“The Roman Mass from the Eve of Trent to the Present and Beyond: An Overview.”

A Talk Give at Una Voce Canada’s 2019 Annual General Meeting on Saturday, October 12, 2019

I am very pleased to be here; I had a wonderful time meeting the members of the board and listening to the excellent work that is being done. Congratulations on being extraordinary members of the International Federation of Una Voce; that’s quite something—I hope your work continues along the same lines. I am also pleased to see some of my former students: Fr. Geddes and Fr. Oballo as well as Matthew and others including Mr Suen (there he is!).

So: the topic of my talk is vast and so I am going to have to put some hedges around it so that I can compress it a bit. I can tell you what I am not going to talk about: I am not going to talk about the Novus Ordo Missae promulgated by Paul VI in 1969—that will have to be another lecture by someone else.

I am going to talk about the evolution of the Roman Mass as we know it from the eve of Trent (although I am going to have to go back a bit before that so that you may see the prehistory of the Roman Mass). I’ll talk about how there were different uses and how it was in fact quite diverse until the eve of Trent. And then from Trent on we’ll see a trend towards centralization and standardization of the Mass which will last until the twentieth century. In the twentieth century we shall see some changes introduced into the Roman Missal up until the last one in November of 1962. Then the last time the Tridentine Missal was published according to the 1962 edition was 1 Januray 1964. After that we’ll look at the survival of that particular “form” of the

Roman rite, as we now call it, to the present day, and then perspectives for the future—which very much involves work that you do as members of Una Voce Canada. That is the rough outline of my talk.

The work that I have used to prepare for this (so that you can go back and check whether what I have said makes any sense) is the foundational work of Austrian liturgist Father Jungmann who was writing in the 1940s-50s and into the 1960s; the work put together by the French liturgist Canon Martimort who edited many theological books in the 1940s and 1950s.[1] Both of these were reformists in favour of reforming the Mass to produce what is now called the *Novus Ordo*. More rectently, though, the work of French priest Father Claude Barthe is of captial importance. In fact I have brought two of his recent books on this topic with me, which exist only in French (perhaps someone will translate them): *The History of the Tridentine Missal and Its Origins* and also *The Mass of Vatican II*.[2] Father Barthe celebrates only the traditional Mass and has a critical view of the reforms, which is a breath of fresh air because most of the histories of the new Mass tend to be, shall we say, in favour.

I am going to talk about where the Mass comes from. Its origins go back to the very beginnings of the Mass in Latin, so that will take us back to the late third-early fourth century. Every ecclesiastical 'zone' developed its own liturgy—think about Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome. But even in the West, there was a great deal of diversity. Since you have a Saint Monica society here, I'll talk about her. Saint Monica was North African, and she went to Milan she met Saint Ambrose, who baptised her son, Saint Augustine. She said to Saint Ambrose that she was a little rattled by the diversity of uses she found in the different provinces she'd travelled through;

[1] J. A. Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman rite : its origins and development (Missarum sollemnia) (New York : Benziger, 1951-1955); A.-G. Martimort, The Church at prayer (New York : Desclée Co., 1968-).
[2] Claude Barthe, *Histoire du missel tridentin et de ses origines* (Versailles: Via Romana, 2016),idem, *La Messe de Vatican II* (Via Romana, 2018).

in Rome they fast on different days to the days on which Christians fasted in North Africa—what was she to do? The saintly bishop of Milan fanously said: "When in Rome, do as the Romans do." That's where that comes from.

We have some indications of this kind of diversity when Saint Gregory sent Saint Augustine of Canterbury to England to convert the English. Saint Augustine asked what kind of liturgy he should bring to that country, to which Saint Gregory did not say "Just bring the Mass I say"; he said:[3]

> I approve of your selecting carefully anything you have found that may be more pleasing to Almighty God, whether in the Roman Church or that of Gaul, or in any Church whatever, and introducing in the Church of the English, which is as yet new in the faith, by a special institution, what you have been able to collect from many Churches.

So there is a great deal of diversity and I'll talk about that throughout.

But really what makes the Roman Mass the Roman Mass is the Roman Canon, which you hear at every Mass according to the extraordinary form, as every Roman Mass has always used that Canon for ever, unchangeably, until three more Anaphoras were put together in the 1960s for use in the new Missal. The oldest attestation we have for the Roman Canon is in Saint Ambrose—he quotes from it as it was adopted into the liturgy of the church of Milan.[4] There are other, later, indications of it; Father Barthe, whose books I just showed to you, says that it probably goes all the way back to the papacy of pope Saint Cornelius, whom my former students remember to have been martyred in 250 AD; indeed he is the last pope mentioned in the Roman Canon, so it makes sense that the canon would be composed under his papacy or that of his

---

[3] Gregory the Great, Registrum Epistolarum, Book XI, Letter 64, trans. James Barmby (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 13; http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/360211064.htm)

[4] Ambrose, *de Sacramentis* (SC25bis, p.114ff).

successor. This, then, is going back to the middle of the third century for that Canon, which we hear to day still, with a few small modifications, but certainly by then the canon is in place.

The Roman Mass is then going to evolve in the following way. In other parts of the West another kind of liturgy will develop, which we call "Gallic" or "Frankish." The daughters of that are the Mozarabic and the Celtic uses and so forth. But under Chalermagne, there was a desire to unify the Frankish empire under one emperor, one law, and one religion, the Catholic religion, which is why they converted the Saxons, and one liturgy. So they asked Rome for Roman Mass books to spread into the Frankish realm; the Frankish dynasty was very close to Rome and they rescued the pope on several occasions. The books are brought in but these books are not complete and they tend to be the books of what we call the liturgy of the papal court, of the curia, which means that it is suited to the basilica of the Lateran, of Saint Peters, etc. Therefore adaptations have to be made, and they will be made by all sorts of scribes, particularly Alcuin and Benedict of Aniana, who will also be put in charge of spreading the Benedictine rule into Frankish realms. This does not take place overnight; it's a long slow process of cross-hybridization you might say. They introduce into the books they receive from Rome such Frankish elements as the Easter *Exultet*, some Prefaces, some blessings and votive Masses, some blessings of the bishop, the ordination rite, some of the prayers in ordinary Sundays are taken from other, older Roman books no longer used in Rome herself as well as some purely local Gallic elements. So for example the sequences in the Missal: those were not in the Roman Mass at all; they are introduced at this time by the Franks. Saying the *Gloria Tibi* after the Lesson as out altar boy said this morning at Mass: that was introduced by the Franks. Also more incensations; the very fact that there are hymns in the breviary is part of this trend: the Roman breviary original did not have any hymns at all; it's a very sober rite, a very matter-of-fact kind

of rite. If you look at the Gallican uses you'll find them to be nearly over-the-top abundant and profuse. You can tell this: just as an experiment if you look at a Mass of one of the early Roman martyrs, you'll see that their prayers are very short and punchy: "O God, give to us who are celebrating the annivesary of the death of your martyr the grace to attain to the rewards she has heaven." And that's it. But then if you look at the blessings of the palms on Palm Sunday there are more collects, and these collects are as long as your arm! They go through the histroy of palms and what they represent: that's more the Gallic style. You can see both of them in the Missals as we have them today. Just one more thing regarding this hybrid, Romano-Frankish Mass as it was used in the empire of Charlemagne: there was an explicit attempt at getting the people to sing the *Kyriale* (including the *Gloria* etc.); the people were asked to sing in the nave. At this time then you have sung participation of the people, in the ninth century AD.

You may say: "Fine, that applies to the Frankish empire. But how does it apply to Rome?" Well there were two centuries of decadence in Rome when they didn't say the Mass very well any more, and so the reforming popes of the eleventh century asked to have the books back from the Frankish empire—with all of these addtions now. By the time *those* come back to Rome during this reform, particulary under Saint Gregory VII, Hildebrand, you start having Roman papal liturgical books that look very much like the Tridentine Mass you have in your Missal that you bring to Mass yourselves: that is their origin. There are some small changes, so for example we say the *Secret* and the *Postcommunion*, whereas in the Frankish realm these would be called the *Super Oblata* and the *Ad Complendum*—little things like that. But it's basically the Mass that we now have. This ebb-and-flow, with books going over into the Frankish realms in the eighth century, coming back again under the great reform of Gregory VII, is what produces the Roman Missal that is recognizable to us today. If you can read the Latin and

its abbreviations you can pick up one of these and say: “Oh I can follow this; I know what’s going on exactly.”

That is just for the texts, though. But as you know when you go to Mass it’s more than the texts that you see. So for example if you go to a low Mass, whether only the server says the responses or the entire congregation does gives you a very different feel of what is going on at Mass, even though the texts are identical. Sometimes, e.g., if a traditional Catholic from the Anglo-Saxon spere, as Fr. Claude Barthe says, goes to Mass in the Latin sphere (France, Italy, Spain), he will say “Well this is not at all the way in which I’m used to hearing Mass.” Everyone says the responses, they hold their arms this way to receive Communion while we do it this other way. You can see these distinctions coming up already back then.

While the Mass was developing in the Frankish empire you have, e.g., the beginning of what we call “Private Masses”—*Missae privatae*. Meaning a priest who says Mass without a congregation or maybe a server, which is very important for us because that is the origin of the Low Mass we attend. And the reason for that is that there were more priests than parishes, particularly in the monasteries, and also the desire to offer Masses for particular intentions. So you start seeing churches with more than one altar, with side altars, so that several private Masses can be said at the same time.

Another big difference this made is that if a priest is going to say Mass by himself he needs to say *everything*, whereas before in the solemn Masses the priests had what is called a Sacramentary with only that parts that pertain to them, while the Epistle was in an *Epistolary* for the subdeacon to sing: he had that book. The deacon had the Evangeliary to proclaim the Gospel from. But now with private Masses you need to start having a single book, as we now have, with

all the texts. And that is the origin of that particular aspect of our current practice: the private Masses.

Furthermore we have the addition of private prayers into the Mass; prayers in which the celebrant begs the indulgence of God for himself as a sinner. This had not existed in the old days. So for example the *Aufer a nobis, quaesumus, iniquitates* ('Take from us, we beseech thee, our iniquities'), or even the *Suscipe Sancta Trinitas* of the Offertory prayers, which were adopted in Rome only in the thirteenth century. There were many others which we don't use anymore; they are called "Apologies." Some of these prayers in the Frankish use went on for some great length, and priest went through the list of all the sins he might have committed. You start to see that in the litanies of ordination: "From the spirit" of this kind of sin, "free me O Lord." Those used to be in there too, but would not cross the Alps back into Rome.

Lastly, in one of the most beautiful ceremonies of our rite, really, the priest adds water to the chalice and says *Deus qui humanae substantiae dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti* (God who didst wondrously establish the dignity of human substance), where the water represents the human nature in Christ and the wine represents the divine. That was added at about this time, too. But all of these recent additions of prayers to the Missal stop being composed after the eleventh century. So by the battle of Hastings, the development is over, really, from that point of view.

Another change that happens through the time of the Frankish Masses is the greater separation between the nave and the sanctuary. This is the time when roodscreens are erected, which correspond more or less to the iconostatis of the Orient: a big wooden structure separating the sanctuary from the nave on which there would be the Holy Cross, which is what 'Rood' means, maybe Our Lady and Saint John on either side. This is also the time when unleavened is

increasingly used (it had been leavened bread), which in turn leads to the shrinking of the paten. Indeed, if you look at the Mass as recorded in the early seventh century as said by the Pope, the paten was a silver dish about this big (two feet in diameter); it was so big in fact that the poor subdeacon who had to hold it, had to hold it in some sort of a big cloth tied around his neck so that he could hold it in front of his chest. When you next see the subdeacon holding the paten up in his humeral veil, that is what you are looking at: that is the origin of that. I had often wondered "Why is he doing that? What is he doing there holding up that humeral veil?"—it comes from the practice of the subdeacon holding up these big massive silver platters in Rome.

Communion under one species is also part of that eighth through eleventh century period: the people no longer receive the precious blood of our Lord under the species of wine. However what did happen is that people would purify after receiving communion under the Host; there'd be an altar boy there with a glass of wine, and there'd be some water. One went up, received communion, and the altarboy would give you a sip of wine to wash your mouth out so that no particle might be left in your mouth. That particular rubric was still on the books until (I think) 1955. You can ask your priests if you want to go back to those rubrics: "Where's me wine" after Communion.

Lastly also back in Rome you have the addition of the Creed, which begins under Benedict VIII in the middle of eleventh century. Indeed until the middle of the eleventh century, belive it or not, the Mass of the Pope in Rome had no creed. The Holy Roman Emperor was disturbed by this: "Holy Father, you're the head of Catholic Orthdoxy in the whole world; why don't you have the Creed at your Mass?" And the answer of the pope was: "Well because we've never been heretics in Rome, so we didn't need to say it." Anyway he did insert it. You see, the history of the Creed at Mass follows the history of heresies; it began when Spain went from

being Arian to Catholic in 589; that's when the creed enters into the Mass just to make sure that the bishop had given up his own Arian heresy he had to say it then.

So that's it: by then we have it. Now I'll bring you to the eve of the council of Trent.

Again, much diversity exists still. Here there is a distinction to be made between 'usage' or 'use' and 'rite.' You've heard of the different rites: there's the Byzantine rite; the Syro-Malabar rite—and then there's the Roman rite. But within each rite there can be different uses of that rite, which tend to be major or minor, especially when it comes to the texts. This is important to know: if some of you have grown up in a parish staffed by Dominicans, you grew up with the Dominican use of the Roman rite (as opposed to the Roman rite), which is a little bit different. For example they have Saint Dominic in the *Confiteor*. The chalice might be prepared at the beginning of Mass, not at the Offertory. So it's that sort of small difference. The difference between what is merely a use and a rite is that the different uses of one rite can adopt each other's feasts easily. So for example in the Roman rite the prayers of the specific feast are going to be the *Collect*, the *Secret*, and the *Postcommunion*. There will also be a Lesson (Epistle) and Gospel, as well as the chants (*Introit*, *Offertory*, etc.). You can exchange those between uses of the same rite pretty easily; indeed that has happened in the history of the Church, when for example a local feast of the Dominicans becomes a feast for the entire Church: we adopt the Mass texts that they have for that day.

You can't do that for example from the Roman rite to the rite of the Diocese of Milan., which has three readings at every Mass. Therefore they cannot adopt one of our feasts because they'd have to come up with an extra reading, which is not available: it is a different rite. That's the difference there. Now one might be tempted to think that the Canon made the rite, but that doesn't hold because for example Milan uses the Roman Canon, and yet is not part of the Roman

rite. Another issue is whether a rite with more that the Roman Canon can still be called Roman—but as I said that is not part of my talk today.

There were, too, diverse diocesan uses. Lyon in the south of France had, and has to this day, its own use. This is the Mass that Saint John-Mary Vianney said, for example. You can follow what's going on, but there are differences. The most striking one is that the priest hold his arms out in the shape of a cross, which is quite striking if you are not used to it. The Carmelites have the same thing. In fact all the rites that are derived from Jerusalem have that. Portugal had the use of Braga and different dioceses had their own usage.

And among all those uses you have the uses of the city of Rome, with its own customs. For example the use of the city of Rome includes the stations: Station at St. Mary Major, Station at the Lateran, etc., which depend on Rome. Why for instance is the Easter Vigil held at the Lateran Basilica? Well because the Lateran Basilica has a nice big baptistery. And again the Vigil of Pentecost, when you baptized people who couldn't attend the rite of baptism for the Vigil of Easter, that again was at the Lateran. That is a local usage: the Pope says Mass in different churches *of Rome*. That use, of course, cannot apply outside of Rome, even though our Missals, at least those published in the first half of the twentieth century, will state "Station at…". The rite of Paris, though, did adopt the same practice. If you look at the usage of Paris in the eighteenth century, it had stational Masses too. So the Archbishop of Paris would say Mass at Notre-Dame, or at Saint-Denis, or at Saint-Sulpice, depending.

Great diversity of uses, then. The religious have their own uses—the Premonstratensians (Norbertines), the Carmelites, the Dominicans, all had their own uses of the Roman Rite. As for the different rites you had Milan, the Mozarabic Rite. In terms of the uses, the *Offertory* could be longer or shorter; liturgical colours could vary. Some uses have blue; the use of Paris had an

unbelivable array of liturgical colours (beige, grey, yellow), all sorts of colours. The way you dress the altar boys may change. In France the altar boys wear read cassocks all year round. In Paris, the altar boys wore the read cassock, a red zuccheto on their head, a white surplice held in place with a broad red fascia. One sees pictures of altar boys in Spanish countries wearing birettas. These are all different local uses. One finds these even at the eve of Trent. Even at Rome one might find differences among the different basilicas. I'm told that the Psalms were pronounced differently in Saint Peter's Basilica than the way in which they were pronounced at the Lateran. That sort of difference depends on the Canons of the chapter, who can be very defensive about their rights and usages.

From the twelfth century to the Eve of Trent there were just a few more changes to the Roman liturgy. The elevation of the host is adopted from Paris in the thirteenth century; frequent Communion is received less and less commonly until people have to be told to receive once a year at least (which is still Canon Law); the business of bringing out candles or tapers at the Canon of the Mass or having a candle on the altar after the Consecration—which is not used everywhere, although it is in the rubrics. This sort of thing appears during the last phase of the pre-Tridentine Roman rite.

At the eve of Trent therefore, say 1474 (the first printing of the Mass according to the use of the papal court), the Mass is nearly identical to what you have in 1570, which is the typical edition of what we can by now call "the Tridentine Mass," because it was Trent that said that this is what we need to do.

Other uses continue. In the meantime though, one has to remember, the Protestants have come along and have begun writing their own Masses. The division between Protestant and Catholic was not as clear-cut as we would think today. Priests would go from Protestant to

Catholic and back again depending on who the prince was, ro depending on whether they wanted to have their heads chopped off or not, that sort of thing. Very often they would learn to say Mass in a very chaotic situtation in which Lutheran uses would creep in to Catholic Mass, and vice versa. For that reason Trent will regulate uniformity with respect for established diversity. This is why Trent said "You cannot have any uses that are less than two centuries old"—which means, Protestant uses. Anything before that, if you can prove that you have been doing something in some way for more than two hundred years by the time the council of Trent comes along, you can keep on doing it, although there is a strong understanding that the Roman Missal is the best.

But the Missal of Rome is regulated by the Roman authorities, naturally, and that spirit of regulating the Mass increases after Trent, particulary after the formation of the Sacred Congregation of Rites which is in charge of explaining how to use that Missal. Indeed before Trent the way the Mass is celebrated was the responsibility of the bishop of each diocese: Rome did not intervene; the bishop was in charge. Now, increasingly, if you adopt the book of Rome, you must follow what it says and if you have a question you write to Rome, who will then tell you how to do it. The Sacred Congregation of Rites is going to send responses for the following four centuries, going into the minutest of details. For example, on the use of the cloth on the Communion rail: that was question answered in the 1920s: "Do we use a paten, or do we use a Communion cloth, or both? How do you do that?" People ask; Rome responds.

As an anecdote, for example: 1570, promulgation of the Tridentine Missal with its rubrics. For the first time you have in the first part of it two chapters. One is called "The General Rubrics" and the other one is called "The Way to Observe the Rite." These give great detail on how to say the Mass. Before that, there had been bootleg editions. There is one bootleg edition

from Venice seven years before the actual Missal of 1570. Whoever the author was—we don't know who it was—was puzzled by the *Domine non sum dignus* at Communion. Now in those days it was the custom for the people to say it along with the priest: *Domine non sum dignus*, Lord I am not worthy. But *dignus* is masculine, so the question was, "What do you do if the congregation is made up only of women, for instance ifm a chaplain is saying Mass for some nuns. Are you going to have these nuns saying *Domine non sum dign**us**,* in the masculine? The rubric in this bootleg said no, the priest ought to lead the women there and say *non sum dign**a**,* in the feminine, so that the nuns can say it with him in the feminine. Rome intervened and said 'no, you just say the black; we're not going to have the priest using the feminine gender for himself.' The rubricists added that if one is going to say it in Latin, one should say what is written, but that there is nothing to prevent the women from saying the *Domine non sum dignus* in the vernacular with the gender appropriate to themselves if they wish.

The reason for this is that while Trent centralises and regulates how Mass is said, it has nothing to say about laypeople. The behaviour of laypeople at Mass is left completely up to custom, which is different from place to place and in time as well. They can go one way or the other: do the people sing or not sing? Do they say the responses or not? Do they say the Rosary at Mass? Do the men nip out for a cigarette and come back in for Communion and nip out again? Hence the questions among the moralists: what does it take for one to have attended Mass? How much does one actually have to listen to? All that is part of the Tridentine standardisation of what happens at Mass.

Now the emphasis of Trent was on *access* and *intelligibility*. I mentioned to you how there had been a greater separation between nave and sanctuary during the Frankish time. Trent explicitly wanted the people better to inderstand what was happening at Mass: it provided for the

priests to explain the ceremonies to the people; the parts said by the priest *clara voce* are to be said in such a way that everyone can hear and understand what is being said (1570 rubrics, as opposed to the completely silent private Masses in Monasteries).[5]

If you went to a mediaeval Mass, particularly in a cathedral, you'd see the altar in the back of the apse, and then the choirstalls of the chapter of canons, which could be quite long, then a rood screen, and the assembly would be behind that. You would have to look behind a column, through the canons and all the way to see what is going on; you would not really have direct access to what is going on. Trent says 'no no, the people have to know what is going on, you have to say it loudly enough for them to hear it.'

The roodscreen starts falling—there is only one church in Paris that sill has a rood screen,[6] for example, because those are going to fall in the eighteenth century, mainly. Also, the tabernacle is put on the altar in the Tridentine period. Before that in the Middle Ages, and you can still see these in museums, there would be a sort of silver dove hanging from the ceiling, where the Reservation was kept, where the consecrated Hosts were reserved. This in turn made frequent Communion difficult, as it was the same system as we now have for the tabernacle lamp that hangs. Someone has to go up there and pull on the chains to bring it down. It discouraged people from saying 'May I receive Communion please." The tabernacle makes it much easier to have frequent communion, including outstide of Mass. And indeed, Communion outside of Mass becomes most common. By the nineteenth centurym most people who receive Communion, which was rare, not where we receive it today. There might be a small Communion service before Mass, or after Mass. People might go to a Communion serive very early on Sunday, say 7

[5] Although there is a detail: the rubric goes on to say that if there is another Mass being said at the same time, one priest should not disturb the other by speaking too loudaly; but otherwise there is a notion that the people should at least know what's going on at the altar.

[6] Saint-Etienne-du-Mont, behind the Parisian Panthéon.

am, receive Communion, go home for breakfast, and then come back to hear the Solemn Mass with the sermon, without receiving Communion then. Which, by the way, shortened the time it took for solemn Mass. Particularly for events like ordinations, the people were not given Communion.

A few last changes: You know how the priest turns around and says *Orate fratres* etc. Well just before Trent it had been *Orate* ***pro me*** *fratres*. Not a big difference, but that is the kind of change that took place at the very last minute of the pre-Tridentine Mass. So by no means can one say that the Missal of Trent was a novelty. Indeed one may say that the Tridentine Missal is essentially the Missale of the 11th-12th century. The most important changes in the Tridentine Missal are: a few votive Masses were suppressed; the calendar was trimmed down to 182 feasts; three Sequences were kept. Now we've seen how the Franks had introduced the Sequence into the Mass books, which then crossed back over the Alps under Gregory VII; then there was a great profusion of Sequences. Some of them, I'm told, are of doubtful quality. And so the Tridentine reform reduced them to just three: the *Lauda Sion* for Corpus Christi; the *Victimae Paschalis* of Easter, which everyone knows I think; and the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*of Pentecost. In addition to those three, the *Dies Irae*, not strictly speaking a Sequence, but rather a "Prose," since "Sequence" means "following the *Alleluia*" and a Requiem Mass has no *Alleluia*.[7]

Now we have the Mass as we know it today, with legitimate diversity which is maintained every time a Tridentine book is published. So the Breviary in 1568, the Mass in 1570, the Ritual in 1614, the last of which states that it was decided against an obligatory implementation and "recommended" the new Ritual (the book used for Baptisms, Weddings, and

[7] We have one more Sequence today: the *Stabat Mater*, added in 1727 for the feast of Our Lady of Sorrows, also sung at the Stations of the Cross.

so forth) only as a model book so that diocesan and monastic Rituals can also maintain their particular rites. Thus Trent itself was respectful of diversity.

However, there was kind of a "Spirit of Trent," which goes beyond the text of Trent. The Spirit of Trent was: "This Roman Missal is really excellent: we should all adopt it." And so a lot of the bishops who were at Trent came home on fire for this Roman usage of the Roman Rite: "I saw it during the sessions of the Council, it's beautiful, we need to do that."

Sometimes they were able to impose it, and sometimes they couldn't. The poor archbishop of Rouen in France came back from Trent with the new book, "We need to do this!" But the canons of the Chapter (the priests who reside at the Cathedral and say the office together), who wielded a lot of power in those days, put so many sticks into the spokes of his brand-new bicycle, so to speak, that he couldn't do it. Indeed many places never adopted the Roman Missal until the next chapter . . . .

Nevertheless there is a slow spread of the Tridentine Missal. It is received, it is adapted, certain uses remain in different places. You still had places right up until Vatican II where the Gospel was sung from the pulpit and the epistle from another pulpit, not at the altar, so that the priest had to process to one or the other of the two pulpits to say the readings. Often these pulpits were incorporated into the rood screen, in fact—if there still was one.

Then, however, several factors militated for the strictly Roman Missal to be adopted also. One of these is the French Revolution, which killed a lot of local uses in France and wherever Napoleon spread a lot of that happened too. Another factor is a movement, it was a long word for a name, and will have many consequences: the rise of "Ultramontanism." It was a movement in the nineteenth-century Church that tended to place more and more responsibility for more and

more things in the Church on the shoulders of the pope in Rome. Before Trent, the pope never looked into the liturgy anywhere; at Trent a decision had to be made because of the Protestant revolt. After Trent more and more of that regulatory power will be concentrated in Rome, the pope, and the Sacred Congregation of Rites. One good example of Ultramontanism you may all be familiar with is Dom Prosper Guéranger, who was a big fan of the Roman rite; all that he wrote was on that rite. The Roman books are adopted in dome dioceses start in 1839—but again, the pope doesn't impose this. In fact Gregory XVI in 1842 indicated that he was pleased that the Roman Missal was being adopted more and more, btu stressed its optional nature. Yet people get the idea that they had to please the pope.

One principle of Ultramontanism is that one doesn't only do what the pope tells one to do; one also does whatever he might find pleasing. This is not at all what the Church is about. A pope can have all sorts of opinions of his own, which we are free to reject. He may prefer purple; I like green, that sort of thing. One of the areas where one sees this princinple at work is that Ultramontanist priests start to say Latin at Mass in the Italian way—not the French way, not the English way, not the German way. So priests are adopting a pronunciation that comes from over the mountains—*ultra montes.* In France, among young priests in the 1860s, one can tell who the Ultramontanists are because they stop wearing the rabat, like the one that St. John Mary Vianney wore: the black bib. Instead they now wear the Roman collar to advertise that they were with the pope. And those who resisted, who wanted to hang to their own way of doing things, to their own traditions, they kept to the old bib, the rabat, which vanishes in France in the 1920s. As for the liturgical books themselves, the last diocese of France to adopt the Roman books did so in 1875, five years after Vatican I, because at Vatican I the official doctrine of the infallibility of the pope is proclaimed. Its definition is very precise and limited.

Yet, and you'll oberve this at any council, I think, when a council convenes and promulgates dogmas, it promulgates those dogmas and does so without error: the Holy Ghost is there to prevent any error from being in the promulgations of the dogmas themselves and their definitions. But a council also consecrates the victory of a faction within the Church, of a clique, which was in favour of those definitions, which is good, but in addition to those also had its own pet ideas, fads, and modes of doing things. They feel that if the Council has agreed with them on the definitions of these dogmas, therefore one should also agree in other things, such as wearing a Roman collar. It's easy to make that skip. That happened at Vatican I.

So just to take a Canadian example: the bishop of Montréal, Monseigneur Bourget, an Ultramontanist himself, had urged his priests to abandon the rabat in 1861. Some did, some didn't. But then in 1875 after the council, Bishop Tacheraud, of Québec, outlawed the rabat. Here you can see the difference before and after the council that defined papal infallibility—now Vatican I says *nothing* about the rabat, but you can see how an atmosphere can be created.

Ultramontanism continues apace and this concentration of all liturgical responsibility on the person of the Holy Father and the Sacred Congregation of Rites continues. In the late nineteenth century you start seeing the first holy cards with the picture of the reigning pope on them. This was a novelty—a holy card normally has a saint. But now you have a living pope of Rome on a holy card.

This concenctration made it more possible then for Rome to modify the books. Since everyone is doing the same thing, since every one is following the Roman books, and since the entire responsibility of the liturgy is concentrated on on the person of the Holy Father and the Sacred Congregation of Rites, they can say "Well let's see what we can do now."

The watershed is under St. Pius X. By the time of St. Pius X nearly every one follows the Roman Rite as used in Rome. He founds in 1902 the commission to study the Breviary, the Missal, and other books. He issues his famous document in 1903, *Tra le sollicitudine*, for Gregorian chant in the style of the Abbey of Solesmes, which we love, and which killed the local traditions on how to sing Mass. Some of these lasted. Marcel Pérès, for example, publishes all sorts of recordings. He made a recording of the way in which the Corsicans would sing at Mass. It's a very different way of singing; it's not solesmian at all. It's a matter of taste if you like it; some people find the Solesmian way of singing to high in the tenor range, to airy, but then you listen to the Corsicans and it's very manly, it's quite different. But now, that was out: now there was one way to sing, Solesmes, 1903. Why? Well because that's what St. Pius X liked, really. Now he did have reasons for it, this is not an anti-Solesmes talk, not at all.

Saint Pius X also mentions *participatio actuosa* in that document. That is, the "active," or "actual," participation of the faithful. This is one of those buzzwords, and I don't want to go downthat rabbit hole. It may be explained by his own words: "Don't pray *at* Mass; pray *the* Mass." He wanted people to follow the Mass in their Missals at least. In fact, it may surprise you that throughout most of the nineteenth century people went to Mass with no book in their hands. Of course the wealthy did and that continued in various places. I know, for example, where I am from in the South of France people still pretty much received Communion at Easter and Pentecost. I asked my father what it was like to be a Catholic in the 1940s and 50s, and he sold me something remarkable: "Oh in those days we went to Confession more often than we went to Mass." "How do you mean," I asked. He answered "Well we went to Mass once or twice a month, maybe, but we always went to Confession before going. Or we went to Confession if we'd done soemthing wrong." So that if you broke a window while playing tennis, you went to

confession. The priest would say "Any other sins my son?" "Well I may have missed Mass last Sunday, Father." "Oh come on, you have to come every Sunday!" "Yes, Father, I have a firm purpose of amendment," but then they wouldn't go. So it was a very different way of doing things. I am not defending it, obviously, there is a third Commandment after all.

The reform of the Breviary too was massive, as priests know, it was a big change of the sequence of the psalms in the Breviary. So that's it the work of St. Pius X.

By the time you get to 1920, there is an *editio typica* of the Roman Missal with the few adjustments in line with Pius X's principles, but interestingly—since by now the book itself has become sacrosanct—the new rubrics of Pius X are not inserted into the general rubrics, but they are added as an appendix.

To summarize: by the time you get to 1920, and I'll quote Fr. Barthe here:[8]

> In sum, the ultimate phase of Roman centralisation, represented by the 19th-century Ultramontanist movement for the Tridentine liturgy, now opened up a greater possibility of reforms. The liturgical movement was to rely on this new situation to suggest and prepare other series of reforms under Pius XII. After Vatican II, the modifications will be such that they will put an end to the Tridentine era of the Roman liturgy and bring it into a new era.

Because—just as an aside, and then I'll gat back to Pius XII—if there hadn't been this concentration of regulatory power over the liturgy in the person of the Holy Father and the Roman dicastery in charge of that, you had some crackpot new idea on how to say Mass, your field of action was your parish or at best your diocese if you could convince your bishop; you couldn't go any further than that. And the people in the neighbouring dioceses would laugh you and your bishop out of the room. Imagine the conversation : "Well now we're doing this in our diocese" "Now that's crazy, don't do it." But if a *Pope* says it in this new atmosphere, you do it.

[8] *Histoire du missel tridentin*, 171.

As another aside one can see this Ultramontanism in the Mass proper for a pope, *Si diligis me*. It's in the missal, right there; that was put together in 1942; there never was a Mass for a pope before. Before that you said a Mass for a Martyr, or Pontiff Confessor; suddenly now you have a Mass for the pope himself. That is a novelty too, in 1942.[9]

Pius XII also tried to bring out a new Psalter in 1945 which fortunately didn't go very far. Most people thought it was a weird new translation into Latin, or an updating of the Latin of the Psalms. It was scrapped. Most people didn't like it—but it was really scrapped because John XXIII, who succeeded Pius XII, simply didn't like it. Again, it depended on *him*. That had never happened before.

Pius XII also oversaw the easing of the Echaristic fast throught he 1950s until we get to the present Eucharistic fast, which is unprecedentedly short. The new Easter Vigil is another story too. The former Holy Week, the Holy Week as it had time out of mind always existed, had around it and supporting it any number of customs that people were used to. Merely bringing the Easter Vigil Mass from the morning to the evening—and this is no place to express an opinion either way on this matter—caused a lot of local customs based on having it in the morning to vanish. One of them being for example (my dear mother-in-law still obeys this) Lent ending at noon on Saturday—some of you might remember those days. So she has her snickers bar at noon on Holy Saturday. And there were more changes of that nature.

Also in 1948 the Commission for Liturgical Reform is founded under the authority of Pius XII. It is called the Pian Commission, and it is going to exist until 1960. This is the commission that implemented *Mediator Dei*, the great document on the liturgy by Pius XII,

---

[9] John Hunwicke, "The Pontificate of Pius XII (2)," *Fr Hunwicke's Mutual Enrichment* 9 July 2016 https://liturgicalnotes.blogspot.com/2016/07/the-pontificate-of-pius-xii-2.html (accessed 4 October 2019).

including evening Masses fr Holy Week, the changes in the fasting rules, and so on and so forth. There was also a suppression of Rubrics in 1955, some Vigils are gone, some Octaves are gone. If you pick up an old Missal from 1948 you'll be surprised at how many octaves are in there, that you had no idea existed—or at least I didn't. Did you know that there was an Octave of St Joseph? How about the Nativity of Saint John the Baptist? That's kind of important for those in Québec in your country. St. Stephen, St. John, Holy Innocents, the dedication of the cathedral church: all had an octave. All that is also taken down.

On the other hand also regarding the participation of the people: historically remember that under Charlemagne it was encouraged, and then it came and went; in eighteenth century France the people could sing everything at Mass, the Revolution cut that down; and uiltimately in most of Europe you arrive at the really silent Mass in the 19th century; then in the 1920s you start having dialogue Masses allowed—which, to the French example, is *the* traditional Mass, that is all that they remember. In the Anglo-Saxon sphere the dialogue Mass sounds like the Novus Ordo. There you see a difference and that is a 20th-century thing.

And then finally more rubrics are changed. The last *typical*, official , primary edition of the Tridentine Missal dates to the 23rd of June 1962. In November of 1962 you were provided with a little sticker with the name of Satin Joseph on it to put in the Canon. (By the way if you can find a Missal that was published back then, that was in use—some of you priests may have seen these—you'll find more and more pages being ripped out and replaced and other things being stuck in).[10] It was published until January 1, 1964.

[10] I have one in my office in which you can see the archaeology of the changes in the 1960s in there.

So: 1 January 1964: the last day a Tridentine Missal is printed as such. That's the end, the last gasp of Trent as such. Three weeks later, Pope Paul VI established the *Consilium* to reform the liturgical books, with Annibale Bugnini as its secretary. The last printing of the Tridentine Missal, with its various evolutions, 1 January 1964; three weeks later, Annibale Bugnini is put in charge of the reform. A three week window for that particular Missal. Those Missals are rare; if you can get your hands on them, they are kind of collectibles now—hardly anyone needed to buy one since they had the 1962, and having heard that there was a commission to reform the liturgy anyway, if you'd put in an order for the 1964 printing you'd then call in and cancel the order.

Now the last few novelties—or rather changes; this is still the Tridentine Missal—of the 1962 Missal are the following: no more special confiteor for the Communicants; a new way to rank feasts; Sunday have priority over the Sanctoral (for certain classes); Lenten ferial Masses have priority over 3rd and 4th-class feasts (it's interesting to track these changes if you have an old Missal); some 'doublets' in the calendar were suppressed.[11]

The apotheosis of Ultramonantism, I think, is that since by now the West has fallen into the habit of following the lead of the Vatican in the minutest details of worship, it took only the first non-Tridentine pope since Trent to overturn Trent. In a sense you might say that Tridentine centralism had begotten the child that killed it. As the god Chronus, the god of time, begat Zeus, who then killed him to become king of the gods. This centralisation enabled the great change. Now we live in that situation.

However, there were certain 'time bombs'—I'll follow Michael Davies's term, may he rest in peace, he is one of the great leaders in the fight for the traditional Missal—there were

[11] For example, until 1962 there were two feasts for the Chair of Saint Peter: there was Antioch and there was the chair at Rome.

certain time bombs in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* that work for the restoration of the old Mass, believe it or not. So for example it says in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 4 that "Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully acknowledged rites to be of equal rite and dignity … she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way." Now if you look into the debates among those who wrote *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, you will see that they are mainly thinking of the Eastern rites. But I think it could also apply to the traditional form of the Roman rite. And Vatican II said *nothing* about the Dominicans and the Carthusians and the Norbertines changing their rites. It said nothing to Lyons, it said nothing to all the local uses. There is nothing in Vatican II that compels those who have their own uses and their own Missals to adopt the Missal of 1969.

Yet they all, however, did—faster than you can say 'knife'—faster than after Trent. So in a way, this conformity with how things are done in Rome, after Vatican II, really went in a flash. While after Trent, in France, you have to wait until 1875 for the Tridentine books to be universally received; but in the meantime, there was this ultramontanism.

The Dominicans, for instance, could have said 'No thank you.' In fact, they didn't even need to say 'No thank you'; they could have said nothing and simply kept their own traditional rite—but they gave in and gave it up. For me, the most interesting thing is that the Novus Ordo purports to be a pastoral Mass, designed for parishes: fine. Yet cloistered nuns adopted this thing. It's—surprising.

After all this, we begin a new phase in the history of the Tridentine Missal, the phase that *Una Voce* is a part of: that of preservation. Now we'll move onto things than many of you in this room remember.

In the late 1960s through 1984/88, you have a lot of independent priests, who continue to say the Mass they'd always had. I did not know the statistics, but in France, for example, two or three priests in every diocese simply said nothing and kept using the Missal they'd been using since before the Council. They were tolerated until they retired; few old people went, and when they died, that was the end of it. We forget that that was also a situation.

The diocese of Campos in Brazil is the great example of a diocese that said 'no.' Bishop Castro-Meyer simply did not implement the new liturgy, and was never once reprimanded for it from Rome. Now we have the Motu Proprio *Summorum Pontificum*. But even before then, if the Tridentine Mass had been abrogated, they would have written or even removed the bishop and told him to obey. As far as we know, never—perhaps there is some archival stuff.

And then of course Marcel Lefebvre, the great pastoral and missionary bishop of Dakar—you should read his biography; it's quite something.

All these people tend to use the 1962 Missal, sometimes with 1965 modifications. Fr. José Maria Escrivá, of the *Opus Dei*, according to John Sonnen (I wish he were here today as he is the one source, as far as I know, for this) asked for permission to keep using the Tridentine Missal. The story there—again you'll have to ask John Sonned if he ever comes out here—is that Annibale Bugnini said that he did not need permission to keep saying it. Is that not remarkable? Make of it what you will, we only have the words.

Then an indult was given in November 1971 for England and Wales. This is interesting. Agatha Christie and others (including Yehudi Menuhin) had made a fuss about seeing the Roman Mass vanish. They wrote, and Paul VI, who liked Agatha Christie—who doesn't, think of Hercule Poirot, wonderful books—granted an indult under certain circumstances for England and

Wales. But someone in Rome predated the text of it to the 14th of April, even though it was promulgated in November, to make it look like Paul VI was not responding to pressure.[12] There is another principle at work there: loss of face during the reform. To go back to the preconciliar Mass, for many people (although it doesn't have to be that way), would sound like they had made a mistake—this is part of the psychology here, I'm sure the priests can attest to that, having had to deal with chancery officials.

So: the 1962 or later versions is used in what really is, in some ways, 'the Resistance.' Then, in 1984, *Quattuor abhinc annos*; in 1988, *Ecclesia Dei adflicta*, which is the regimen under which people of my generation started attending the old Mass. Perhaps that's your story too; I was born in 1968. Most of us discovered the Mass after 1988. Sometimes we discovered the existence of an 'old Mass' simploy by reading of it in the Catholic newspapers. 'Oh, there's an old Mass? what's that?' And ultimately, I think all of us remember where we were on the 7 July 2007 when Summorum Pontificum comes out.

During that whole period, the 1962 Missal slowly emerges from confinement. The foundation of the Fraternity of Saint Peter dates to 1988; the foundation of the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest in 1990, and a few other smallish congregations such as the Benedictines in Norcia.

There has also been discreet reemergrance of religious uses of the Roman rite, for example the Carmelite men out in Wyoming: in 2003 they started saying their own, finally (and it is Roman)—beautiful—Carmelite use.

[12] Barthe, *Messe de Vatican II*, 122.

But as you know, the true watershed moment was the 2007 motu proprio, which brought in these new terms: ‘extraordinary’ and ‘ordinary’ for the first time in the history of any rite. You now have a great increase of Mass venues after 2007. Suddently younf priests can say, more or less openly, to their bishops “I want to say the old Mass,” and the bishop must allow him to do it. Now of course, bishops tend to be one document late, so that they apply the provisions of the former document once the new document is promulgated.

Also since the motu proprio another thing that happens is that demand begins to be measurably higher for the Tridnetine Missal. There is a series of statistics, which I recommend to your study, published by a French outfit called *Paix Liturgique*. They conducted suveys of randomly selected Catholics who go to Mass every Sunday in difference countries (France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, the UK, Poland, and I think they may have done Brazil and the US are in the works). The results of these surveys—and this is going to surprise you as it did me—are that when asked “If the traditional Mass were offered every Sunday at your parish, would you attend it?” Now these are people who go to Mass every Sunday, that is, a small proportion of people; understood. And 30% said ‘Yes.’ Thirty percent! It fluctuates, you know, between 28 and 33%. So I think there is great hope for your work, the board members of Una Voce. But these are people who never say it unless they are asked. You se this time and again. When Lefebvre was famous in 1976 a local newpaper conducted a survey of Catholics asking “What do you think of what Lefebvre is doing, saying the old Mass?” And the result was overwhelmingly “Oh those who want the old Mass should have it of course.” This was published in 1976. A journalist presented these results to the archbishop of Lyon, asking him “What do you think of that?” The archbishop answered “Well I had no idea!” So the Mass continued in the hearts of the faithful.

As for the diveristy of rites: the Ambrosian rite is not extinct; it is currently being celebrated in three locations (it used to be the entire diocese of Milan). So there is some hope there.

In Lyons the Fraternity of Saint Peter has a parish where they said the Roman Missal because that is what they knew but the current pastor—speaking of the present now—is reviving it. The Low Mass every Sunday is according to the use of Lyons, and it appears that Father Meissonier intends to celebrate a solemn Mass at some point.

Now regarding diversity, the principal of legitimate diversity among traditional rites, Benedict XVI thought about it and wrote about it. He said:

> "Insofar as these traditions expres in a distinctive way the faith that is held in common, there are a gift to be shared in the wider Church. The unity of the Church does not require a uniformity that ignores cultural diversity, as the history of Christianity shows… Our communion is therefore strengthened by such legitimate diversity"[13]

I think it's clear that he is speaking of traditional liturgical diversity.[14]

There was a big question in 2011: "Can we use traditional liturgical books not the 1962 edition of the Roman Missal?". The question was posed to the Ecclesia Dei Commission with respect to religious uses. The answer this: "The use of the liturgical books proper to the Religious Orders which were in effect in 1962 is permitted."[15] This means then that any religious priest can say the traditional use of the Roman rite proper to his outfit, under the same conditions as the motu proprio of 2007. That is, he doesn't have to ask any one and no one can say 'boo.' In

---

[13] Vatican Press Office, Note of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on Personal Ordinariates for Anglican Entering the Catholic Church," in *L'Osservatore romano—Weekly Edition in English* (28 October 2009): 20, quoted in Feulner, 41.

[14] Now there is another kind of diversity that is not the same. That is the diversity of the school of Bugnini and Chapungko, the Filipino liturgist theologian. It is kown as inculturation, which often simply means adopting local pagan practices into the worship of the one true God. That is not at all the diversity spoken of here

[15] Ecclesia Dei's 2011 Instruction *Universae Ecclesiae* 34.

reality of course, if you live in a community, you have nowhere to go home to, and it might be a little more difficult than that.

Nothing has been said of the different uses of the local dioceses, but diversity does seem to be a part of the logic of the thing. So that's looking across the board at different rites.

But how about looking though time? There has been a discrete use of other uses going behind 1962. Right now there is a bit of anarchy it seems in some places: is it 1955, 1948, 1920, etc. But certainly among the Dominicans, especially younger Dominicans, they are saying the Dominican use of the Roman Mass to the complete incomprehension of older Friars. They ask "Why do you want to do that?" Even perfectly older men, I am here thinking of now Bishop Augustine DiNoia, or Fr. Romanus Cessario, a well-known moral theologian, extremely orthodox: they have no idea why young people want the old rite—evne of their own congregation.

So it's for the young to work at this. All of you young people (younger than me, that is) need to get to work as well. The Carmelite rite has spread to Pennsylvania, In the Czech republic one finds a Cistercian Mass being used, and there is some renewal of interest in the rite of Sarum (Salisbury), although that is not very vigourous just now.

That is where we are now.

Now, some prospects for the future.

Who is the guardian of the liturgy? Using the word very broadly. I suppose the guardian fo the liturgy might be the Swiss guard who kicks out of the papal Mass someone being rowdy, after all. Until Trent, the guardians of the liturgy were the bishops and the clergy, particularly the canons of the cathedral chapters who preserved the traditions and the books proper to their rite or

usage. Slowly control was taken over by Rome—not on purpose initially, but by the time you get to St. Pius X Rome had got into the habit of telling everyone how to day Mass. And then you have the catastrophe.

From 1964 on though, it seems that the laity played a great role, including some leading ladies, true *mulieres fortes*. I think of the Italian poetess Cristina Campo and her friend Emilia Pediconi, instrumental in founding *Una Voce Roma*. In fact I was rather pleased to see how many ladies there are up here on the dais today—ladies have a lot of power in this. You've heard of the *Ottaviani Intervention*, kind of a trad classic;[16] it is also thanks to these two ladies, who were able to cause all the right people to meet each other: Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci could meet Fr. Michel Guérard des Lauriers, who wrote the thing with others. They were able to network, these ladies, having as they did nice salons in which they served nicce food and drinks, getting people to talk, and before you know it, action takes place.

Other laity: *Una Voce*, of all places, started in Norway in 1964. At the time—those were the good old days—Una Voce was only about the preservation of Latin. That was the battle: Latin. There were many other initiatives too along the same lines locally, including individuals. One specific example of resistance that I'll mention is a very famous Italian novelist called Tito Casini, who wrote a book against the reformed liturgy called *La Tunica stracciata*, *The Torn Tunici* or *The Rent Tunic*. When Paul VI would say the Mass in Italian, Tito Casini, this very well-known author, would sit right up front and yell out the Latin responses. Cardinal Bacci wrote the preface to *La Tunica stracciata, The Torn Tunic*, which is a classic. By the way, there

[16] All of the critiques of the Novus Ordo—which I have no intention of getting into today—essentially are developments of the *Ottaviani Intervention*.

is a number of these classics of Traditionalist resistance, which are currently being republished by Angelico Press.

Among the clergy, of course the name that cannot be unspoken is the name of Marcel Lefebvre, Bishop Castro-Mayer, and coutless other priests and prelates to thank.

Among the laity, Michael Davies: one cannot overemphasise his leadership in the Anglo-Saxon sphere, Nero Capone among the Italians, and the public outcries of Evelyn Waugh, the great writer, who didn't spare poor Cardinal Heenan, who had to agree with him, and many other names. Tan press, Angelus Press, Angelico Press and many others. Ironically, some of the theologians of the Church of the reform in the 1960s believed that the Church shouldn't be a pyramind with the pope at the top, but rather an inverted pyramid with the people of God at the top and the pope at their service (some of you are wagging you heads). But the traditional movement is a little like that—its' us!

Now then, what are we going to do? Get involved, subscribe to *Una Voce*, show up for the meetings and vote and please, well it's about money I'm afraid, there is a temproal concern and we do need money. I can tell you this: when the Canadian seminarians in Denton knew I was coming here—they are really good men by the way—they wanted to express their great gratitude or being there.

Another piece of advice I have is to try to be as serene and as peaceful as you can: there is now use yelling and screaming. Stay informed. Understand the liturgy itself, i.e. what it is that you are defending. A curial official at Ecclesia Dei told me: "Know what the Mass is so that you can talk about it to people. Understand also that, as frustrating as it is sometimes, if there is not priest to say the old Mass, there isn't going to be the old Mass. We have to have more priests.

Even a bishop with the best good will in the world may have to say “I don’t have a man who can say it…” He may not have enough priests or, frankly, none of his priests may want to say it or is able to say it. That is why seminaries need to be supported. God seminaries, and good seminarians. Some of that starts in the cradle: teach the Old Mass to your children and get them used to it; teach them Latin or get them to learn it-it’ll be that much easier for them to understand the Mass and to respond to vocations.

For more people to go to Mass you have to understand the target audience. And from this point of view we ought to thank this providential pontificate” more and more conservative Catholics who never thought of going to the traditional Mass are thinking about going; among yout friends, those would be the people to invite. Presence on the internet too is capital, particularly photos and videos on websites like the New Liturgical Movement and other I can’t remember to mention. Just the neauty of the traditional Mass evangelises: such is the ‘Heaven on Earth’ aspect of the traditional liturgy.

In dealing with bishops the current research on the demand for this rite might be convincing. The statistics from Paix liturgique will help there, as the bishops don’t necessarily know what the people really want: in a hierarchical society like the Church, people are loath to tell their superiors what they really think unless asked directly. And that’s probably for the best, or else we’d have people mouthing off all the time. But the fact is that when someone does ask the question, people say “Well yes, I would actually go to the old Mass if it was available.”

So I have gone through the whole history just to show you where we’ve ceom from and, I hope, where we’re going to go. I agree with your assessment David on the future of the Old Mass for 100 years in the future—I don’t think I’ll be there either. But I have a little thing I add to that. I come from a very conservative diocese; this one is too, relatively speaking. I think that it is the

conservative dioceses that will keep the Novus Ordo the longest. The dicoeses most ravaged by modernism and progressivism will be a vacuum for the old Mass to fill.

That’s it, that’s my talk. Thank you.