have to undergo change, and these would be much more radical for the new liturgy; whereas, for the moment, it is only the traditional rite from which is expected change—and this is not reasonable! It would be for the traditional rite to adapt to the new, whereas the new rite is more removed from the intentions of the Council than the old one. No, it seems to me that the reform of the old Roman Rite should be free of everything that is tactical or strategic for the purpose of preparing a future union of the rites. And we must always be aware of this good principle—stated in the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, and automatically forgotten today—that the burden of proof falls not upon the shoulders of tradition but upon that of change.

-V-

Considered in itself, the classical Roman Rite—in order to stay alive and vital—must develop as it always has. Otherwise, it will become petrified, like a museum piece. For example, it must stay open to new saints.

The people present here know better than myself the problems that become evident in this context. I only desire to express a *desideratum*: this is communion under both species on certain important occasions in the life of a community or a single believer. Such a desire today is no longer inspired by doubts about the validity of the sacrament, but by research into the fullness of the sign instituted by Christ.

Several other changes are sometimes suggested, however, without serious foundation. For example, the *Pater noster* in common. It is clearly against the Roman tradition: already Saint Gregory defended the Latin custom of this prayer performed by the priest alone, and Saint Augustine also did not know another usage. In this, the Latin rite is better founded than the one of the Greeks. For the *Pater noster* is neither an acclamation, nor a hymn; it is a prayer. It is not a prayer of the priest alone, but of the whole community. However, it is a grave misunderstanding to think that a communal prayer should be sung collectively, like a hymn. Even from a psychological point of view, it is easier to participate in this prayer in a personal fashion by following the chant in one voice, than singing it all together. The collective song has altogether another meaning; it is well used when it is a matter of acclamation and hymns. Notice that Pius XII, by introducing the communal recitation of the *Pater noster* on Holy Friday, did not have it sung but only recited as a community, and this, only on this particular occasion. It is profoundly touching to hear the priest's voice at the end of Vespers, singing the *Pater*

noster in silence in the large Abbey. Everyone can unite himself to this prayer—provided that it will not be deformed by another unexpected sound.

It was fortunately not in this service, whereas during Mass, I heard yesterday—for the first time in my life in the old liturgy—the *Per Ipsum* and the Preface not at the altar, but through an intermediary. During about a thousand years the liturgy was celebrated in this Abbey without such deformity. Yes, the priest is far and his voice is feeble. But, he appears also to be very small as seen by the faithful, and we do not see the host while the priest elevates it: why, then, would we not install a big screen television in order to see the priest and the host, rather than the real priest at the real altar? The microphone deforms the concrete space and leads us into a virtual world, where we are lead every day by the media. Here, in the liturgy, everything must stay real, concrete and authentic. My honored priests, I would love to convince you, and I beg you: remove the microphone from the liturgy and restrict it to the homily only. Do not favor confusion between prayers and sermon. The Bride does not speak to her Bridegroom with a microphone.

Knowing that there are two Roman Rites, there are no reasons to insert in the old rite the new elements of the new rite. This would only be justifiable if there was a reunion of the rites—this is not the case. A common Penitential rite at the beginning of Mass has, for example, a certain spiritual advantage. But we cannot unite all perfections possible within one rite. Because of this, the plurality of the rites would not be the ecclesiastical wealth which the Council speaks of, and we would end up building a rite that is simply artificial, a melting pot of rites—a monstrosity.

-VI-

I shall conclude with this last statement: The development of the ancient Roman Rite occurs today under unfavorable conditions. And I would like to highlight the necessity of great prudence in this matter, especially in the non-monastic communities. Pius XII could make liturgical reforms—for example Holy Week—that were quite radical, but each one was accepted, often with gratitude. There was no doubt about the intentions behind these reforms, nor were there any suspicions that this reform was leading to undesirable goals.

The 1965 Missal was accepted without a murmur as long as it was considered definitive. And it was declared definitive by the Vatican Secretary of State. Today, however, this Missal appears to many as a stage in the revolution. (The 1789 reform retrospectively appears as a transitory stage of a revolution that showed its face in 1792.) Today, each innovation, each reform of the rite is met by friends of the old Roman Rite with suspicion and mistrust. Rightly so. We are like foster children: “Where will we be placed next? We have once before been taken to where we did not want to go.” One of the most disturbing elements of the new Mass is the fact that the simple lay person is put under this guardianship. He no longer knows, for example, if the eucharistic prayer is one of the canons that are approved by the Church or if it is the priest's invention. He accepts all that is presented to him. If he takes refuge in the old rite, he does not want to be degraded once more to the status of a minor and put at the mercy of a cruel foster parent. This is the reason why the “traditionalists” manifest an extreme mistrust of the smallest innovations. How does one respond to this? First of all, it is important to respect them. This mistrust is not without the foundation of a painful experience. It seems to me then that we should not insert bit by bit in the non-monastic communities innovations without the knowledge of the *telos*—which means at the same time “goal” and “end.” If we believe the old Roman Rite should be reformed in the sense of the 1965 Missal, the faithful have the right to accept the form due to a new *editio typica* of the Roman Missal. At any rate, they must know that this edition is not only a transitory stage for the next *experimentum*. They have the right to be assured that their own children, if they estrange themselves from the Church for years, will recognize it when they

REFORM

come back to the house of the Father and will not have to say: "*Tulerunt Dominum Meum et nescio ubi posuerunt eum.*"

Personally I am convinced that the old Roman Rite has the vitality and the strength to integrate certain rare innovations, like communion in both species on certain occasions, and the omission of the recitation of the texts in doublet by the priest sung by the people—supposing that the people will not sing paraphrases of these texts. A lot of my friends despise such talk. I understand this. Seeing the hostility which they meet so many times in the Church, their suspicion that there are many priests and bishops who see in the disappearance of the old Roman Rite the best solution to all these problems is not groundless. The friends of the old rite fear that each change favored by the authorities is one step toward the definitive abolition of the whole rite. And this fear is augmented if the changes are inserted without the existence of a Missal approved by the Church that contains these innovations. If the faithful ask the priest why he reads another reading of the gospel rather than the gospel of the day according to the Roman Missal, and if the priest responds to them that there exists a letter addressed to this or that community permitting this change of the readings, these faithful have the right to be worried. They wanted to escape the reign of the arbitrary by going to the "old Mass," and they do not want to find it there again. In one diocese the bishop strictly forbids all mixture of the old and the new rite; in another the bishop prescribes it.

In such a situation only an *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum*, carrying the pope's name could dissipate the suspicion and fear. Once recognized as a community of rite within the Latin Church, the hearts of the "traditionalists" would open without a doubt to a couple of prudent reforms of this rite which is dear to them. They are normally more disposed to submit themselves to legitimate authority than other groups in the Church. But I need to add this: authority is obliged to publicly disavow using the "blackmail" of already accomplished facts, imprudent concessions such as altar girls or communion in the hand.

In this context, let me offer one word on the form of the Holy Eucharist. In the Masses of the *Novus Ordo*, there is no longer one common rite left for communion. The faithful divide themselves up at this moment of unity, and each is obliged to manifestly join himself to one of two sides. It is unique in the history of the liturgy, and it is a true scandal. And now, there is a rumor that we allow ourselves to permit the reception of communion in the hand in the old Roman Rite as well. Why insert, without any necessity, this anomaly of two different forms for the reception of the Body of Christ, in a liturgy that is free from it up to now? Is there a clandestine hatred for a liturgical world that has stayed intact? There are no existing pastoral reasons. In the rare cases where a member of the faithful asks for communion in the hand, the priest will always find a path of prudence. After all, he knows of the concept of the *epikeia*. We must not follow the favored method of subversion: change the rules in favor of the rare exceptions.

A solution to the problems posed by the two rites is possible, if we understand that the permanence of the old Roman Rite is of priceless worth for the universal Church. In a time of great confusion, it makes present the norm, the criterion of what each Catholic liturgy should be. It is a supreme model.

Each celebration of holy Mass must be measured against this norm. I dream of the day when each bishop will oblige his seminarians to attend the old Roman Rite Mass from time to time. We are not vagabonds. We must all know where we come from. It is the ones who know and love the old liturgy who will guarantee that the new liturgy is celebrated in a respectful and worthy way. It is a fact that we learn best about the Eucharist by the study of the traditional rite. It seems to me that the destiny of the liturgy in the Latin Church depends on the respect for the commandment upon which God made our terrestrial destiny depend: "You shall honor your father and your mother."



Solemn High Mass (August 15, 2002), Tridentine Rite, Immaculate Conception Cathedral, Camden, N.J. celebrated in thanksgiving for the creation of Mater Ecclesiae Parish.

A VICTORY FOR THE MASS OF ST. PIUS X

An Historic Act

There are some acts that are historic. The one that took place in the Cathedral of the diocese of Campos in Brazil on the 18th of January 2002, on that day which was traditionally dedicated to the Chair of St Peter—dates have their significance—is one of those acts—and eminently so! That was the historic day of the juridical recognition by the Church of the “priests of Tradition” of the diocese of Campos.

Having considered everything and keeping before our eyes the glory of God, the good of Holy Church and that supreme law which is the salvation of souls (cf. Can. 1752 CIC), and being sincerely agreeable to accede to your request for admission into full communion with the Catholic Church, we acknowledge that you belong to it canonically.

That was the day when the Church established, at diocesan level, in the diocese of Campos, Brazil, a “Personal Apostolic Administration” which goes by the name of “Saint John Marie Vianney.”

At the same time, we inform you, Venerable Brother, that a legislative document will be drawn up which will establish the juridical form of the confirmation of your ecclesiastical property and guarantee respect for the property which belongs to you. By means of this document, the Union will be canonically raised to the status of a Personal Apostolic Administration which will be directly subject to the Apostolic See and will have its territory in the diocese of Campos. The question of jurisdiction exercised concurrently with that

VICTORY

of the Ordinary of the place will be dealt with. Its government will be entrusted to you, Venerable Brother, and provision will be made for your succession. (Letter of J.P. II 25. 12. 2001)

That was the day of the public appointment of Msgr. Licinio Rangel as the bishop in charge of this Administration without any obstacle or difficulty arising, even though he had been consecrated by Msgr. Tissier de Mallerais.

"In order to provide for the government of the Personal Apostolic Administration "Saint Jean Marie Vianney" . . . the Sovereign Pontiff John Paul II . . . designates and appoints as Apostolic Administrator His Excellency Monsignor Licinio Rangel . . ." (Decree 18. 01. 2002). That was the day of the public lifting of the censures or canonical penalties which were considered to have been incurred by these Brazilian priests during the past thirty years of religious crisis and friendship with the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X. In this context, the Holy Father, "with profound joy" and "in order to facilitate full communion, grants the lifting of all canonical censures where they have been incurred" (*communiqué* published in the Vatican, on the 18th of January 2002).

That was above all the day—and this is a point of particular importance—of the recognition by the Church of the right to the Latin, Gregorian and Roman Mass of All Time, restored in its purity—centuries ago—by Pope Saint Pius V, a Dominican Pope! "The Apostolic Administration will receive ratification of the faculty (*facultas*) to celebrate the Eucharist and the Liturgy of the Hours according to the liturgical discipline of the Roman rite and in conformity with the precepts of our Predecessor Saint Pius V, with the adaptations introduced by his successors up to the time of Blessed John XXIII." (Letter of J.P. II, 25. 12. 2001). What an occasion! What a ground-breaking event! What a splendid assertion!

These are priests who, by the express will of the Sovereign Pontiff, henceforth possess the faculty—the power—the right to celebrate the ancient Mass, the Mass of All Time. And they are recognized by the Church, the Roman Church. Whereas yesterday they were excluded from it because of their fidelity to that same Mass! And the document was signed and accepted on the 25th of December 2001 with the express signature of the Sovereign Pontiff John Paul II in the 23rd year of his pontificate. There is no end to the number of times we could quote this text, or read it, or analyze it.

So the 18th of January was the day of the recognition of our legitimacy, of the legitimacy of our fight for the Tridentine Mass, formerly led on both sides of the Atlantic by Msgr. de Castro Mayer and Msgr. Lefebvre, and still being continued today by "their disciples." It was the day of the canonical rehabilitation not only of our brother priests and friends, but also of the rehabilitation of the Holy Mass of All Time, a canonical rehabilitation, whole and entire, not simply a concession, not merely a permission, and certainly not an act of toleration, but purely and simply a recognition,—or rather the faculty—well and truly affirmed for the priests of Campos to celebrate this Mass. Today, it is the affirmation of the faculty for these priests. Tomorrow, it will be so for others: ourselves. The day after tomorrow, it will be for all who would like to have it! Would everyone please take stock of this affair!

The 18th of January 2002, feast of the Chair of Saint Peter, is for me a day of glory, a day of jubilation, a day of peace, a day of brotherhood. Honor to my Brazilian brother priests for having brought this fight—this battle—to a successful conclusion, without a trace of betrayal, using, moreover, the skillfulness enjoined on them by our Savior Jesus Christ in the Gospels.

This is for them a practical, concrete, and unprecedented situation which, in the diocese of Campos, will give them new-found happiness, a new position of strength, the strength of a legitimacy that is officially recognized and ratified. This legitimacy existed, certainly, but it was not, however, taken seriously. Now, today, we have it recognized. If anyone fails to appreciate that, it would, in my view, be staggering! I would have found it impossible to abstain from sharing the happiness of my brother priests

from the other side of the Atlantic with whom we have been united for the last thirty years in a common fight for the faith, fighting the good fight for the Mass. Our links of friendship and confidence are and still are too strong for us not to share this “family” happiness, the joy of fellow combatants.

So I caught an early morning plane on the 17th of January. It meant getting up at 5:45 a.m. if I wanted to get the plane to Fumicino in Rome. There is no doubt that when I was in Rome it was Providence that led me to meet Msgr. Fellay. We had important things to discuss, particularly the attitude to adopt in the negotiations between our friends and Rome and now in face of the “results” obtained.

These days everyone knows the wide divergence of opinion concerning this affair. They have found their way into the newspapers, our newspapers too—that’s inevitable. Rome is aware of them. Anyone who found that surprising would be lacking in knowledge of what makes people tick. Before we get to the stage of a happy consensus, there is a period of examination. That’s the way it was at the time of the consecration, when people expressed their opinions. I expressed my point of view. I was there in Rome to do so, in the shadow of the dome of Saint Peter.

To resume contact with Rome

I was—and am—in favor of reopening negotiations with Rome even before Rome expressed this desire after our pilgrimage in the jubilee year. My reasons are simple. It is now fourteen years since the consecrations took place. They saved Tradition, its expression, and its *modus vivendi* in the Church. Without them, the Church’s treasure, for example, the Tridentine Mass would have disappeared from the Church and we with it. Providence did not permit that. On the contrary, the mainstream movement of Tradition was strengthened, as was the Priestly Society of Saint Pius X together with its associated work in Europe, and both North and South America. We must continue these efforts. We must continue this expansion. “He who does not go forward, goes backwards!” It is not enough to guard a treasure and keep it for ourselves. We have to make it shine forth, and be loved throughout the Church. That is, by the way, the meaning of the inscription on the tomb of Msgr. Lefebvre: “*Tradidi quod et accepi*.” (“I have passed on what I have received”). There we have a watchword, an example to imitate. We must hand on.

So Rome is opening its doors? How astonishing! Of course, we must be prudent but not fearful or timid. The conditions proposed by Rome are unique—unprecedented—especially the exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, which is of the highest importance. They have just put forward the juridical structure, an Apostolic Administration. These were all things which Msgr. Lefebvre was asking of Rome. I would consider anyone who failed to take all that into consideration to be guilty of faintheartedness and weakness, and think that they were timid and inward-looking. All such an attitude would achieve would be to weaken them in the immense doctrinal struggle which we have to undertake. Moreover, it is an unfortunate fact that divisions exist in the government of the Church. It is not a monolithic government. One can detect a certain cacophony. Also, during these fourteen years, our legitimacy has become—for many—even in the Roman Curia, more evident, while our canonical penalties have become less certain.

Criticism of the liturgical reform has made itself heard in new places too. Even Cardinals speak out about it. Some examples I can point to as evidence are the recent statements reiterated by Cardinal Ratzinger, Cardinal Stickler, and Cardinal Mayer. You’ve got to be blind not to see it, but who these days reads and takes note of all that? There has never been a situation like it before. Our brother priests in Campos see it all right. The fact is that our efforts, as you can see, have borne fruit. We must press on.

Things are coming to a head and the time is ripe for a new “strategy,” a new stage in the proceedings—or at the very least a new way of looking at things. Msgr. Fellay therefore summoned “his men” to a meeting in Menzingen. My friends from Campos were there, represented by Father Rifan, who came on behalf of Msgr. Rangel. The discus-

VICTORY

sion was thrown open for all to have their say. Rome must lift the excommunications. "That is something which must be said." Rome must recognize the right, for every priest, to say the Mass of All Time. Msgr. Fellay listened, considered, judged and weighed the pros and cons. He accepted the principle of dialogue with Rome. He set forth his conditions for it. He made these clear in a letter to Rome, and later through an intermediary. Complications began to set in. Rome could not accede to our demands concerning the Mass ("It would be too risky"). Rome wrote back. The situation drew to a close.

Meanwhile, on the other side of the Atlantic, the Priests of Campos, with Msgr. Rangel, were also weighing up the pros and cons. They were of a mind to go ahead. The new bishop is quite open-minded! There are more advantages for them in gaining juridical recognition in their diocese than in remaining in the status quo. Theirs is a particular situation, peculiar to themselves.

July 2001

One Friday at the end of July 2001, there I was driving along the road to Brussels. I was about to meet the community of which I was to take responsibility. It was about 5:30 or 6 pm. My mobile rang: it was Fr. Rifan. He sounded as if he was just on the other side of the door! I was over the moon! He told me Msgr's decision: to go ahead with contacts with Rome. I encouraged him, congratulated him for having such manly fortitude. I thought of the circumspection of certain people. "It is perhaps easier for you to act in your domain. Your faithful and clergy are more united." I encouraged him to pursue his plans in that direction, and wished him good luck, adding that when the victory came to pass I would be with them in Campos for the celebrations. I thought to myself that they will surely be a model for us. Things are looking up!

It's a momentous event. What they have achieved on the juridical level, we could also achieve in our turn—one day. The experiment has been made. I remembered the patience which Rome showed towards Dom Gerard. It is rather a pity, I told him, that this initiative did not come from the Society, but never mind, to get out of the status quo is a good thing. We have nothing to fear with regard to the Campos Fathers. I know and appreciate their serious outlook, their theological rigor, and their missionary sense. They have lived as long as we—they know Rome—they have fought against the enemy as much as we. They have supported Msgr. Lefebvre as much as we—perhaps even better. They had no hesitation in crossing the Atlantic to be present at the consecrations. It was the right thing to do for the aging Msgr. de Castro Mayer, to cross the sea simply for the love of the good of the Church!

And then they have remained faithful in all they say and write. They have reiterated their assurances of friendship. They came to preach during the pilgrimage at Pentecost. There was Fr Rifan. What a sermon he gave, delivered with such fervor and passion! We must trust them, I said to Fr Rifan. I agree with you. If you succeed, without making any compromises, of course, you will be our models, our example, our shield, even. That's what I had always thought and said to some people. They couldn't get over it and thought I was raving. I don't mind admitting it. I get mad that we didn't have the guts to throw ourselves into the "affair," but I understand the difficulty. We must be prudent, take time for reflection so that we can get a clearer view. I quite understand the stance taken at headquarters, but that should not stop them from being bold and analyzing the situation correctly! Finally, my last words to him were: "*If you succeed, I will come and be at your side on the day of celebration*".

That day has arrived. Juridical recognition with the right, ratified, in writing, signed by the Pope, for them and their faithful, to celebrate the Mass of All Time. Some people in Rome must be grinding their teeth. Believe me! I could not fail to keep my promise.

Then came the time—the 25th of December 2001—when our request was finally granted. That was the time when "*the possibility of continuing to have recourse to the integral and fruitful Roman Missal of Saint Pius V*" was affirmed anew. That was the fruit of

thirty years of struggle. That was the time when those in authority heard the anguished plea of the faithful, the same appeal which had been made by Jean Madiran. He never gave up requesting from the Holy Father both the catechism and the Sacred Texts of the Mass. The Mass has been given back to us. It was the first thing that was taken from us. It is the first thing to be given back to us. The rest—the catechism and the Sacred Texts—will have to follow. The Church is holy.

The 25th of December 2001, a new juridical status for the Mass

The juridical status accorded to the old Mass by John Paul's letter of the 25th of December 2001 is radically different from the situation created (at the time) by the *motu proprio Ecclesia Dei afflictata*. The Mass of All Time has, on this occasion, been recognized as a right. It belongs, as a *right*, to the Personal Apostolic Administration which the Holy Father has just established in Campos, the Apostolic Administration of Saint Jean Marie Vianney. This right, together with its exercise, no longer depends on the Ordinary of the place. It is the "property" of this Apostolic Administration, which has full jurisdiction over its members, clergy, and faithful alike. In this Apostolic Administration there will no longer be any such thing as "biritualism," but completely and exclusively the so-called rite of Saint Pius V. It is a right which applies to every church, to every priest, to every member of the faithful who are in this Apostolic Administration. There is no longer any question of designating, where the need arises, diocesan churches and to draw up specific schedules, as is the case for the Fraternity of Saint Peter. Here, in the Apostolic Administration of Campos, the parish priest is by right fully in charge of his church. He has full jurisdiction. He enjoys full possession of his right. He has the *cura animarum* (the care of souls) with his right—his "*facultas*"—to say the Mass of Saint Pius V including Requiem Masses, nuptial Masses and celebrate all the other Sacraments according to the old rite.

The conditions which Cardinal Medina had laid down for the priests of the Fraternity of Saint Peter on the 18th of October 1999 do not apply here; they are not mandatory for the members and priests of the Apostolic Administration of Saint Jean Marie Vianney. All that is over now. Also the restrictive conditions contained in the Indult granted by the *Motu proprio Ecclesia Dei* have gone. Everyone knows, in fact, with what limitations and restrictions the bishops granted the benefit of the Indult. The old Mass still continued to exist, certainly, by means of the *Motu Proprio Ecclesia Dei* as well as under the 1984 Indult, but with what restrictions! A kind of "liberty under supervision." It was granted a degree of tolerance in the Church but in the way that one tolerates an evil.

The members of the *Ecclesia Dei afflictata* communities went, one day, to complain to Rome—I am referring to the 24th of October 1998—about the policy of the bishops which is far too restrictive. I followed them there in order to hear for myself and I was criticized for doing so. Now there is nothing like that with the "faculty" approved for the Campos priests to say the Mass. They have just been, quite simply, granted "*the possibility of continuing,*" this time without any restriction, "*to have recourse to the integral and fruitful Roman Missal of Saint Pius V.*" Admit it, it's a great victory! We must insist upon that.

This "faculty" to say the old Mass was granted to the Campos priests without their being obliged to acknowledge the "doctrinal rectitude" of the new Mass. That was the case for the priests of the *Ecclesia Dei* communities. For their part, in order to be allowed to celebrate the Mass of All Time under the Indult, they had not only to 1) recognize the validity of the new Mass (which no one ever denied, and which we have no problem in accepting) but also, and especially, 2) they had to acknowledge the perfect "legitimacy and doctrinal rectitude" of the new Mass.

The permission to say the old Mass was given, objectively speaking, only on this condition. That was expressly stated in the Indult letter *Quattuor abhinc annos*. That was the first condition to satisfy. And that condition was expressly repeated in the *Motu*

VICTORY

Proprio *Ecclesia Dei*: in note 9 (small “c”) in chapter 6. It was again mentioned by Cardinal Medina on the 18th of October 1999: “The faithful, for their part, must genuinely accept the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, as well as the legitimacy and orthodoxy of the liturgical texts promulgated in the context of the liturgical renewal.” “Bi-ritualism” was a “must,” but there was a huge difference between the legal statuses of the two rites. Conciliar Rome waited ten years before bringing all the *Ecclesia Dei* communities to this confession of orthodoxy.

It was Dom Gerard who, on the 24th of October 1998, speaking on behalf of them all, stated to Cardinal Ratzinger:

It is in this spirit of peace and community that I agreed, on the 27th of April 1995, to concelebrate with the Holy Father, wishing to show by that action that all of us who are fighting for the preservation of the old Missal believe in the validity and the orthodoxy of the new rite.

None of that was expected this time of Msgr. Rangel and his priests. They would, however, have refused. All they did was recognize what Msgr. Lefebvre recognized: “The validity of the New Order of Mass promulgated by Pope Paul VI when it is celebrated correctly, with the *intention of offering the true Sacrifice of the Mass.*”

In his declaration, solemnly proclaimed on the 18th of January, in the Cathedral of Campos, Msgr. Rangel ensured that his audience—especially the diocesan clergy—accepted that the Mass is a true sacrifice (which is an unusual feat nowadays). The liturgical reform wanted to turn it into a Supper, a commemoration of Good Friday, an Easter event, or whatever. No, the Campos priests maintain the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass. They made the diocesan priests of Campos—present in the Cathedral and who, I can assure you, were listening attentively—listen to this declaration: that the Holy Sacrifice of the Church is necessarily a true sacrifice, the sacrifice of Christ. Some of them were, by degrees, unconsciously and over a period of time, celebrating the new rite in the new Conciliar spirit, in the spirit of the reform which makes the new Mass into “a simple *narratio institutionis . . .*” to quote from the uncompromising words of the declaration. No! No! They heard, from the lips of Msgr. Rangel, in the presence of two Cardinals of the Church, that, in order to be valid, the Mass, even the Mass of the liturgical reform, must be offered with the intention of doing what the Church has always done: offering the true Sacrifice, that of Christ on the Cross. This declaration is a true profession of faith. A public witness of fidelity to Catholic Tradition

That took place at Campos, on the 18th of January 2002, in the presence of more than 4,000 faithful and the diocesan clergy. In this simple gesture, Msgr. Rangel perhaps reawakened on that day the wavering faith of some people.

And who is talking of betrayal? Who is saying that the Campos fathers have embarked on a dangerous evolution? The truth is that this Apostolic Administration of Saint Jean Marie Vianney was born of a profession of faith that was clear, distinct, precise. I believe in such works! With their juridical recognition by Rome, the Campos priests have at the same time secured the “faculty” to say Mass in the rite of Saint Pius V. They have won!

Cardinal Castrillon and his secretary were delighted with it. Whether they were being dishonest and trying to take us in. Time will tell, but the letter of the 25th of December 2001 stands and will still stand. It sets the tone—that’s what matters. People come and go, documents remain.

Some time ago, Rome wrote to the priests of the *Ecclesia Dei* communities: “As the present manner of celebrating, according to the Roman rite, corresponds to the common liturgical norm, one must not speak of “two rites” or of “biritualism.” The concession made by the Motu Proprio *Ecclesia Dei afflicta* protects the liturgical sensitivities of the priests and faithful who are used to the former manner of celebrating, but in no way does it form them into a Church with its own rite.” That is something that has been

done in our day even if we must not use that expression. A Personal Apostolic Administration—a quasi-diocese—will be able to celebrate the Tridentine Mass without any problem and entirely legitimately. Whether it is a Church with its own rite or not, only the rite of the Mass of All Time will be celebrated in the churches of Msgr. Rangel.

The Campos Ceremonies

Here we are in Campos. We left the coach and made immediately for the Cathedral. It was already full to bursting. The area was full of the activity and excitement that accompanies grand occasions. There were as many people inside as there were outside. People would have to follow the ceremony from outside, by means of a public address system. It was 5:30 p.m., then 5:45.

The priests were conducted to a large hall on the first floor, behind the Cathedral. As for the prelates, of whom there was a large number, they were on the ground floor. There was Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos, and the Cardinal of Rio, Dom Eugenio Salles. He has an impressive bearing. The Nuncio was there too. What a fine head of hair! Several local bishops were present. They were all ready.

On the first floor, the priests gathered. What an amusing sight! On one side there was Msgr. Rangel in soutane, surplice and stole, and on the other were the diocesan clergy in their “cowled” vestments and long stoles. Taizé has imposed its “look” even in Brazil. The clergy of both groups remained in their own place. I greeted Father Rifan, Father Possidente and some other priests whose names I do not know. I found the atmosphere rather cold.

The procession started to move off. The organ sounded. Father Rifan's choir could be heard everywhere. The ceremony must have been well prepared. We were handed a programme for the ceremony. The proclamation of various documents were to be read out, all relating to this juridical recognition by the Church of the Campos priests now organized into the Personal Apostolic Administration of Saint Jean Marie Vianney. Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament would bring this great historic ceremony to a conclusion.

We processed through the Cathedral. It was a very dark night. The Cathedral was well lit, decorated in Marian colors, blue and white. It's not a very big Cathedral. We walked round on the Epistle side. There were about 50 clergy. The diocesan priests of Campos took up position in the sanctuary, on the Gospel side. The priests of the new Apostolic Administration, on the Epistle side. The prelates arrived and bowed to the main altar.

Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos, the pontifical legate, brought up the rear. He was applauded. Brazil is a warm-hearted country. He was attended by two train-bearers, two of Msgr. Rangel's priests. There was a Redemptorist priest, bustling all over the place, who supervised the whole procedure of the ceremony. During the ceremony I found out that he was Father Fernando Guimarães, the Secretary General of the Cardinal, or rather his Chief Advisor. I was at Father Rifan's side.

The Cardinal arrived in the sanctuary, expressed some concern as to whether the Real Presence was in the tabernacle or not. He was told “no.” He made the customary bow and went to his throne. There was a rousing rendition of hymn singing. Looking strange on the top step of the high altar, in the middle of the sanctuary, in front of the original main altar, Msgr. Rangel, Dom Roberto Guimarães, the Bishop of the diocese, the Apostolic Nuncio, Dom Alfio Rapisarda took their places. Msgr. Rangel was on the right of the Cardinal-Legate, then came the Cardinal of Rio.

The ceremony began with the hymn to the Holy Ghost, then the orations, and the chanting of the Gospel; a deacon with a resonant voice sang the Gospel. It was a passage from the Gospel of Saint John, chapter 17. The Bishop of the place—the Ordinary—Dom Roberto Guimarães, addressed a few words to the prelates, to the priests, and the congregation. He thanked God for this day, for the work of Providence,

VICTORY

of the Holy Ghost, which had restored peace. Father Rifan translated for me. Then came the sermon of the Cardinal-Legate. It was brief. I must get a copy of it to complete my records. Next the letter of Msgr. Rangel and his clergy to the Sovereign Pontiff was read out. It was delivered with confidence by Father Rifan. I would not perhaps have written it like that, but the content was well balanced. It's a model of its kind.

After that, it was the turn of the Vicar General of the diocese of Campos, who read the decree. It was not the decree of the erection of the Personal Apostolic Administration as announced in the programme—that would be made public later—Father Rifan explained to me that in the five points specified in the text there was no clear allusion to the use of the old rite for all the Sacraments; the Cardinal decided to have this corrected before the solemn publication. It was a question of intellectual honesty concerning the decree of nomination of Msgr. Rangel as Apostolic Administrator of the Personal Apostolic Administration of Saint Jean Marie Vianney. Father Rifan explained that they will be directly answerable to Rome and the Roman Congregations and in particular to the Congregation of Bishops and in no way to the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission. It seems to me that this Commission has finished its task. It will continue in existence for as long as it takes for the Society of Saint Peter to gradually regain everything—whether it be dioceses or other associated communities. Msgr. Perl will be able to have a well-deserved rest!

He also explained that Msgr. Rangel was appointed bishop as the Head of this Apostolic Administration with the right of succession. "He can, with immediate effect, ask Rome for an auxiliary [and] use will be made," he told me, "of the customary 'terna' [a group of three] which is normally adopted in the running of the Apostolic Administration." He knows what he is talking about. He has read the Roman decree.

Finally, Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos officially received Dom Licinio Rangel as Administrator. This was accomplished with the signing of the letters and documents which had just been read. It was the Redemptorist Father, Dom Fernando Guimarães who brought the documents, presented them for signing and who took them away, placing them carefully in the folder. These were solemn and moving moments.

Then there was the embrace between the two bishops, one with territorial jurisdiction, the other with personal jurisdiction over his Apostolic Administration. The clergy were there—in the sanctuary—looking on attentively and happily.

We witnessed next Msgr. Rangel's profession of faith made before two qualified witnesses: the Cardinal-Legate and the Apostolic Nuncio. Once this profession had been read out, it was signed by all concerned on the Cathedral altar. And Msgr. Rangel gave everyone his apostolic blessing.

The ceremony in the Cathedral ended with Solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament presided at by the Cardinal. All the prelates left their places on the steps of the altar and went towards the altar in the sanctuary. The Blessed Sacrament was brought. Cardinal Hoyos took a step forward, hesitated for a moment—should this ceremony be celebrated facing the people or with one's back to them? His two attendants—both priests of the Administration—showed him the right direction. Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament went ahead exactly according to the classical tradition with the vibrant chanting of the *Te Deum*. I looked at the diocesan clergy. They were absorbed in prayer, on their knees, at peace—the first fruits of Tradition.

The ceremony came to an end. The priests left the sanctuary, and made their way directly to the sacristy. I had the opportunity to greet the Cardinal, to say a few words to him. He was delighted to see me there at that occasion. We would meet again. We left the church. It was raining slightly, a fine drizzle.

Another ceremony was to take place in the huge church built by Father Rifan which was bigger than the Cathedral. About thirty coaches, and some private cars took the faithful from one church to the other. Everybody was in a hurry, milling about everywhere! In no time at all, we were again in church. The people climbed the steps, took

their seats. The prelates were there, waiting at the foot of the steps: the Cardinal-Legate, the Nuncio, the bishops, Msgr. Rangel, all except the Cardinal of Rio who had to leave.

The church, dedicated to Our Lady, rises majestically heavenwards. Its exterior shines with an immaculate whiteness that is remarkable to behold. The bulk of the work is finished, but the interior is "bare concrete." It has no stained-glass windows, but the large hangings on the walls give a festive appearance.

The procession advanced towards the sanctuary. Again, the Cardinal was applauded. The new Apostolic Administration was placed under the protection of Our Lady. The faith of the Brazilian people was expressed in joyous hymns. There was a large number of priests and lay people.

While waiting for the ceremony to get underway, I had a few words with the Cardinal's Secretary, his Chief Advisor. He is happy for the Campos priests. "This faculty to celebrate the Mass of All Time is a blessing. It was difficult, I should say even impossible, to reply straight away to the Society of Saint Pius X: to declare the right for every priest to say the Mass of All Time. But the Mass is coming back, gradually, through the back door." I thought of Cardinal Stickler's idea that the Pope will not make a U-turn in liturgical matters, he will do precisely the opposite. We have to be satisfied with small victories here and there, keeping a united front and looking ahead towards the final victory: the triumph of the Mass of All Time, recognized throughout the whole Church. It seems to me that the Campos priests have gained a victory.

The Apostolic Administration will receive ratification of the faculty (facultas) to celebrate the Eucharist and the Liturgy of the Hours according to the liturgical discipline of the Roman Rite and in conformity with the precepts of our Predecessor Saint Pius V, with the adaptations introduced by his successors up to the time of Blessed John XXIII.

They have ventured into the occupied City. They have the intellectual ability to resist attacks which have been made upon them. Fr. Rifan is a formidable dialectician, skilled in the art of logical disputation. At meetings of priests and deacons, he and his colleagues will make a great impression.

We must stop being afraid of always being taken for a ride, and regarding ourselves as the weaker party. We must believe in the force of the truth spoken and confessed with conviction. We must have the soul of a conqueror. Saint Paul, whose feast we celebrate during Lent, could be sometimes taken as a model!

RECOGNITION OF THE POPE

In our public declaration, we stated: *We acknowledge the Holy Father, Pope John Paul II, with all his powers and prerogatives, promising him our filial obedience and offering our prayers for him.*

That is something we have always acknowledged. In all our sacristies, as is the custom in all our churches, there is on display a picture with the names of Pope John Paul II and the bishop of the diocese appointed by him. In our public prayers we have always prayed for Pope John Paul II and for the diocesan bishop. We have never adopted the sedevacantist position and we have never attempted to form a parallel diocese to contest the unity of the Church.

Even when, out of necessity, and in line with Catholic doctrine, we have had to offer resistance, that has never, for our part, meant that we have disputed papal authority or failed to recognize it. Moreover, we have always been fully aware of the abnormal, occasional and exceptional character of resistance in times of necessity, hoping always for a speedy regularization and normalization.

We have always had present in our minds the dogma of Faith: *We declare, state, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.* (Boniface VIII. Bull *Unam Sanctam*, Dz-Sh 875).

VICTORY

That is why, in our letter to the Pope, we wrote: *We place in the august hands of Your Holiness our Profession of Catholic Faith: we profess perfect communion with the Chair of Peter of which Your Holiness is the legitimate successor. We acknowledge your primacy and your government over the Universal Church, priests, and faithful. We declare that we would not, for anything in this world, wish to separate ourselves from the Rock on which Jesus Christ has founded His Church.* That is the very text of our profession of Catholic Faith of 1982, written under the direction of Monsignor Antonio de Castro Mayer.

RECOGNITION AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

In our declaration we also stated: "We recognize the Second Vatican Council as one of the Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church, accepting it in the light of Holy Tradition." We thus acknowledge that the Second Vatican Council was legitimately convened and presided over by Pope John XXIII and continued by Pope Paul VI, with the participation of the bishops of the whole world, including Monsignor Antonio de Castro Mayer and Monsignor Marcel Lefebvre who signed its documents. Monsignor Antonio de Castro Mayer wrote several pastoral letters on the Council, one in particular dated 1966 on the application of the documents promulgated by the Council.

However, there arose the "destructive spirit of the Council" which, according to Cardinal Ratzinger, "is the anti-spirit according to which the history of the Church ought to begin from Vatican II which is regarded as a kind of zero point." (Cardinal Ratzinger, in his interview on the faith, Chap. II, p. 37). That is why we stated in our declaration: "We recognize the Second Vatican Council as one of the Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church." The Church cannot separate itself from its past or contradict it.

But as far as the teachings of the Council are concerned, because of its eminently pastoral nature, which was proclaimed by the Council itself, and in order to adapt the unchangeable doctrine to our times, it is necessary for these teachings to be accepted in accordance with the whole of the Magisterium of the Church, that is to say, in the light of Holy Tradition. We say that because there are some people who, under the guise of the Council, have tried and still continue to try to introduce heretical doctrines into the bosom of the Church, doctrines which have been condemned by the Magisterium of all the previous centuries which constitutes Tradition. Pope Paul VI spoke of "the smoke of Satan" which has found its way into the Sanctuary (Allocution of June 29th, 1972) and His Holiness Pope John Paul II also deplored the fact that "ideas contradicting the revealed truth which had been constantly taught have been spread without restraint. Real heresies have been propagated in the dogmatic and moral domain, giving rise to doubt, confusion, and rebellion, and even the liturgy has been manipulated." (speech to the Congress of Missions June 2nd, 1981, quoted in *Iota Unum* p. 14). That is why we have recourse to the light of Tradition for the criterion of interpretation.

And accepting the Council in the light of Tradition is what everyone ought to do. It is the criterion of interpretation indicated by the Popes who convened it and who presided over it. In his allocution of the 11th of October 1962, at the opening of the Council, Pope John XXIII said this:

The essential purpose of this Council is, therefore, not a discussion on this or that article of the fundamental doctrine of the Church. We did not need a Council for that. But from a renewal of our adherence, in an atmosphere of serenity and calm, to the entire teaching of the Church in all its fullness and preciseness, such as it continues to shine forth in the Acts of the Council of Trent and Vatican I, the Christian, Catholic and Apostolic spirit throughout the whole world expects a clear step forward towards a doctrinal penetration and a formation of consciences in a more perfect accordance with the fidelity they profess towards authentic doctrine . . . which is to be studied and expounded through the methods of research and presentation of modern thought. The substance of the ancient doctrine contained in the deposit of the faith is one thing, and the formulas in which it is clothed are another: every-

thing must be measured in the forms and proportions of a Magisterium which is predominantly pastoral in character.

In fact, this was also the criterion used by Pope John Paul II when he spoke of the “whole doctrine of the Council,” which means, as he explained, that “*the doctrine must be understood in the light of Holy Tradition and with reference to the constant Magisterium of the Holy Church.*” (John Paul II, discourse to the assembly of the Sacred College, 5th November 1979).

And it could not be otherwise: that is what is taught by the Ecumenical Council of Vatican I: “*the Holy Ghost has not been promised to the successors of Peter for them to expound, under His revelation, a new doctrine; but that with His assistance, they may sacredly guard and faithfully expound the revelation handed down by the Apostles, that is to say, the deposit of the faith.*” Moreover, Monsignor Marcel Lefebvre himself said: “*I accept the Council interpreted in the light of Tradition.*” Similarly, Monsignor Bernard Fellay, Monsignor Lefebvre’s successor, stated: “*Accepting the Council is not a problem for us. There is a criterion of judgment. And that criterion is what has always been taught and believed as ‘Tradition’.*” (Interview with the Swiss Journal *La Liberté* 11. 5. 2001).

On this criterion of interpretation “in the light of Holy Tradition,” the famous Catholic French writer, Jean Madiran, gave his considered opinion (*Itinéraires*, November 1966, p. 13):

We accept the decisions of the Council in conformity with the decisions of the previous Councils. If such and such a text might seem, as can happen to any human form of expression, to be capable of more than one interpretation, we think that the correct interpretation is fixed precisely by and in conformity with the previous Councils and with the whole of the teaching of the Magisterium . . . If it came to the point—and there are some who have dared to suggest this—of having to interpret the decisions of the Council in a sense contrary to the previous teachings of the Church, we would have no reason to accept these decisions and no one would have the power to impose them on us. By definition, the teaching of a Council is the living continuity of all the Councils. Those who would like to present the teaching of the Council outside this context by breaking with this continuity would be presenting a pure invention of their own minds, without any authority whatsoever.

So it is with this criterion that we recognize and accept the Second Vatican Council.

ON THE HOLY MASS

We preserve, in our Personal Apostolic Administration “Saint Jean Marie Vianney,” as the Holy Father Pope John Paul II has given us the right to do, the Holy Mass in its traditional form, codified by Pope Saint Pius V, and not only the Mass but also the whole traditional liturgical discipline, in keeping with the words of Saint Peter. And we preserve it because it is an authentic treasure of the Holy Catholic Church, because it is a Liturgy which has sanctified many souls, because this Mass is the one which the Saints celebrated, because this Mass is the one in which the Saints participated. It is a Mass which expresses clearly and unambiguously the Eucharistic dogmas; it constitutes an authentic expression of the Faith; it is a symbol of our Catholic identity, a genuine theological and spiritual patrimony of the Church. It must be preserved. As Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Clergy has put it:

The old rite of Mass enables many people to keep this sense of mystery alive. The sacred rite, with its sense of mystery, helps us to enter by means of our senses, into the hidden places of the mystery of God. The nobility of a rite which has been with the Church for so many years fully justifies the efforts that a select group of the faithful should undertake in order

VICTORY

to maintain appreciation of this rite, and the Church, speaking with the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff, sees it that way when it requests that doors should be kept open for its celebration . . . Together we celebrate a beautiful rite, a rite which was that of many saints, a beautiful Mass which filled the naves of many cathedrals, and which made its mysterious tones resound in all the small churches around the world.” (Extract from his sermon preached during the Mass of Saint Pius V which was celebrated in Chartres on the 4th of June 2001).

With regard to the traditional Mass, Pope John Paul II praised it as a model of reverence and humility for all the celebrants in the world:

The People of God need to see in the exterior actions of priests and deacons an example of reverence and dignity, which would help them to enter into the invisible mysteries, for which few words and explanations are needed. In the Roman Missal, so-called of Saint Pius V, can be found some very beautiful prayers with which the priest expresses the most profound sense of humility and reverence in the presence of the sacred mysteries: these are the basis of the very substance of all liturgy. (John Paul II, message to the Plenary Assembly of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments, on the theme “Deepening the liturgical life of the People of God,” 21. 9. 2001).

There is no doubt that we have stated in our declaration that we recognize the validity of the New Order of Mass promulgated by Pope Paul VI whenever it is celebrated correctly and with the intention of offering the true Sacrifice of the Holy Mass.

But this is what Monsignor Antonio de Castro Mayer and Monsignor Marcel Lefebvre had been teaching all along. The latter, in the Protocol of Agreement of the 5th of May 1988, agreed to sign the following:

We declare, moreover, that we recognize the validity of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Sacraments celebrated with the intention of doing what the Church does and in accordance with the rites contained in the typical editions of the Roman Missal and the Rituals of the Sacraments promulgated by Popes Paul VI and John Paul II. (Protocol of Agreement - 5th May 1988, 14).

Why have we made the reservations “*whenever it is celebrated correctly and with the intention of offering the true Sacrifice of the Holy Mass*” ? Because if the priest celebrates Mass with the intention of carrying out a communal meal or a simple gathering or even a simple narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper, without the intention of offering the true Sacrifice of the Mass, the very validity of the Mass is at stake. And what is more, it is not a rare occurrence to come across such Masses, even if they are valid, in which “The liturgy has been violated” as Pope John Paul II said (Discourse to the Congress of Missions. 6/2/1981). “*In them the liturgy has degenerated into a 'show' in which attempts are made to make religion interesting with the help of fashionable trivialities or seductive maxims, which produce an ephemeral success among the group of liturgical designers . . .*” according to Cardinal Ratzinger's criticisms (Foreword to the book, *The Liturgical Reform*, by Mgr. Klaus Gamber, p. 6)

OUR REQUEST FOR PARDON

To ask forgiveness for mistakes or offences which may have been committed is an eminently Christian attitude. Only the proud and the stubborn are always right; they do not even admit the simple possibility of making a mistake. However, Saint Pius X said that in the heat of the battle it is difficult to gauge the accuracy and range of each blow or shot. So it is possible to err by deficit or by excess, which are excusable and un-

derstandable faults, but faults nonetheless. That is why, in our letter to the Pope, we wrote:

And if by chance in the heat of the battle to defend Catholic truth, although our intention has always been to serve Holy Church, we have made some mistakes or caused some displeasure to Your Holiness, we humbly request your fatherly forgiveness.

Although the cause is legitimate and holy, it can happen that errors and excesses in the manner of speaking or writing can arise, as well as an overly critical spirit and also a lack of the reverence and respect due to one's superiors. Those are the things for which we ask forgiveness, for ourselves and for all the faithful under our care. There is absolutely no question of our having to ask pardon for our Catholic stance with regard to doctrine or liturgy, which has been recognized personally by the Holy Father himself.

WE WILL CONTINUE OUR COMMITMENT TO DEFEND THE CHURCH

The fact that the Holy Father, the Pope himself, has given us a Personal Apostolic Administration does not mean that the crisis of the Church is over and that our fight for the defense of traditional values will grow lukewarm. As we wrote to the Pope:

In the name of our Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith we have striven to safeguard the sacred doctrines and liturgy of Tradition which the Holy Church has handed on to us; and, within the limitations of our own weakness and with the help of God's grace, we have made every effort to resist what your illustrious Predecessor, Pope Paul VI, called the auto-demolition of the Church. It is in this way that we hope to render the best service to Your Holiness and to the Holy Church.

And now, as we are canonically recognized, we offer ourselves to the Pope to collaborate officially with him in the fight against the errors and heresies which are unfortunately in the bosom of the Church.

This is what we said to the Pope in the same letter:

We wish, officially, to collaborate with Your Holiness in the work of the propagation of the Faith and of Catholic doctrine, working zealously for the honor of the Holy Church—Signum levatum in nationes—[as a sign lifted up among the nations]—and in the fight against the errors and heresies which are threatening to destroy the Barque of Peter, but to no effect because the gates of Hell will not prevail against Her.

And the Holy Father has kindly accepted our offer:

We have received, with great pastoral joy, your wish to collaborate with the Successor of Blessed Peter in the propagation of the Faith and of Catholic Doctrine, seeking the honor of the Holy Church—which is the banner raised up among the nations (Is. 11, 12)—in the fight against those who would destroy the Barque of Peter, vainly because the gates of Hell will not prevail against Her.”(Mt. 16, 18)

And that is why we concluded our declaration with the words:

We commit ourselves to studying in greater depth all the points which are still open, taking into consideration Canon 212 of the Code of Canon Law.

This Canon recognizes the right and even at times the duty of the faithful to express their opinion publicly in the Church. The reference to this Canon indicates that we have not committed ourselves to a guilty silence when confronted with error. For that

reason, and wishing to be faithful to the Magisterium of the Church, with the grace of God, we will continue to combat the errors which the Holy Church has always condemned and resisted. But this fight will always be carried out with due regard for the norms of respect, humility and charity, as we have stated at the end of our declaration: "with a sincere spirit of humility and fraternal charity towards all." *In principiis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus charitas [in essentials unity, in open questions liberty, and in all things charity]* (St. Augustine).

To those who rejoice with us, our thanks!

To those who disagree with us, our understanding!

To those who attack us, our forgiveness!

To everyone, our request for their prayers for our perseverance!

*Holy Roman Catholic Church
One, excellent, Divine, eternal
Which keeps the Apostolic faith
And the promises of life everlasting
We love you, we are your children
In your bosom we wish to live
And in the radiance of the light which you give us
In your motherly arms to die!
(These two verses are from a hymn known and loved by our people.)*

FR. PAUL AULANGIER, SSPX

REVIEWS

Recordings

A Treasure of Inestimable Value. Music from the Latin Mass at St. Agnes, New York. B. Andrew Mills, organist and choirmaster. Museovich Productions. (available via internet distribution: CDNow.com and Amazon.com)

Banging kneelers, crying babies, coughs and sniffles—the accustomed noises of a Catholic congregation at worship—are all gratifyingly audible on this extensive collection of Gregorian chants, polyphonic Mass movements, motets, hymns, and organ pieces, recorded live at St. Agnes during the old rite Latin Masses celebrated there each Sunday. It is really quite moving to hear all this exquisitely performed music in the context of actual parish worship. The music-making from the small choir is of a very high order—chant sung with careful attention to its rhythmic properties, and polyphony performed with great purity of sound and sensitive phrasing. The congregation joins heartily in the hymns and a few well-known chants.

Everyone at St. Agnes, and especially Mr. Mills, is to be warmly congratulated on carrying out with scrupulous devotion what the Second Vatican Council really said about sacred music, and helping thus to preserve the “treasure of inestimable value” which is the music of the Church.

Calvert Shenk

NEWS

The Twelfth Annual Church Music Colloquium co-sponsored by the Church Music Association of America and Christendom College met on the campus of Christendom College June 18-23 of this year. There were some changes in the faculty. The chant instructors were Fr. James Aylward of San Francisco and Mr. Scott Turkington of Stamford, Connecticut. Fr. Robert Skeris rehearsed the mixed choir. This year's guest lecturer was Professor William Mahrt of Stanford University. The Colloquium ended on Sunday June 23rd with a beautiful *Missa cantata* celebrated by Fr. Laurence Violette, a priest of the diocese of Arlington. The Ordinary of the Mass was Victoria's *Mass in the Phrygian Mode*, sung by the

Colloquium choir and the Propers were chanted by the Advanced Schola made up of Colloquium participants.

‡

Msgr. Richard B. Curtin, a Juilliard trained seminary music professor who later became pastor of five parishes in the Archdiocese of New York, was called to his eternal reward on Sunday 21 July 2002, aged 86 years.

A Manhattan native, Curtin took his bachelor's degree from Manhattan College in the Bronx before entering Dunwoodie to study for the priesthood. After ordination on 30 May 1942 the young priest spent the war years assisting at various parishes in metropolitan New York whilst pursuing graduate studies at the Juilliard School (1943/46). After appointment to the faculty of St Joseph's Major Seminary in Yonkers, Curtin continued his professional preparation at NYU (1947/48) and the Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music in Rome (1951/52).

The years he spent as seminary music director were remembered as a time of “animation, reorientation and renewal of church music.” His style reminded some of “Zeus hurling thunderbolts on 240 unwilling virtuosi,” and “with his adamant assertion that everyone can sing, he impressed even the few cynics to be found amongst the seminarians with the beauty and the prayer that was Gregorian chant.” Msgr. Curtin also taught courses at the St Pius X School of Liturgical Music, and to the Sisters of Mercy at their Mercy College in Dobbs Ferry.

Members of the CMAA will recall that when Pope Paul VI founded the *Consociatio Internationalis Musicae Sacrae* in 1963, at the recommendation of Mons. Higinio Angles, the first Vice-Presidents named by the Holy Father were Egon Wellesz of Oxford, and Msgr. Curtin. High points in his life were two papal visits to New York. In 1965, for the Mass of Pope Paul VI in Yankee Stadium on the occasion of his visit to the United Nations, Msgr. Curtin organised and directed the choir of 225 men from major seminaries in the New York metropolitan area. He also conducted the singing of the congregation at Pope John Paul II's Mass in the Stadium in 1979.

Named a domestic prelate in 1960, Msgr. Curtin's “two loves were music and pastoral life.” He spent his long life serving the Church in New York where he was long a powerful figure in the Irish Catholic community. From 1957/70 he head-

ed the Church Music Commission of the Archdiocese, and he served on the first archdiocesan Liturgical Commission from 1964/70. In these capacities he championed the English liturgical compositions of Frank Campbell-Watson, the pipe organs of the Delaware Organ Co., and the Benziger Catholic Hymnal which in its day was a milestone of sorts. In his active retirement, Msgr. Curtin's activities included service as a confessor for priests, which is "the zenith of peer acknowledgement," as was noted at his funeral rites.

Richard Curtin's life was lived under six New York Cardinals. Born under Cardinal Farley and a seminarian under Cardinal Hayes, Curtin was ordained under Cardinal Spellman, who appointed him to his first pastorate. He served in parish work under Cardinals Cooke and O'Connor, and his exequies were conducted by Edward Cardinal Egan at St Joseph's Seminary on 25 July 2002. May he rest in peace.

†

I have recently received a newsletter from the *Mary Mother of God Mission Society* which announces the formation of the Catholic Concert Choir of Vladivostok (Russia). The choir will be made up of 26 members and will be directed by Miss Svetlana Naumova. The yearly schedule of the concert choir will be divided into two parts (Christmas and Easter). The choir will be preparing Camille Saint-Saens' *Christmas Oratorio* and appropriate parts of G.F. Handel's *Messiah* among other pieces. The newsletter says that the concerts are used as a means of evangelization in a region where only 4% of the population is baptized and the effects of atheistic communist propaganda are still present. The organizers see the concert series as a "way to get non-religious or non-practicing Russians to visit our church . . . Since beauty and music are very important to the Russian soul our concerts have a very positive influence on what and how the citizens of Vladivostok think about the Lord and His Church."

†

For the second time, the Tridentine parish of *Mater Ecclesiae* in Berlin, New Jersey celebrated a Solemn High Mass according to the Traditional Roman Rite in the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception of the Diocese of Camden on the Feast of the Assumption (August 15th) 2002. This Mass was in thanksgiving for the establishment of the parish and featured the *Ars Laudis Chorale* singing the *Messe Solennelle* of Louis Vierne. The editor of

this journal was there and found the event to be quite impressive. The Cathedral was packed and the music and ceremonial were superb. May God receive the glory, of course, but much gratitude should go to the pastor of *Mater Ecclesiae*, Fr. Robert C. Pasley, who made it all possible. Those interested in purchasing a video of this event should make out a check for \$19.95 to the Padre Pio Gift Shop and send it to Mater Ecclesiae Roman Catholic Church, 261 Cross Keys Road, Berlin, NJ 08009-9431.

†

The wording of one of the recent "American Adaptations" to the GIRM treats kneeling almost as a deviation from the law to be handled in a pastorally sensitive manner (i.e. the concept of the *epikeia*) until such hold outs are persuaded of the importance of standing. ("The norm for reception of Holy Communion in the dioceses of the United States is standing. Communicants should not be denied Holy Communion because they kneel. Rather such instances should be addressed pastorally, by providing the faithful with proper catechesis on the reasons for the norm.")

The history behind this American Adaptation is that, after intense lobbying, Rome finally gave in to pressure and allowed the American bishops to say that "Holy Communion in the United States of America is *normally* received standing" (emphasis added) if they introduced a clause "that would protect those faithful who will be inevitably led by their own sensibilities to kneel from imprudent action . . ." Cardinal Medina Estevez, who allowed this in Protocol n. 138/10/L, in essence said, "OK you guys, you may strongly recommend the standing option as long as you don't harass those who want to choose the kneeling option—both are licit." (Note: Even without this protective clause kneeling would still not be forbidden. The American Adaptation, as allowed by Rome, does not command or forbid anything. It merely *describes* the customary practice.)

But the final American version is tendentious and sows confusion as to what the law really is. It cries out for an official clarification! Also of interest is that Bishop Wilton Gregory, President of the USCCB, in promulgating this American Adaptation claims to be issuing a particular law on behalf of all the dioceses in the United States, something which he cannot do; he also claims that it goes into effect immediately, which seems to contradict what Cardinal Medina Estevez says in

Protocol n. 138/10/L (i.e. none of the “American Adaptations” can go into effect until published as a part of the *official* General Instruction—presumably as part of the new English version of the Missal—not as part of a “separate fascicle.”)

I think it is very important for this matter to be officially clarified, because as the American wording stands it allows people to use the GIRM as an attack on kneeling for communion. This is a matter of importance for Catholics nationwide and someone should submit a *dubium* to Rome immediately.

†

CONTRIBUTIONS

Rev. Msgr. Richard Schuler is pastor emeritus of St. Agnes Parish in St. Paul, MN and former editor of *Sacred Music*.

Professor Dr. Robert Spaemann has taught philosophy at the Universities of Heidelberg, Salzburg, and Munich. He is a member of the Pontifical Academy for Life. His works are translated into three languages. He is the founder, former vice-president, and currently honorary president of the association *Pro Missa Tridentina*.

Laurence Lombardi is a student at Christendom College in Front Royal, VA.

Fr. Paul Aulagnier, SSPX is a priest of the Fraternity of St. Pius X.

SACRED MUSIC (00474960) is a quarterly. Subscription is \$20 annually. Office of Publication is 134 Christendom Drive, Front Royal, VA 22630-5103. Publisher is Church Music Association of America, (same address). Officers are Robert A. Skeris, 722 Dillingham Avenue, Sheboygan, WI 53081-6028, president; Robert Pasley, 261 Cross Keys Road, Berlin, NJ 08009-9431, vice president; Rosemary Reninger, 13283C Leafcrest Lane Apt. 201, Fairfax, VA 22033, secretary; Ralph Stewart, 5389 22nd Avenue SW, Naples, FL 34116, treasurer. Total copies 1000. No sales through dealers. Main subscription and total circulation: 700. No free distribution. Kurt R. Poterack, editor.