

ILLUSIONS of Reform

*Responses to Cavadini,
Healy, and Weinandy*

IN DEFENSE OF THE TRADITIONAL
MASS AND THE FAITHFUL WHO
ATTEND IT

EDITED BY

PETER A. KWASNIEWSKI

with contributions by Alexander Battista,

Gregory DiPippo, Fr. Samuel Keyes,

Peter A. Kwasniewski, Roland Millare,

Fr. Peter Miller OSB, Dom Alcuin Reid OSB,

Joseph Shaw, and Janet E. Smith



Copyright © 2023 by Os Justi Press

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except by a reviewer, who may quote brief passages in a review.

Os Justi Press
P.O. Box 21814
Lincoln, NE 68542
<https://osjustipress.com/>
info@osjustipress.com

Hardback 978-1-960711-06-9
Paperback 978-1-960711-07-6
eBook 978-1-960711-08-3

Interior design: Michael Schrauzer
Cover design: Julian Kwasniewski

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface by *Peter Kwasniewski* ix
Abbreviations xii
Summary of Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy
by *Janet E. Smith* xiii

Part 1. Janet Smith's Critique 1

1 Sacrificing Beauty and Other Errors 3
2 Misrepresentation of *Mediator Dei*, *Sacrosanctum
Concilium*, and Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI 17
3 The Genesis of the Novus Ordo and "Theological and
Spiritual Flaws" of the TLM 30
4 Unity, Charismatic Masses, and Africa 41
5 Mischaracterization of the TLM, Then and Now 46

Part 2. Peter Kwasniewski's Critique 63

6 Unconvincing Propaganda against the Latin Mass 65
7 Noble Patriarchs, Wayward Grandchildren: A More Realistic
Appraisal of the Liturgical Movement 77
8 Is the Laity's Offering of the Mass a Postconciliar
Rediscovery? 83
9 Offspring of Arius in the Holy of Holies 93
10 Was Liturgical Latin Introduced As—and Because It
Was—the Vernacular? 114
11 The Dubious Legacy of Leonardo's Last Supper 123
12 Games People Play with the Holy Spirit 134

Part 3. Additional Commentary 151

13 *Alexander Battista*, "Church Life Journal Insults Eastern
Liturgies with Amateur Scholarship" 153
14 *Fr. Samuel Keyes*, "The Failures of Reform" 162
15 *Roland Millare*, "Joseph Ratzinger and the New
Liturgical Movement" 175

- 16 *Fr. Peter Miller, OSB*, “Bible by the Pound: Would the Holy Spirit Agree that More Bible is Better at Mass?” 180
- 17 *Dom Alcuin Reid, OSB*, “The One Thread by Which the Council Hangs” 198
- 18 *Joseph Shaw*, “The Art of Missing the Point” 213

Epilogue: New Liturgical Anathemas for the Post-Conciliar Rite by *Gregory DiPippo* 217

Acknowledgments 222

Select Bibliography 223

Contributors 227

PREFACE

BETWEEN SEPTEMBER AND NOVEMBER 2022, the University of Notre Dame's *Church Life Journal* published a series of articles on liturgical reform coauthored by Dr. John Cavadini, Dr. Mary Healy, and Fr. Thomas Weinandy. This series was then republished as a unit on December 1, 2022. (In the pages that follow, the trio of authors will often be referred to simply as "CHW.") Unsurprisingly, the lengthy series—with its rosy view of the Liturgical Movement, its caricature of the Catholic faithful prior to Vatican II, its virtual identification of the *Novus Ordo* with *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and its chrismation of both by the Holy Spirit, and its severe rejection of the "Tridentine movement"—generated much conversation, nearly all of it sharply critical of the authors' flawed scholarship, grandiose generalizations, and pastoral callousness, three qualities that run contrary to the purported aims of *Church Life Journal*.

In a spirit of fair play, it was my original plan that this book should open with the unabridged CHW series and should close with a response by CHW to their critics. This, after all, is a classic format for high-level dialogue between persons of good will, mature intelligence, and scholarly aspirations. The editors of *Church Life Journal* turned down all proposals of this kind. As a result, Janet Smith kindly offered to write a matter-of-fact summary of the series, organized according to the eight sections of the single "synoptic" version published on December 1. Dr. Smith's overview of CHW's main points enables this book to be useful even for those who are not already familiar with the series—although truly nothing can replace the experience of time-travel to the 1970s that reading it provides for readers in the 2020s.

Part 1 of the book consists of Janet Smith's five-part series, published at *Crisis Magazine* in February and March of 2023 and presented here as five chapters, with slight emendations as compared with the online version.

ILLUSIONS OF REFORM

Part 2 gathers several refutations of my own, directed at CHW's slanted portrayal of the Liturgical Movement; the claim that the *Novus Ordo* is more explicitly Trinitarian in theology; the assertion that Latin was originally chosen for the Roman rite because it was the vernacular of its day; the opinion that the *versus populum* stance of the priest better reflects what the Mass is; the widespread view that only the reformed liturgy makes the baptized into (and makes them aware of being) co-offerers of the Holy Sacrifice; and, most of all, the asseveration, solemnly delivered, that "resistance to the reformed liturgy" of Paul VI is equivalent to rejecting both the Council and the Holy Spirit.

Part 3 presents the critiques of six more authors: Alexander Battista, an Eastern-rite Catholic; Fr. Samuel Keyes, a convert from Anglicanism and a priest of the Anglican Ordinariate; Roland Millare, an expert on the liturgical theology of Joseph Ratzinger; Fr. Peter Miller, a Benedictine monk who is especially well-equipped to tackle the subject of the lectionaries; Dom Alcuin Reid, one of the greatest living scholars on liturgical matters; and Dr. Joseph Shaw, President of the International *Una Voce* Federation and Chairman of the Latin Mass Society of England and Wales.

The volume is rounded out by a mordantly humorous Epilogue by Gregory DiPippo and a Select Bibliography recommending the finest resources for those who wish to equip themselves well for serious discussions of these complex issues.

Some readers might be tempted to wonder: "Why should we care about a series written by three scholars who are obviously totally out of their depth and who have done little more than make a public spectacle of themselves? Shouldn't we just let it pass and move on?" To this, I answer, we *should* care, and we should *not* let it pass. The kind of arguments given by CHW are precisely those that are still lazily regurgitated in seminaries and liturgical degree programs around the world; they are the "commonplaces" that hold on doggedly in diocesan newspapers, bulletins, homilies, blogs, and workshops. The contributors to this volume have sought to do a service to the Church by summing up major innovationist

Preface

and anti-traditionalist arguments and, like a good apologetics manual, presenting Catholic counterarguments. A handy, readable, persuasive case in favor of tradition against novelty will be especially helpful for younger people today who long for the sacred and the authentic while feeling at a loss for explanations. Moreover, we are passing through a period of vengefully fierce opposition to Catholic tradition; the worst attitudes of the 1970s have reappeared in holders of the highest offices and have metastasized into a felonious campaign designed to wipe out the Latin Mass and other traditional sacramental rites and forms of prayer, not to mention the orthodox doctrine and morality of which the ancient *lex orandi* is the spotless reflection. What is almost worse than the errors in CHW is the way in which they, and the journal that published them, have allowed themselves to be co-opted by an ideology directly aimed against the immemorial *lex orandi* and therefore against the *lex credendi* and the *lex vivendi* as well—an ideology that, as a consequence, thwarts the common good of the entire Church (the nearly verbatim parallels between CHW and Cardinals Roche, Cupich, and Cantalamessa are eloquent in this regard). In other words, the CHW series is no mere ivory-tower exercise to be laughed away; it is a form of ecclesiastical-political propaganda that needs to be clearly identified and rigorously snuffed out as the distorting and perverting force it is.

I thank all of the authors for their diligent defense of the Roman Church's great liturgical heritage, now under remorseless attack but destined to survive as it has done through many evil periods in Western history—indeed, destined to thrive again. As Dom Gérard Calvet once said: "Tradition is the youth of God."

In the printed version of this book, the ugly clutter of hyperlinks and access dates has been omitted in the notes, since anyone with internet can effortlessly locate the items identified herein by author, title, website, and date.

Peter A. Kwasniewski

March 31, 2023

Seven Sorrows of Our Lady

ABBREVIATIONS

- CHW = Cavadini, Healy, Weinandy
MD = Encyclical Letter *Mediator Dei* of Pius XII
NO = Novus Ordo (Missae) of Paul VI
SC = Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy
Sacrosanctum Concilium of Vatican II
TLM = Traditional Latin Mass

SUMMARY

of Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy

JANET E. SMITH

ON DECEMBER 1, 2022, IN THE ONLINE publication *Church Life Journal*, John Cavadini, Mary Healy, and Thomas Weinandy published “A Synoptic Look at the Failures and Successes of Post-Vatican II Liturgical Reforms,” a compilation of a previously published five-part series undertaken to “address the theological, liturgical, and pastoral issues that have arisen over time and that presently disrupt the unity and peace of the Church. Our hope is that, in bringing some clarity to what has developed, both positively and negatively, a constructive way forward may be found.”

Permission was sought from the *Church Life Journal* to reprint the series in this volume prior to our critiques of it, and an offer was made to include a response from CHW to their critics. The request was denied, and so we offer instead the present summary of CHW’s “Synoptic Look.”

In their “Synoptic Look,” CHW list the topics they address. 1. The rise of the liturgical renewal; 2. The state of the liturgy prior to Vatican II; 3. The Council’s reforms as outlined in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*; 4. The implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*; 5. The movement to return to the Tridentine liturgy; 6. The pastoral strategies of Popes John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and Francis; 7. Theological and pastoral concerns with the Traditional Latin Mass movement; 8. The way forward. Our summary follows these eight sections.

1. The Rise of the Liturgical Renewal. In the first section, CHW speak of the Liturgical Movement prior to Vatican II and review the work of monks and priests who were involved in it. Some advocated “reforms” that stressed the

importance of the liturgical year, the promotion of Gregorian chant (which, it seems, all desired), and “active participation,” which meant, for some, that the laity were to have a greater awareness of their participation in the priesthood of Christ, and, for others, that the laity should sing or recite the responses and join in singing the Ordinary of the Mass. Some advocated the use of the vernacular in the Mass; others opposed it. There was a general sense that the laity needed more instruction on the nature of the Mass. CHW remark especially on the founding of a center for liturgical renewal at St. John’s Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota.

CHW also review the content of Pope Pius XII’s encyclical on the liturgy, *Mediator Dei* (1947), and portray it as being very favorable to the Liturgical Movement. They comment on his support for promoting a revival of Gregorian chant and especially on his advocacy of more active participation for the laity. They claim that Pius XII speaks of maintaining respect not only for the ancient liturgies but also for contemporary rites, since all were inspired by the Holy Spirit.

CHW single out two theologians who contributed to Vatican II’s Constitution on the Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963): Fr. Romano Guardini (1885–1968), whom they report as stressing the communal nature of the liturgy, and Fr. Louis Bouyer (1913–2004), a consultor for the Vatican II document on the liturgy and who also served on the *Consilium* that composed the *Novus Ordo* after Vatican II.

CHW portray the Liturgical Movement as a movement “from the ground up” since it was initiated primarily in monasteries. They also state that the renewal was “guided, sanctioned, and encouraged by the Church’s hierarchy.” They conclude that the movement was “an authentic work of the Spirit for the benefit of Christ’s Church.”

2. The State of the Liturgy Prior to Vatican II. In the second section, CHW portray the attendees of the Mass prior to Vatican II as mere “observers” of a great mystery and claim that only the priest and altar boys were “seen as actively engaged.” They depict the laity as largely inattentive to what was going on at the altar as they “engaged in their

Summary

own personal forms of prayer.” CHW tell us that the laity

had little sense of asking forgiveness of their sins during the opening penitential rite, nor did they consciously offer themselves to the Father in union with Jesus during the offertory. There was little or no engagement with the scripture readings. Likewise, unless they were following along with a bilingual missal, which must be said was fairly popular, they would not be praying along with the celebrant, for they could neither hear him nor understand what he was praying in Latin.

Further, according to CHW, the laity, while they knew they were receiving Jesus in the Eucharist,

had little awareness that the privilege of receiving Holy Communion was founded upon their having participated in Jesus’s once-for-all sacrifice of himself to the Father for the forgiveness of sins and the outpouring of the divine life of the Holy Spirit. Significantly, while the faithful knew and believed that the one God is a Trinity of persons, their liturgical and personal prayer often primarily consisted of praying to the one (generic) God.

It was not until the Mass was in the vernacular, they assert, that the faithful became “cognizant of the trinitarian nature of the liturgy and of their own ability to pray in a trinitarian manner.”

CHW report that while some priests were reverent, some said the Mass in under twenty minutes, mumbling a Latin they did not understand. Moreover, there was a paucity of Scripture in the Mass, which prevented Catholics from coming to know the whole of the Bible. The sermons largely addressed the necessity of living a moral life and striving for holiness, but they did not “bring to life the mysteries of the faith” and thus most Catholics “never grew in their understanding of the doctrines of the faith beyond what they learned from catechesis as children.” The priests were not much more mature in their faith.

CHW claim that few Catholics knew why the Mass was said *ad orientem* and were only aware that they could not see or hear what the priest was doing or saying.

All the above indicate that the Mass was based on an “inadequate theological understanding” which had resulted in “deficient liturgical practice.”

3. The Council’s Reforms. The third section discusses the reforms of the liturgy proposed by Vatican II in *SC*, which, said the Council, was undertaken to meet the needs of our time. They note that the key intent of *SC* was expressed in this passage:

Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to the full, conscious, and active participation in the liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy, and to which the Christian people, “a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people” (1 Pet 2:9; cf. 2:4–5) have a right and obligation by reason of their baptism.

In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy the full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered above all else, for it is the primary and indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit. Therefore, in all their apostolic activity, pastors of souls should energetically set about achieving it through requisite pedagogy.¹

CHW note that *SC* holds that the “promotion and restoration of the liturgy” has been prompted by the Holy Spirit. CHW claim that the Council advocates for active participation because “only through such active engagement in word and action do they [the laity] reap the graces that flow from the Eucharist.”

CHW then list eight desiderata of *SC*: changes must be made if there are elements that do not harmonize with the “inner nature” of the liturgy (*SC* 21); changes may not be made to the liturgy except under the authority of the Church (*SC* 22); active participation, which involves the laity reciting prayers of the Mass and engaging in various physical movements, should be promoted (*SC* 30); liturgical rites should have a “noble simplicity” and be “short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions” (*SC* 34); there should be more Scripture in the liturgy (*SC* 51); homilies should expound

1 *SC* 14. See chapter 6 for a critique of the translation “above all else,” which is not what the Latin of *SC* says.

Summary

“the mysteries of the faith and the guiding principles of the Christian life” (SC 52); Latin is to be preserved, especially in the Ordinary of the Mass, but a wider use may be made of the vernacular (SC 36); Gregorian chant should be given “pride of place in liturgical services” along with other forms of sacred music, “especially polyphony” (SC 116). In addition, respect should be given to the musical traditions of people in mission lands (SC 119) and the pipe organ should be held in “high esteem in the Latin Church” (SC 120).

CHW understand these decrees to be part of a liturgical renewal inspired by the Holy Spirit and directed towards active participation by the faithful. CHW argue that the Church intended not to *rescind* the Tridentine Mass but rather to revise it into a new version of the same Roman Rite.

4. The Implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. In the fourth section, CHW note “the achievements and disappointments” of the NO. They maintain SC was rightly implemented as follows:

The active participation of the faithful was heightened in a myriad of ways: in their vocal responses in the Penitential Rite, in the restoration of the Prayer of the Faithful, in the restoration of the offertory procession in which the faithful bring forward the bread and wine, in their response to the priest’s invitation to pray that his sacrifice and theirs would be acceptable to God, and in other responses and acclamations. The role of the altar servers became less prominent.

They assert that the simplification of the rubrics, accompanying a new suite of Eucharistic Prayers, allowed for greater active participation by the laity and greater understanding of the Eucharist by the priest.

It is here that CHW find “one of Vatican II’s enduring and most important achievements: the recovery of the Scriptural and patristic doctrine of the priesthood of all the baptized.” The NO permits the laity to realize more fully their “baptismal priesthood,” for they share more in the offering of the Eucharist and are less cast in the role of “strangers and silent spectators” (SC 48).

A major contributor to a fuller participation of the laity in the liturgy is the use of the vernacular language, which makes possible “active, vocal, [and] intelligible participation” for both laity and priest. CHW note that the use of the vernacular was enthusiastically welcomed around the world. “The *vox populi* had spoken” in going past the limited opening to the vernacular called for in SC. CHW reject the claim of some opponents of the NO that in adopting the vernacular effectively to the exclusion of Latin in most places, the NO went against the intentions of SC, and, for support, point to the fact that Popes Paul VI and John Paul II accepted these developments.

CHW provide a fairly long list of some of the “unfortunate developments” in the English editions of the Missal: the translations were not true to the original; references to Scripture were obscure; the beautiful poetic sense of the collects and prayers was lost. They lament that the translations of the Eucharistic Prayers,² products of the “dubious theology” that followed Vatican II, failed to fully convey the sacrificial nature of the Mass. In their view, the several revisions of the Missal since the original edition have rectified the problem.

CHW find one of the “most pastorally advantageous changes in the reformed liturgy” to be the expanded lectionary, which has a three-year cycle of Sunday readings and a two-year cycle of weekday readings. They believe the laity have immensely benefitted from this greater exposure to Scripture which enables them to understand the Eucharist better and leads to a more intimate communion with Christ.

CHW applaud the fact that the new lectionary provides priests with more material for their homilies but maintain that priests have not taken advantage of the new riches, still giving homilies that are too moralistic. CHW deplore the fact that priests are also in the habit of “telling personal and humorous stories.” The Church has responded by issuing several documents encouraging priests to speak on the mysteries of the faith as disclosed in Scripture.

² CHW call these “canons” although the liturgical reformers called them *preces*, since the term “canon” had become more or less equivalent over the centuries to the sole Western anaphora, the Roman Canon.

Summary

CHW lament the fact that, contrary to SC, there has not been a revival of Gregorian chant, and portions of the Mass that were to be *sung* in Latin are now simply *recited* in the vernacular. They note that “the loss of the Church’s musical tradition tended to undermine the heavenly solemnity and gravitas of the Mass.” They paint a mixed but largely dismal picture of modern-day Mass music:

The use of the vernacular did give rise to the composition of vernacular hymns and new sung Masses. Some of these were of high biblical and theological quality and skillfully composed, but others were banal and sentimental, with moralistic lyrics, often focused on celebrating the congregating community rather than worshiping Christ. Many were devoid of any mention of the mysteries of the faith, the exaltation of the Holy Trinity, Jesus as the Son of God incarnate, his saving death and glorious resurrection, the new life in the Holy Spirit, or the marvel of the Eucharist. The lyrics of such hymns possessed little biblical or theological correlation to the liturgy itself and were not conducive to entering into the liturgical celebration. Likewise, some of the melodies possessed a liturgical quality, a sacred eminence that would not be found in contemporary secular music. Others, however, sounded like Broadway rejects—a poor combination of “spiritual” words with the tune of contemporary musicals.

CHW speak approvingly of the many different instruments used at Mass and portray the distress of those who complain about guitar Masses as “sometimes overwrought, fueled by an elitist mentality.”

CHW are enthusiasts for the Mass said *versus populum* or with the priest facing the people. They acknowledge it was not anticipated by the Council but maintain it is in keeping with the attempt to foster the “full participation of the laity” who, because of the priest facing toward them, are better drawn into celebrating the Eucharist with the priest. Moreover, the representation of the spousal covenant is better effected because the priest, representing the bridegroom, is facing the Church, his bride (that is, the people in the nave). CHW observe that some priests used the new positioning to “assume the role of an entertainer,” with the result that

“instead of the liturgy being renewed and the faithful more actively engaged, it became muddled and banal.”

CHW note that the Vatican has been slow to act against the transgressions that have at times characterized the NO: “Few positive measures were taken to correct the liturgical abuses and few disciplinary actions were taken against those who perpetrated them.” They find signs that authentic renewal took place during the pontificates of John Paul II and Benedict XVI, but list some important steps that still needed (and need) to be made, since “not all of the changes [in the liturgical reform] have always and everywhere been accompanied by the necessary explanation and catechesis; as a result, in some cases there has been a misunderstanding of the very nature of the liturgy, leading to abuses, polarization, and sometimes even grave scandal.” John Paul II observed that liturgy needed to possess a contemplative dimension to arouse “awe, reverence, and adoration,” and mentioned the need for more silence in the Mass, more Latin, and more chant.

For all of its problems, however, CHW believe the Holy Spirit has been “present and active” in the implementation of the NO—a view they find echoed in John Paul’s remarks on the twenty-fifth anniversary of *SC*, where he gave a long list of the good that has come from liturgical renewal, including greater knowledge of Scripture, increased participation by the laity in the Eucharist, and a greater sense on the part of the laity of their common priesthood, all of which has redounded to the vitality of Christian communities.

5. The Movement to Return to the Tridentine Liturgy. In the fifth section, CHW take up the question of the growing preference of a rather small number of priests and laity for the Tridentine Mass (TM). They list some reasons that have contributed to this preference, such as the chaotic implementation of the NO and the sense that the TM is more reverent, transcendent, and solemn. Although sympathizing with the desires of the attendees of the TM, CHW “believe that a return to the Tridentine Mass is liturgically unfortunate and doctrinally unacceptable.” They cite a 1974 document that

forbids the availability of the TM in areas where episcopal conferences have mandated the NO.

CHW assert that the TM was itself a reform in its day, that it is only 400 years old, that it will disappear over time, and that the NO will undergo changes as well. CHW claim that Latin was introduced because it was the vernacular of its day and that Jesus employed the vernacular of his day to enable the apostles to participate actively in the liturgy.

To the claim that the TM was not in need of reform since it had produced thousands of saints, CHW respond that many became saints *before* Trent while several have become saints who worshiped in the NO. CHW believe that a return to the TM with its “more limited and less adequate ecclesiology” would be a return to the laity being “silent spectators” sadly separated from the priest and from the offering.

6. The Pastoral Strategies of Popes John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and Francis. In the sixth section, CHW address the pastoral strategies of Popes John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and Francis. In 1984 John Paul made a concession, in the form of an indult, that permitted bishops to allow the TM under very tight restrictions, such as: that those asking for it make it publicly clear that they accept the NO; that the Mass not be held at parishes; and that the 1962 Missal be used. John Paul made further concessions after Archbishop Lefebvre’s illicit ordination of four bishops and asked that ordinaries give “wide and generous” permission for the TM. In 2007 in *Summorum Pontificum*, Benedict XVI made a distinction between the NO as the “ordinary form” of the Roman Rite and the TM as the “extraordinary form” of the same Rite, and mandated that a TM should be provided for groups of the faithful who request it of their pastors. CHW question Benedict’s wisdom in allowing such availability of the TM, since they find the continued presence of the TM incompatible with the movement of the Holy Spirit in respect to the liturgy and, according to them, “undercut[s] the fundamental principle of the liturgical renewal: active participation of the laity.” CHW also accuse Benedict of having undermined his own principle of a hermeneutic of continuity, which CHW

understand to mean that the NO must (by definition) be in continuity with the TM and not a departure from it so notable that it counts as a different form of Mass.

CHW identify a large number of problems with the TM, such as that the “silent and prayerful” participation of the laity in the Mass is not what SC meant by “active participation.” They lament that those who attend the TM will not have the opportunity, afforded by the NO, to become more familiar with Scripture.

CHW report that Pope Francis in *Traditionis Custodes* (2021) reversed the normalization of the TM by greatly restricting its availability, since it had become a source of disunity in the Church. He mandated that parochial churches could not host the TM nor could new parishes or groups be established to provide the TM; priests and seminarians who wish to celebrate the TM must be given permission from the bishops, who must in turn consult the Holy See before the permission may be granted. Francis consulted the bishops around the world before making his decision, not only because those who attend the TM have contributed to division in the Church but also because some go so far as to reject Vatican II. In a subsequent document, Francis indicated he wanted the restrictions he mandated to be applied strictly, in order to discourage those who attend the TM from assuming they are truly a part of parish life or that they could expect the TM to be regularly available.

CHW call for a pastoral approach on the diocesan and parish levels to those who are hurt by the decisions of the Holy Father, which CHW found somewhat insensitive.

7. Theological and Pastoral Concerns with the Tridentine Mass Movement. In the seventh section CHW respond to those whose advocacy for the TM they find offensive and single out Peter Kwasniewski, who warns people not to participate in the NO because “it deprives the Lord of the reverence that is due to Him.” They accuse him of not recognizing that the NO is often said reverently and of not recognizing that it is a source of attraction to the Church for those in Africa.

Summary

CHW believe that Vatican II is, ironically, in some way the cause of present disaffection for the NO, because Vatican II taught the importance of “an experience of active participation in something of surpassing beauty, namely, the Eucharistic sacrifice,” and those who today find that surpassing beauty in the TM seek out “a self-selected group of enthusiasts who share the same ideal” and prefer not to worship with those who don’t have their “level of interest, faith, or attention span.” CHW believe that some romanticize the preconiliar TM, which they describe as “very routinized and in many instances almost mechanically celebrated.”

CHW insist again on the importance of the laity fully experiencing their baptismal priesthood, a priority of Vatican II, and again claim that the TM risks overaccentuating the ministerial priesthood. CHW also claim that the NO better enables the laity to internalize the mystery of “Jesus’ once-for-all saving sacrifice” because they can worship in their own language. They claim that the rubrics of the NO better convey mystery whereas in the TM, “it can happen that the ceremonial itself and its meticulous observance take on a life of their own, as though they were the focus and source of the feeling of transcendence.”

CHW warn that “there can be a danger of loving a form of the Mass more than one loves Jesus.” The unity of the Church is threatened by “a self-selected group of like-minded people within the Church” who can come to think of themselves as better Catholics. CHW reject the views of those who blame the NO for the decline in vocations, the increase of divorce, and declining numbers in the Church.

CHW point out that John Paul II, Benedict, and Francis all bemoaned the division in the Church caused by the presence of two Roman Rite liturgies and gives as evidence that they all required that attendees of the TM recognize the validity of the NO. They single out Dom Alcuin Reid’s clandestine ordination to the priesthood as an indication that the TM is moving towards establishing a separate Church. They also urge devotees of the NO to grant the legitimacy of the charge that the NO is at times banal and that this problem ought to be addressed.

8. The Way Forward. In the eighth and final section, CHW “propose some positive ways forward.” The first is a call to bishops and pastors to educate the laity about Vatican II, as few are familiar with it and sometimes are led astray by those who denigrate the Council. It is often the young who suffer the most from ignorance of Vatican II and thus are tempted to gravitate towards the TM.

CHW also challenge bishops and priests to “call the faithful to a deeper conversion,” for which purpose a mystagogical catechesis on the Eucharistic liturgy will be necessary. This will not be effected without a “new Pentecost” wherein there will be a fresh outpouring of the Holy Spirit. CHW give a fairly extensive summary of the catechesis that they believe is necessary to lead the laity to recognize their baptismal priesthood and the truth that we are to become one with Christ; they call for parishes to provide classes on these matters and for priests to focus on these themes in their homilies.

CHW also give specific instructions on how the laity might be helped to experience liturgy as beautiful and that giving this goal due attention will be a means of fostering interior conversion. They recommend genuflecting to the tabernacle and keeping more silence before Mass and at the appropriate moments within Mass. Those who receive Communion should have a reverent posture (by this, however, they do not mean kneeling while receiving) and should be more modest and less casual in their dress. They note the need for vernacular hymns to speak of the Eucharist not only as a banquet but also as a sacrifice. They urge lectors to read with understanding. They want us to work “to recover the iconography and devotional furnishings that nourish the devotional life and help to localize it in place and time.” They express their own frustration with some of the results of the new liturgy: “One can understand the impulse to leave behind the reformed liturgy if the very reasons for which it was reformed are continually subverted by bad hymnody, incomprehensible Scripture reading and psalmody, and the seeming negation of the possibility of devotion, especially to Mary, to which *Lumen Gentium* exhorted us.”

Summary

CHW particularly want to find a way to link the liturgy with the New Evangelization and suggest that, during the Mass, after Communion, some of the faithful might give public testimonies about their love for the Eucharist.

Their final request is twofold. First, they “hold that it is time for those who have become part of the Tridentine movement to reconsider their position.” Second, they urge “those who are responsible for overseeing the celebration of the Eucharist to get much more serious about reforming the reform, about addressing the legitimate concerns of those attracted to the Tridentine rite instead of turning a deaf ear to their complaints.” Recognizing that liturgy on earth can never be perfect, CHW call upon those who worship at the TM to return to “the Church’s ordinary liturgical form” and to contribute to its ongoing reform.

PART 1

Janet Smith's Critique

1

Sacrificing Beauty and Other Errors

ARORATE CAELI MASS EMBRACES THE attendees in an atmosphere of mystery, transcendence, and solemnity; it is very clear that something supernaturally wonderful is happening. I went to a *Rorate Caeli* Mass on a punishingly windy, cold, rainy morning—most fitting for an event marking emergence from darkness to light, from evil to goodness. The Mass began at 7 AM in a mostly dark church lit by hundreds of candles on the altar and in the church; everyone in the congregation was holding lit tapers.

The symbolism was impossible to miss. Advent is the time when we realize how dark the world is without Christ and how desperate we are for the light that He brings. The Mass is devoted to Mary who enabled that light to come into the world and enables all of us to be Christ-bearers. It was too dark for me to follow in my missal so “all” I did was meditate on those basic truths and luxuriate in the beautiful music and the dazzling candlelight. I felt completely engaged in the liturgy along with my fellow worshippers who also seemed enthralled by the occasion. (I wonder if our profoundly contemplative engagement qualifies as “active participation” or were we just passive woolgatherers?) I suspect the symbolism of the ceremony embedded itself deeply into the subconscious of the small children in attendance. It was certainly in my mind days after the event.

The Mass I attended was held in a parish church that has recently been restored to its pre-Vatican II glory. Shortly after Vatican II it was “wreckovated” into what bore some resemblance to a bordello. Pictures of the Church through several of its stages can tell us much (see Figures 1–6). The *Rorate Caeli* Mass was designed to be said in beautiful churches,

with beautiful art and music; it would have been very much out of place in the bordello version of St. Thomas the Apostle, a design evidently considered fitting for the *Novus Ordo*—a Mass that has not spawned beautiful architecture, music, and art, but rather the opposite.

Sadly, most Catholics have never heard of a *Rorate Caeli* Mass, let alone attended one.

John Cavadini, Mary Healy, and Fr. Tom Weinandy in their five-part series¹ on the Traditional Latin Mass² seem determined to make the *Rorate Caeli* Mass and all forms of the Traditional Latin Mass (TLM) unavailable (though they do not state their exact intent).³ Certainly they said nothing

1 All five articles have been merged into one: John Cavadini, Mary Healy, Thomas Weinandy, "A Synoptic Look at the Failures and Successes of Post-Vatican II Liturgical Reforms" (*Church Life Journal*, December 1, 2022; hereafter, "A Synoptic Look").

2 I prefer the term "Traditional Latin Mass" to "Tridentine Mass," since "Tridentine Mass" can be interpreted (as it often is) to suggest that a new Mass was invented at Trent, when in truth Trent codified the Order of Mass that originated around the fourth century and had developed organically since then, remaining recognizably the same rite.

3 It seems to be a reasonable interpretation of their articles to conclude that CHW think that the Church would be better off without the general availability of the TLM and indeed, would be better off if it were more or less confined to the dustbins of history. They do not explicitly say they think that the TLM should be abrogated, but they do say: "we believe that a return to the Tridentine Mass is liturgically unfortunate and doctrinally unacceptable," and "To return to the Tridentine Mass is, then, to lose or obscure a foundational dimension of the Church and her worship." They also ask about traditionalists: "Do they [traditionalists] really expect that hundreds of years from now the Tridentine Mass will still be celebrated, even unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ at the end of history?" The answer to that question is that the advocates of the TLM *do* think it will be celebrated hundreds of years from now—a prospect unthinkable to CHW. Although their piece, so contemptuous of the attendees of the TLM, is not likely to persuade them of deficiencies in the TLM, they ask its attendees "for the well-being of the Body of Christ, to return to the Church's ordinary liturgical form." They certainly never address the possibility of any accommodations made to the Traditional Latin Mass community.

I sent a query to the authors for a clarification about what precisely they are proposing as to the availability of the TLM—does saying there should be no "return" to the TLM mean only that it should not *replace* the NO, or rather, that it should not be available *at all*? I heard back only from Mary Healy, who acknowledged that my questions were good ones but that she does not have the time to give them the attention they deserve. Certainly, it can be said with confidence that CHW intend to



Figure 1. Original appearance of parish church, ca. 1900.



Figure 2. Solemn Requiem Mass for Pius XI, 1939.



Figure 3. “Renovation” of the church after Vatican II, 1965.



Figure 4. Close-up of the high altar in 1965. “More renovations were made under the leadership of Msgr. G. Warren Peek, 1964–1993. Windows were covered and the apse was repainted gold. The high altar, reredos, marble angels, side altars and Communion rails were all removed. The sanctuary was extended, a simple, freestanding altar was added, and the first several rows of pews were rearranged” (*Detroit Church Blog*, September 21, 2017).



Figure 5. Restoration in 2020 by Conrad Schmitt Studios.

about retiring the architecture, art, and music together with the liturgy that inspired it, and one cannot imagine that they would want to deny the faithful that beauty.

Nevertheless, the fact is that the TLM and such beautiful architecture, art, and music are based on the same theology—one CHW deem “inadequate”—and are meant to be experienced together. CHW seem to have no sense of how devastating the loss of the TLM—and all its beautiful accouterments—would be to some very devout Catholics and how hard it will be, without it, to restore to the Church the beauty it had before the ravages of the modern age.

discredit the TLM and to discourage people from attending it. It is not unreasonable to think they would like to see it abrogated, so I will be using “discourage/abolish” when speaking of their intention; if they intend otherwise, I welcome a clarification from them. It is also worth noting that I submitted my essays to the *Church Life Journal* in hopes that it would be interested in hosting a thorough and fair response to CHW. I received only an automated response and withdrew the article after they had had it in their possession for several weeks.



Figure 6. Closeup of restored sanctuary.

It's a rare event when three well-respected theologians— noted for their fidelity—team up to write against a time-honored practice of the Church. CHW have put their impressive academic skills, considerable intellectual gifts, and well-deserved scholarly reputations in service of . . . discouraging and even perhaps abolishing the Traditional Latin Mass forever, a Mass that likely only 1–2% of Catholics currently attend.

I am sorry to say that the arguments that CHW offer are simply not up to the goal they have set themselves.⁴ For the last two or three years I have immersed myself in reading about the history and meaning of the TLM and of the Novus Ordo (NO).⁵ The narrative that I discovered is remarkably different from that laid out by CHW, whose reading on the

4 I must thank Dr. Peter Kwasniewski for his help on my response; he provided invaluable bibliographical and editorial help, often sharpened my argument, and encouraged supplementation of my analysis in important ways. The critique remains mine but has been much improved because of his input.

5 Here is the list of books I have purchased; many I have read in their entirety, others in part. (I am not showing off; it is just that there is such a wealth of material, I couldn't resist building at least a basic library of resources, most on the TLM but also on criticisms of Vatican II. There are also, of course, countless informative articles on the internet.) Romano Amerio, *Iota Unum: A Study of Changes in the Catholic Church in the Twentieth Century* (Kansas City: Sarto House, 1996); Louis Bouyer, *Liturgical Piety* (Providence, RI: Cluny Media, 2021); idem, *The Memoirs of Louis Bouyer: From Youth and Conversion to Vatican II, the Liturgical Reform, and After* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2015); Yves Chiron, *Annibale Bugnini: Reformer of the Liturgy* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2018); Michael Davies, *Liturgical Time Bombs in Vatican II: Destruction of the Faith through Changes in Catholic Worship* (Rockford, IL: TAN Books, 2003); Roberto de Mattei, *The Second Vatican Council: An Unwritten Story* (Fitzwilliam, NH: Loreto Publications, 2012); Michael Fiedrowicz, *The Traditional Mass: History, Form, and Theology of the Classical Roman Rite* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2020); Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy: Its Problems and Background* (San Juan Capistrano, CA: Una Voce Press and Harrison, NY: The Foundation for Catholic Reform, 1993); Thomas G. Guarino, *The Disputed Teachings of Vatican II: Continuity and Reversal in Catholic Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018); Prosper Guéranger, *The Traditional Latin Mass Explained* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2017); Matthew Hazell, *Index Lectionum: A Comparative Table of Readings for the Ordinary and Extraordinary Forms of the Roman Rite* (N.p.: Lectionary Study Aids, 2016); Bryan Houghton, *Judith's Marriage* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2020); idem, *Mitre and Crook* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2019); idem, *Unwanted Priest: The Autobiography of a Latin Mass Exile* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2022); James Jackson, *Nothing Superfluous: An Explanation of the Symbolism of the Rite of St. Gregory the Great* (Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 2021); Peter Kwasniewski, *Reclaiming Our Roman Catholic Birthright: The Genius and Timeliness of the Traditional Latin Mass* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2020); idem, *Resurgent in the Midst of Crisis: Sacred Liturgy, the Traditional Latin Mass, and Renewal in the Church* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2014); idem, *Tradition and Sanity: Conversations and Dialogues of a Postconciliar Exile* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2018); idem, *The Holy Bread of Eternal Life: Restoring Eucharistic Reverence in an Age of Impiety* (Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 2020); idem, *Noble Beauty, Transcendent Holiness: Why the*

meaning and history of the liturgy and whose direct personal acquaintance with the current TLM and its attendees seem thin, to say the least.

Sadly, they do not worthily employ their skills of scholarship and reasoning in their critique of the TLM. The chief problems are that they omit evidence that works against their position; they draw conclusions not warranted by the evidence; they misrepresent the views of some theologians and some Church documents; they do not address the strongest arguments of the advocates for the TLM; they make arguments that are irrelevant to the question at hand; and they uncharitably depict the motivations of TLM advocates.

But before I respond to particular arguments put forward by CHW, let me explain why I find the project rather doomed

Modern Age Needs the Mass of Ages (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2017); idem, *The Once and Future Roman Rite: Returning to the Traditional Latin Liturgy after Seventy Years of Exile* (Gastonia, NC: TAN Books, 2022); Matthew L. Lamb, ed., *The Reception of Vatican II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017); idem, ed., *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); Ulrich L. Lehner, *On the Road to Vatican II: German Catholic Enlightenment and Reform of the Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016); Elizabeth Lev, *How Catholic Art Saved the Faith: The Triumph of Beauty and Truth in Counter-Reformation Art* (Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 2018); George J. Moorman, *The Latin Mass Explained: Everything Needed to Understand and Appreciate the Traditional Latin Mass* (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books, 2010); Aidan Nichols, *Conciliar Octet: A Concise Commentary on the Eight Key Texts of the Second Vatican Council* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2019); John W. O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2010); Aurelio Porfiri, *Uprooted: Dialogues on the Liquid Church* (Hong Kong: Chora Books, 2019); Lauren Pristas, *The Collects of the Roman Missals: A Comparative Study of the Sundays in Proper Seasons Before and After the Second Vatican Council* (London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013); Joseph Ratzinger, *Theological Highlights of Vatican II* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009); Athanasius Schneider, *The Catholic Mass: Steps to Restore the Centrality of God in the Liturgy* (Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 2022); idem, *The Springtime That Never Came: In Conversation with Paweł Lisicki* (Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 2022); H. J. A. Sire, *Phoenix from the Ashes: The Making, Unmaking, and Restoration of Catholic Tradition* (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2015); Bernard Tissier De Mallerais, *Marcel Lefebvre* (Kansas City, MO: Angelus Press, 2004); George Weigel, *To Sanctify the World: The Vital Legacy of Vatican II* (New York: Basic Books, 2022); Brian Williams, *Why Tradition? Why Now?* (Clackamas, OR: Regina Magazine, 2018); Ralph Wiltgen, *The Rhine Flows into the Tiber: A History of Vatican II* (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books, 2014).

from the start, if it is designed to convince any of us who now attend the TLM and have studied its history and that of the NO to eschew the TLM in favor of the NO.

A POOR DEAL

What we are to get in return for giving up the TLM is a “reformed” NO of some as-yet-unknown description. Reformed, because, as CHW readily and even frequently acknowledge, all too often the NO has proven to be a very inadequate form of worship. Indeed, never in the history of mankind have congregations been subjected to such faith-destroying, banal, silly, and even blasphemous versions of the liturgy. Those are not everyday occurrences to be sure, and yes, there are “reverent NOs” (I have attended many and still do), but few adult Catholics have not encountered or heard about a NO that has shocked and offended their Catholic sensibilities, and in some parishes and some parts of the world offensive NOs are the rule rather than the exception.

CHW say we are to overlook these abuses as glitches in the performance of the NO since it is still “young” and trust that the abuses will eventually be a thing of the past and that it is possible that some future form of the NO will have all the virtues of the TLM—without its flaws—and more. Of course, I pray that happens, but I am not foolish enough to be willing to give up a liturgy organically one with the most beautiful architecture, art, and music the world has ever known for a liturgy that is perfectly at home in some of the ugliest churches ever built, with sing-song tunes offered as hymns, and abstract art without aesthetic or religious value. Case closed for some of us.

In short, the kind of art, architecture, hymns, and poetry that the TLM has inspired compared with that which the NO has inspired is pretty much in itself a sufficient “argument” that we cannot and must not let the TLM be taken from us again.

But when respected Catholic scholars spend their valuable time trying to convince others that the Mass used by the Church for at least a millennium and a half is a danger to the faith, a response is in order. Indeed, some will be persuaded

simply because it is CHW who are critiquing the TLM, and their witness will be trusted. I believe my analysis of their position will show that trust to be misplaced.

There are many who are much more capable than I of responding to the arguments of CHW—some have already done so⁶—but I want to add my voice to the cry of those who find antipathy to the TLM among faithful Catholics, and learned ones at that, to be perplexing in the extreme.

After all, those who attend the TLM to a person have a profound devotion to the Eucharist; they study the Mass inside and out; they withdraw their children from pernicious public and Catholic schools; indeed, they make great sacrifices to drive a long way with their many children who are evidently quite content to attend a liturgy long and peculiar—though fascinating—to them. These families and other attendees at the TLM produce a greatly disproportionate number of vocations to the priesthood and life-affirming marriage. But none of that seems to matter to CHW.

It would require a book to respond to the series in detail; what I have written is a partial response that gives representative samples of what seem to me to be patently unfair and weak scholarly and argumentative approaches to the question of the value of the TLM.

AGE OF THE TLM

Factual errors in the articles undermine confidence in how much CHW know about the TLM. For instance, they claim that the TLM is just “400 years old” and that the Tridentine Mass was a “reform” of the liturgy. All sound scholarship indicates, however, that the TLM goes back to

6 Among others, see Peter Kwasniewski, “A More Realistic Appraisal of the Liturgical Movement and Its Destructive Descent,” *One Peter Five*, September 21, 2022 (see chapter 7 below); Joseph Shaw, “A Reply to Cavadini, Healy & Weinandy,” *Rorate Caeli*, November 25, 2022 (see chapter 18); Sam Keyes, “The Failures of Reform: A Response to Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy,” *Covenant*, December 13, 2022 (see chapter 14); Dom Alcuin Reid, “The One Thread by Which the Council Hangs: A Response to Cavadini, Healy, and Weinandy,” *One Peter Five*, January 19, 2023 (see chapter 17).

the early stages of the Western Church and was found in its essential Latin form 1,500 years ago (if not before) — not four hundred years ago. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger made this point emphatically:

There is no such thing as a Tridentine liturgy, and until 1965 the phrase would have meant nothing to anyone. The Council of Trent did not “make” a liturgy. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing, either, as the Missal of Pius V. The Missal which appeared in 1570 by order of Pius V differed only in tiny details from the first printed edition of the Roman Missal of about a hundred years earlier. Basically the reform of Pius V was only concerned with eliminating certain late medieval accretions and the various mistakes and misprints which had crept in. Thus, again, it prescribed the Missal of the City of Rome, which had remained largely free of these blemishes, for the whole Church.⁷

The Mass of the sixth century resembled the TLM much more than the NO resembles the TLM — just as the other ancient liturgies of the Church, such as the Byzantine liturgy, resemble the TLM more than they do the NO in regard to a host of characteristics.⁸

Again, Pope Pius V in 1570 did not introduce a “new” or “reformed” liturgy but codified a form of the liturgy that was already in place, his missal being nearly identical to the one published a century earlier in 1474, and this, in turn, very like the missal of Innocent III from the early thirteenth century. Changes made were largely in accord with the wishes of those in remoter areas of the Church who wanted to have their liturgies be in conformity with prestigious ancient Rome.

There is absolutely no similarity between the codification of what was already in place well before 1570 and the introduction of a “new rite” in 1969. Moreover, Pius V permitted

7 Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *The Feast of Faith: Approaches to a Theology of the Liturgy* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), 85.

8 See “Byzantine, Tridentine, Montinian: Two Brothers and a Stranger,” in Peter Kwasniewski, *The Once and Future Roman Rite: Returning to the Traditional Latin Liturgy after Seventy Years of Exile* (Gastonia, NC: TAN Books, 2022), 279–311.

the continued saying of any rite or use of Mass that had been said for at least 200 years, whereas Pope Paul VI wanted the TLM completely suppressed (although he made a few exceptions for elderly priests and for Agatha Christie and friends in England!).⁹

LATIN AS VERNACULAR

Another factual misconception that CHW perpetuate is the oft-refuted claim about the reason that the traditional liturgy of the Church was conducted in Latin; they say:

Earlier, the Mass came to be celebrated in Latin in the western Church not because it was a sacred language but because it was the vernacular of its day; likewise, earlier still, with Greek. Jesus himself employed Aramaic, the vernacular of his time and place. If he had not, the apostles would have had no clue as to what he was doing at the Last Supper, nor could they then have actively participated in that first Eucharistic liturgy. The same holds true for the faithful today.

But Latin was not “the vernacular” in all places when it was chosen. It was the official, bureaucratic language of the Roman empire, an empire that included many peoples whose native language was not Latin; it was not the “vernacular” for them. Moreover, scholarship has shown that the Latin of the liturgy was a highly refined or “cultic” version of language, not the language “of the people”; it was, in fact, chosen because it already had features of a sacral or hieratic language and was utilized in part for that reason.¹⁰

The reference to the Last Supper is a red herring, for two reasons: first, Jesus would have celebrated much of the Passover in the (by then sacral) language of Hebrew, which was *not* the common language of his day and place;

9 K. V. Turley, “The Mystery of the ‘Agatha Christie Indult,’” *National Catholic Register*, November 5, 2021.

10 For an explanation of Latin as a sacred language, see Christine Mohrmann, *Liturgical Latin: Its Origins and Character* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1957); Peter Kwasniewski, “Why Latin Is the Right Language for Roman Catholic Worship,” *Rorate Caeli*, June 4, 2022. See also chapter 10 below.

and second, we still have a “clue” what is going on at the liturgy even when we don’t understand the language. I have been to Melkite liturgies and others where I understand nothing of what is being sung, but I know precisely the kind of event in which I am participating—and participating actively because I am conscious of what the event is and the response it demands of me in faith, adoration, and love.

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT AND BOUYER

CHW attempt to tie the NO to the Liturgical Movement that preceded it, as though the NO were the logical and perhaps inevitable development of that movement and were embraced by Vatican II. What CHW fail to mention is how unwelcome some of the proposals of the Liturgical Movement were to the authorities in the Church. Indeed, the primary aspects of the Liturgical Movement that made their way into *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the constitution on which the Fathers of Vatican II voted, were the call for some use of the vernacular in the Mass and a call for more active participation on the part of the laity.

CHW quite selectively report on the Liturgical Movement and particularly on some of the views of the individuals cited. For example, they cite the work of Fr. Louis Bouyer, who wrote on the history of liturgical movements and reported that at different periods in Church history, reform of the liturgy was needed, but a reform that generally involved removing inappropriate accretions.¹¹

While CHW acknowledge that Bouyer “was not entirely happy, during and especially after the Council, for he anticipated and after observed the subsequent liturgical aberrations, both theological and pastoral,” that demurrals is a serious misrepresentation of Bouyer’s sharply expressed disgust with how the NO was *composed* and with the NO itself. There are few individuals who have written more acerbically about Vatican II and the NO, both ventures in which he was closely involved. He is famous for this claim:

11 Louis Bouyer, *Liturgical Piety* (Providence, RI: Cluny Media, 2021).

ILLUSIONS OF REFORM

You'll have some idea of the deplorable conditions in which this hasty reform was expedited when I recount how the second Eucharistic prayer was cobbled together. Between the indiscriminately archeologizing fanatics who wanted to banish the *Sanctus* and the intercessions from the Eucharistic prayer by taking Hippolytus's Eucharist as is, and those others who couldn't have cared less about his alleged *Apostolic Tradition* and wanted a slapdash Mass, Dom Botte and I were commissioned to patch up its text with a view to inserting these elements, which are certainly quite ancient — by the next morning! . . . I cannot read that improbable composition without recalling the Trastevere café terrace where we had to put the finishing touches to our assignment in order to show up with it at the Bronze Gate by the time our masters had set.

I prefer to say nothing, or little, about the new calendar, the handiwork of a trio of maniacs who suppressed, with no good reason, Septuagesima and the Octave of Pentecost and who scattered three quarters of the Saints higgledy-piggledy, all based on notions of their own devising! Because these three hotheads obstinately refused to change anything in their work and because the pope wanted to finish up quickly to avoid letting the chaos get out of hand, their project, however insane, was accepted.¹²

A theologian who writes such words in his memoirs can hardly be included in a list of enthusiasts for the NO! The sort of criticisms we have quoted from Bouyer can easily be found in other theologians and bishops who were closely involved in the liturgical reform.¹³ Expression of regrets about what happened and even of support for the return of the former rites are by no means rare in the literature, but no one would know that from CHW's series.

12 Louis Bouyer, *The Memoirs of Louis Bouyer: From Youth and Conversion to Vatican II, the Liturgical Reform, and After*, trans. John Pepino (Brooklyn: Angelico Press, 2015), 221–23.

13 See also chapters 6 and 7.