

Keeping the Mass, V

(ICEL), English one might find in the Denver Post. This was authorized by Paul VI.

Realizing at some point that this translation was not a translation at all, but rather an interpretation, another English translation was made which was promulgated in 2011 through a document called *Liturgiam Authenticam*. In #27 we read "If indeed, in the liturgical texts, words or expressions are sometimes employed which differ somewhat from usual and everyday speech, it is often enough by virtue of this very fact that the texts become truly memorable and capable of expressing heavenly realities."

In this mild language it is easy to see that the proposal gives a liturgical principle or guideline for translators which may not be found in SC, and contradicts Archbishop Bugnini. Nor may it be found in any (as far as I am aware) of the many documents on the liturgy from 1970-1990. And if you look at the Directory for Masses with Children, of 1973 (an appalling thing if there ever was one), you're confronted with mire flat-out contradictions. So in the 1990's the opposition to the first ICEL translation grew and grew, until *Liturgiam Authenticam* practically abrogated, or suppressed, all the official guidance that had been given since SC, up to 1994. It states simply: "The norms set forth in this Instruction are to be substituted for all norms previously published on the matter."

Now let that sink in for a moment. It is as if the Magisterium is saying in 1994 that all pronouncements of the Magisterium previous to 1994 are to be rejected. The accusation then that traditional Catholics are not following the Church on liturgical

matters is rather silly. What are we supposed to follow?

Take the whole matter of Latin. In SC, it seems rather clear. "Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites." (36.1) And, "In accordance with the centuries-old tradition of the Latin rite, the Latin language is to be retained by clerics in the divine office." (101.1...this never happened of course.)

But Pope St. Paul VI taught, "No longer Latin, but the spoken language will be the principal language of the Mass." (Nov. 26, 1969, about one year after the promulgation of SC.)

But Pope St. John Paul II taught in *Dominicae Cena* a few years later, "'Latin is an expression of the unity of the Church and through its dignified character, it elicited a profound sense of the Eucharistic Mystery. The Roman Church has special obligations towards Latin, the splendid language of ancient Rome, and she must manifest them whenever the occasion presents itself.'" (#10)

But this was followed by dozens of statements insisting that Latin kept us apart from children and youth, and the world; statements that praised the beneficial effects of putting the liturgy in the vernacular, as something desired by the Council.

Thus, a state of confusion over the liturgy has existed for some time. There is an answer to this, but in my next insert I'd like to address sacred music before suggesting what the answer is. Needless to say at this point I suppose, but if we want to keep the Mass, we need to keep Latin.

You'll notice I didn't mention the Second Vatican Council in the sermon today – but not because there are no good quotes in it about the liturgy – but because the premiere document on the liturgy of that council is very hard to follow. And when you compare the document (called *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, SC) with other official documents, you're left with a fair amount of confusion.

SC doesn't have many concrete guidelines, but there are a few. For example, it calls for a wider use of the vernacular (#63), a removal of useless repetition (#34), and a more "lavish" presentation of the Scriptures for the readings, arranged over a prescribed number of years (#51). Three years was ultimately what they settled upon, given that was the number and program used in the Episcopalian and Methodist and Lutheran churches, thus fitting well into the desire for ecumenism.

But at the same time it declares that "There must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should grow organically from forms already existing."

So it should be clear one would think, that the two conditions (provable good and organic growth) are not present in the suggestions that the document itself makes. That is, for something to grow organically means it must spring from something that is already present. Yet in the history of the Church there is no precedent of a multi-year lectionary. There is no precedent for mixing Latin and the vernacular together in the Mass, and there is no precedent for looking at the repetition in the Sacred Liturgy as "useless." And no one has been able to show how these changes are certainly required because of their inherent goodness. It would be like saying "The

faithful should not hear the Last Gospel after the Mass is concluded, because the Prologue of the Gospel of St. John is genuinely and certainly not good for them to hear at the end of Mass." We detect then, absurdity, and incoherence.

And if one searches for a coherent, logical progression of ideas translated into concrete actions, such that a coherent program of liturgical development is clear, then that search would be in vain. SC gives a roadmap with contradicting directions.

At this point we would naturally look towards other extra-conciliar documents to clear up the confusion. So we must look to the various legislations and pronouncements which followed the promulgation of the *Novus Ordo Missae*. But they are of little help. They too are mutually contradictory. Because if you look first of all at the interpretation of Archbishop Bugnini of SC, #34, you see this, "The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear and unencumbered by useless repetitions; they should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation."

This was in fact the justification for re-writing practically every single prayer in the Missal, and then authorizing its translation into a vernacular which was anything but sacred. And in fact, no document nor the Council made clear what a sacred language is. The Church once moved from a vernacular language (common Greek) to a sacred language (ecclesiastical Latin), but she never went the other way until the 1970's. No definition or even a rudimentary description of how the vernacular might be made sacred was given, much less attempted. So a very, very common English was adopted by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy