

Why Catholics can't preach (and prefer not to listen)

It is said that the Devil hates preachers even more than he hates exorcists. A preacher, after all, ministers to multitudes, driving away error and encouraging conversion of heart by the exposition of Catholic doctrine. Common opinion suggests that today's homiletic standards should give the Evil One little cause for concern. Everyone, or so it seems, has a pulpit horror story of banality, heresy or simple incoherence, even from traditional priests. Having accounted for exaggerations, clerical bad hair days and the posturings of the professional sermon critics among us, it does seem that much, perhaps most, preaching, is substandard.

It's harder to establish the reasons for this lack of eloquence. Laying the blame on a lack of proximate preparation seems the most popular course - Father is too busy or lazy to prepare properly. Many priests don't seem to read much more than the daily newspapers, and become preachers of *The Weekend Australian* rather than the Gospel. The television and the internet have established themselves as the sacerdotal diversions of choice. It's not that the means of social communication, as the Vatican coyly dubs them, are unimportant, just that as a promoter of homiletic skills they are intrinsically limited. Gone are the days of the presbytery library brimming not just with texts of the Fathers, theology and lives of the saints

but also with classics of literature in several languages.

Loud, long and severe

The Curé of Ars as a young priest is said to have slaved over the preparation of his sermons, writing them out in full on the sacristy bench and going to the high altar to pray when he needed inspiration. Having completed them he would commit them to memory. His

Bad preaching
is not just a
clerical problem

sources were limited to the standard manuals of the time and his sermons reflect his chief preoccupations - the evils of dancing, drinking and impurity. You have to wonder whether the laity who complain about the irrelevance and tedium of contemporary preaching would deal well with the words of a saint like St John Vianney. His extensive denunciations of all kinds of vice and every spiritual malaise would drain the blood from any face. Nothing he said was for the sake of consolation but rather for destroying the calm of those content with laxity and sin. It was noted that his listeners didn't even have the luxury of sleeping through his often very loud sermons.

He was not thought of as a good or learned preacher. Both long winded (his average was about an hour and forty minutes) and severe (he was accused of having a Jansenist temperament), he often forgot his place, resuming, if at all, after a long pause. One of his brother priests absentmindedly mislaid the text of about twenty of the saint's homilies because he didn't think them very interesting or important. It was only when he began to preach *ex tempore*, abandoning his youthful rigorism, that the Curé's words hit home. As a toothless old man mumbling in the pulpit about the love of God he would reduce the whole church to tears of penitence - his sermon was his life. Anything that involves the action of the Holy Spirit is a lot more complicated than any of us imagine.

We can compare the preaching of this saint to that of another holy man, Henry Cardinal Newman, his contemporary. He coaxed and cajoled his listeners, pointing to the beauty of the Church and its teaching, secure in the conviction that the Truth, once announced, attracted the mind. His was a soul that rested peacefully in that Truth, inviting others into its tranquil harbour. You couldn't imagine Newman shouting at a congregation in the way that Vianney did, yet both were holy, both influenced the people of their time, neither had truck with error or vice.

continued page 3

Oriens

Volume 9, Number 2
Summer 2004

Published by the Ecclesia Dei Society
GPO Box 2021, Canberra ACT 2601

www.oriensjournal.com

Editor

Gary Scarrabelotti

Contributing Editors

Rev Fr Ephraem Chifley O.P.

Gerard McManus

Stephen McNerney

Martin Sheehan

Layout

Luna Graphics

Oriens is the Journal of the *Ecclesia Dei Society*, a lay association of Catholics who foster, nurture and promote the traditional liturgy. The Society's name is inspired by the Apostolic Letter *Ecclesia Dei* of His Holiness Pope John Paul II, issued in 1988, in which the Pontiff asked for a "wide and generous application" of the norms governing use of the liturgical books of 1962 to those faithful of the Latin rite who felt an attachment to the traditional liturgy, which His Holiness called a "rightful aspiration". Membership of the *Ecclesia Dei Society* includes a subscription to *Oriens*. To join, simply fill in the form below and return to:

The Ecclesia Dei Society
GPO Box 2021
Canberra ACT 2601

I hereby apply to join the Ecclesia Dei Society:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Annual Ordinary Membership | \$30 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 year Supporting Membership | \$150 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Life Membership | \$600 |

Or Please send me more information.

Name

Address.....

.....

Telephone

SignatureDate/...../.....

Page 1

Editorial – Why Catholics can't preach

The quality of preaching is a function of the readiness of the laity to listen

Page 3

Chicago Cardinal endorses traditional Mass

Page 4

Michael Davies cuts to the chase

Michael Davies gives last briefing to *Una Voce*

Page 6

Father Aulangier urges SSPX to settle with Rome

Page 10

The Vatican's new realism about Islam

La Civiltà Cattolica sounds a wake-up call about Islam

Page 12

Obituary

Dame Felicitas Corrigan OSB

Page 13

Fraternity plans Australian seminary

Page 14

Devotion does not a Catholic prove

Oriens examines whether the desire for devotion is central to the case for the classical liturgy

Page 16

Our Lady of Clear Creek

Alison Hope pays a visit to the new Benedictine foundation at Clear Creek, Oklahoma

Pages 18ff

Book Reviews

continued from page 1

Congregation hostile

Much has changed in the course of two centuries and those who lament that their clergy don't preach like Henry Newman or John Vianney should bear in mind that, by and large, a modern congregation won't sit still for more than twenty minutes or consent to listen to anything more challenging or complicated than a joke about the football. St John would be viewed as an arrogant bore gratuitously insulting his respectable parish, Bd Henry as an uncaring elitist preaching "over the heads" of simple folk. You can be more or less certain that both would be reported to the diocesan authorities or their religious superiors as troublemakers and "unpastoral". A.N.Wilson wrote a novel which begins with a dense Jesuit who didn't know how to preach. He coped with the challenge by reading other people's sermons. As long as he chose the words of those who pandered to the current fashions he was considered a celebrity preacher, given honour and advancement. His fall occurred when, running short of time, he selected a book at random on the way to the pulpit - a collection of Cardinal Newman's

homilies. Unfortunately for him it contained an oblique reference to the glories of High Mass in Latin. His career as a preacher ended ignominiously.

Low regard

Humbert of Romans, a medieval theorist of preaching, suggests that the Holy Spirit inspires the preacher in direct proportion to the devotion of the people. It is worth considering that bad preaching is not just a clerical problem, but a function of the low regard in which this ministry is held by everyone in the Church, despite protestations to the contrary. In the same way that the merest glimpse of even a completely cold thurible provokes Pavlovian coughing fits, the accession of the priest to the pulpit often reduces the congregation to a state of evident catatonia before he says a single word. A culturally ingrained habit of thought, of both clergy and laity, considers the preaching of the Church not so much an action of Christ the Teacher but an address whose principle function is to deliver the congregation from boredom. The recent tendency to employ non-clerical preachers at the liturgy - their

proper functions lie elsewhere - has not helped this perception.

The French chronicler of manners, Anthelme Brillat-Savarin, records the custom of one famous old canon who would periodically pause during his longer instructions to consume a pickled walnut, while he allowed the congregation leave briefly to clear their throats and nasal passages. He also records an ecclesiastical difference of opinion over the propriety of allowing ladies to have their servants bring them cups of hot chocolate during extended preaching. However quaint these historical portraits they reveal a period in which preaching was taken seriously. It was an event of Divine Mercy at which you might find edification, grace or conversion of heart.

In an age when the preacher competes not just with the *cabarets* and *soirees* of Ars but with increasingly expert and technologically advanced electronic media and cinema proper training of the clergy in sacred eloquence is only part of the solution. We have to have good listeners as well as good preachers.

O

Chicago Cardinal endorses traditional Mass

VERSAILLES: The Cardinal of Chicago has given his clear support for the use of the traditional Latin liturgy.

In a preface written for a collection produced by the International Committee for Liturgical Studies (CIEL), Cardinal George has referred to the Missal of St Pius V as "a precious source of liturgical understanding for all other rites," and said that the pre-conciliar liturgy should be "better accepted". The work by CIEL, a Versailles-based organisation

faithful to the traditional liturgy, was published in France.

Several months after Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos celebrated the classical rite of Mass at the Roman basilica of St Mary Major, Cardinal George said that the Church has reached "a moment of considerable importance" for the future of the traditional liturgy and thus for CIEL. He pointed out that Pope John Paul II

has repeatedly mentioned the beauty and depth of the traditional Mass.

A broader use of the old liturgy, the Chicago archbishop continued, should be more than a "nostalgic revival". The authorized use of the traditional rite, he explained, should be encouraged because the old liturgy "belonged to the entire church" as part of the patrimony of the faith.

continued page 13

Michael Davies cuts to the chase

Gerard McManus reports on Michael Davies' final briefing delivered to the International Una Voce Federation.

IN his final report to the general assembly of the International Una Voce Federation at its meeting in Rome in October, retiring president, Mr Michael Davies, provided some important insights into the views of high-ranking Vatican officials on the status of the traditional Latin Mass in the Catholic Church today.

Mr Davies, who was succeeded as president of the federation by Mr Ralf Siebenbrger (from Austria), has also revealed that he is suffering from terminal prostrate cancer.

The crusty, courageous and outspoken Welshman, who has done so much for the traditional Mass movement over the past three decades, including writing some of the seminal books on the liturgical problems arising out of the Second Vatican Council, also talked frankly about his illness in an article published in *The Remnant* magazine.

In a moving piece, Mr Davies' well-known irascible and unpretentious character and self-deprecating sense of humour shines through. Despite his illness, Mr Davies provided the Una Voce Federation with a full update of what he believes to be the far more important health and status of the traditional Mass movement internationally.

Compromises planned

During negotiations with senior cardinals, Mr Davies said Federation delegates had successfully fended off a concerted push to introduce novelties into the Latin Mass including communion in the hand and altar girls.

Mr Davies said the unambiguous aim of the Ecclesia Dei Commission was that of "integrating the traditionalist faithful into the reality of the Church".

"It also became clear (during negotiations) that the Commission wished us to modify the celebration of Mass according to the 1962 Missal, not only by adopting the 1965 modifications, but by using the 1970 calendar and adopting such practices as Communion in the hand," Mr Davies said.

No go!

In a lengthy correspondence with Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos the Federation had made it clear that its members would not even contemplate accepting such innovations.

"These proposals have now been completely abandoned and Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos is proving himself to be a true friend of the traditional movement as was made clear by the Mass in St Mary Major on 24th May 2003," he said.

Mr Davies also revealed that in July he and Dr Turrini Vita, President of Una Voce Italy, had a long meeting with Cardinal Francis Arinze, the new Prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship. Mr Davies said the Cardinal was very friendly and listened to all that was said with great attention.

However, "he is under the impression that if the norms that he intends issuing before the end of the year result in the new Mass being celebrated without abuses, then opposition to it would cease, and so would the demand for the 1962 Missal," Mr Davies said. **(See Oriens commentary, page 14.)**

"It was made it clear to him that this was not the case, and that with or without abuses the 1970 Missal is unacceptable to members of the Federation."

Mr Davies said Cardinal Medina Estevez (Cardinal Arinze's predecessor) had also confirmed that on the basis of his personal research the rite of St Pius V has never been abrogated.

Referring to Cardinal Ratzinger, Mr Davies said while the Cardinal's personal inclination remained for a "reform of the reform" and having the new Mass celebrated more reverently, he had been unwavering in his support for the Federation and insistent that those who request Mass according to the 1962 Missal should be granted it.

Abuses sanctioned

Mr Davies, however, made it clear to Cardinal Ratzinger that it was the view of the Federation that what were originally abuses in the new rite are now institutionalised.

Mr Davies described the progress of the Federation and the traditionalist movement in general since the new Missal was published in 1970 as "amazing", "even miraculous".

"Who would have dared to predict that in those early days when Dr de Saventhem was President and he seemed to be working for an unattainable cause, and that the traditional Mass seemed to be the mother of all lost causes, that from the 1990s onwards Pontifical Masses would be celebrated by such members of the Sacred College as Cardinal Mayer,

Cardinal Ratzinger, Cardinal Stickler, Cardinal Medina Estvez, and Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos?

“Who would have imagined that at the start of the third millennium there would be at least 12 priestly societies and monastic communities using the pre-Vatican II liturgical books with Vatican approval?”

According to Mr Davies possibly the most significant and encouraging development since 1970 was the extension of recognition to the priests of the Diocese of Campos.

During the delegates’ reports to the Una Voce Congress, Italy’s Count Neri elaborated on the support which Catholics attached to the traditional Roman Rite were receiving from members of the Orthodox Church.

Vale

On a more personal note, in an article in the US magazine *The Remnant*, Mr Davies asked the thousands of people with whom he had been associated over the years not to write or email him about his illness.

“Every prayer that is said for me will be deeply appreciated,” he said. But “please, please do not write or email me to tell me of your sympathy which I take for granted.

“This does not mean that I have become anti-social. My objective is to conserve every possible minute in order to complete three new books which I hope will give inspiration to Catholics in these troubled times.”

Mr Davies revealed that he had been diagnosed with late prostate cancer earlier this year, and that the disease was of a very aggressive nature. However, with treatment he still hoped to survive another year or possibly two.

Mr Davies said he had used the life and death of Fr Adrian Fortescue, the greatest authority on the history of the

traditional Roman rite, as his inspiration on how to respond and deal with the news that he was dying.

“A good number of friends have asked me how I reacted when I got the news of my illness. Did I feel that God had been a little hard on me?,” he said.

Blessing & example

“Quite the opposite. I gave Him thanks for what I consider the greatest blessing that He could have bestowed upon me. To be given an 18-month warning of the day that will decide my fate for all eternity is a great privilege.

“I thought immediately of Fr Fortescue, one of my very greatest heroes.

“Adrian Fortescue (1874-1923) was a priest of unique and remarkable talents who truly merited the title of genius. In

all evil from our circumstance, or all trials from our path. These are the terms on which we are put into the world, and we do wrong to expect or claim security; no security exists for any mortal thing subject to the laws of nature.

“Christ’s office is to comfort us through all, for He has been through all Himself. Our heaviest burden cannot be heavier than was His, nor our road harder than was His to His sacred feet. He had gone before us into all dark places, and will strengthen us in those we have to go through. The final outcome of all is good; no evil is infinite, for the world is not governed by an evil demon, but by a living God.

“Meanwhile the best road for us all is the road of duty, the acceptance of tasks and their brave performance,

“All that is necessary to save our souls is to love and obey Him.”

the midst of life, this amazing scholar was unexpectedly and cruelly called away with much of his work unfinished when diagnosed with cancer.

“In typical Fortescue manner, he returned calmly to his parish, celebrated all the Christmas Masses, did what he could to put his papers and the parish finances in order, felt sad at the books he was writing but could not finish, and preached a final sermon to his flock on 31st December- ‘Christ our Friend and Comforter’.

In this remarkable sermon, Fortescue declared that though human friends might fall away or forget us “whatever happens, Christ will not leave us.”

“He will keep us company even in sorrow and death. He will not take away

irrespective of the pain or joy they might bring us. In following this path we will have the comfort of our dear Friend who will sustain us in weariness, cold and hunger. We must say always: ‘He will never leave me.’ Each year [at Christmas] we can think this thought: ‘Heaven has visited earth.’”

Mr Davies said these words made him understand the task of every Catholic.

“All that is necessary to save our souls is to love and obey Him, even when He asks us to follow Him along the path of suffering He has taken for our salvation.”

Fr. Aulangier urges his SSPX superiors to settle with Rome

Fr. Paul Aulagnier was among Archbishop Lefebvre's first class of seminarians, the first French seminarian to be ordained into the Priestly Society of St Pius X, and one of the SSPX's strongest proponents of the episcopal consecrations, conducted without Roman mandate, in 1988. As a former assistant to the superior general, Fr. Aulagnier and Archbishop Lefebvre remained close until the archbishop's death. In more recent years, Fr. Aulagnier has become an outspoken voice among SSPX clergy who favor reconciliation with Rome. This interview with Fr. Aulangier was recently published in *The Wanderer*.

Q. Since you are the first French priest ordained for the Priestly Society of St. Pius X, were you close to Archbishop Lefebvre? How did he inspire you?

A. Yes, I was close to Archbishop Lefebvre. I knew him well and I strongly appreciated him. He was so cordial, pleasant, a great prelate, but humble, simple, thoughtful for those who surrounded him. He had heart. It was difficult to not love him. He had a magnetic personality. I knew him while during my seminary days at Santa Chiara, the French Seminary in Rome. We were in the midst of the Second Vatican Council in 1964. The seminarians followed, as much as they could, this ecclesiastical event.

The seminary professors often invited a particular conciliar father to spend the evening with us. They were of every tendency. It certainly brought some of us joy to hear Archbishop Lefebvre on the two or three occasions he was invited. Differing from the others, he spoke little about the Council. Rather he spoke about the priesthood to which we desired Ordination. Like several of my fellow seminarians, I appreciated his presentation of the Catholic priesthood.

In the midst of the Council, everything was changing. In a university seminary, minds react quickly, undergo influences, and seek to understand. We participated at the seminary in all the systematic changes of everything — of the common life, of the house rules, of theology, of scholastics. In the midst of this spiritual and intellectual agitation, we needed to be careful, to reflect, to inquire, and to read a lot in order to remain informed.

We painstakingly followed such journals as *Nouvelles de Chrétienté*, *Itinéraires*, and *La Pensée Catholique* to follow the conciliar debates. Without these journals, I do not know if I would be a priest today. Without Archbishop Lefebvre, I certainly would not be. The superiors of the French seminary would not have accepted me. My mind was not open to the proposed novelties.

Our little group of traditional seminarians quickly saw ourselves becoming the object of criticism. When many of us were refused tonsure in 1968, we turned to Archbishop Lefebvre. Having resigned as superior general of the Spiritans, Archbishop Lefebvre was now free to found a seminary in Fribourg, Switzerland. I remember when he approached

Bishop Charriere of Fribourg about this project. The bishop accepted it and even encouraged him. The archbishop saw the finger of God.

I became part of the first class of nine seminarians. My diocesan bishop at the time authorized the transfer. Being the most experienced seminarian — I already had four years of seminary under my belt — gave me the opportunity to become close to Archbishop Lefebvre. During walks, he would gladly converse with us. He even confided in us spontaneously, spoke of his projects, of his priestly ideal, of his hesitations. He often shared his African memories, his memories of the Council, his decision to publish his essay, "To Remain Catholic, Must We Become Protestant?"

This essay explains the whole of Archbishop Lefebvre. He hated the modern world's revolutionary spirit that refused subjection, submission, subordination to a created order, to a divine order. Archbishop Lefebvre had been formed by the thinking of Popes Pius IX, Leo XIII, St. Pius X, and Pius XII. These were his masters. He remained faithful to them all his life. For Archbishop Lefebvre, God as Trinity is everything.

Q. What functions did you have in the heart of the SSPX before coming to Quebec?

A. My “ecclesiastical career” is simple. I served three years as a professor and the sub-director of our seminary in Ecône, and 18 years as district superior in France. Along with my confreres, I built the French district from two houses in 1976, when Archbishop Lefebvre entrusted me with this district. My brother priests and I worked hard over the next 18 years to found priories, churches, chapels, schools, journals, and retreat houses.

When my mandate expired in 1994, I needed a break and went to England. I was always a rebel. In 1995, I asked to be installed in Normandy. I loved the Normands. I left Normandy after founding DICI, an information agency. It was a new form of apostolate for me and I had a passion for it.

In 2001, I was made superior of an autonomous house in Brussels. Then, “no longer in the good books” with the SSPX’s leadership, I spent another sabbatical year in Quebec. As I became more and more vocal about my differences with the direction taken by the SSPX leadership, I resigned as assistant to the superior general. I had held this office since Archbishop Lefebvre founded the SSPX. He had first appointed me to this office on November 1, 1969.

Q. Why were you strongly in favor of the consecrations of 1988?

A. I personally saw in it the wisdom of Archbishop Lefebvre. I knew he loved the Church, that he wanted to serve the Church. He did it all his life. He did it in Africa, for many years as apostolic delegate for francophone Africa. He knew the Church better than most. He had numerous contacts with Pius XII, with Roman congregations. He was appreciated by all, by many. He had the opportunity in his life to choose and

prepare numerous bishops, to organize numerous episcopal conferences in Africa. As superior general of the Holy Ghost Fathers, he was in contact with all the great religious and political leaders of the world.

All this gave him experience and wisdom. He knew the Church in its internal structure. I trusted in him more than others. The consecrations were not an easy decision for him. I myself favored them. I could not see how Catholic Tradition, the Catholic priesthood, the Catholic Mass would survive without any assured episcopal succession. It is the bishop who ordains the priest. It is the priest who offers the Sacrifice of the Mass, renewing the Sacrifice of the Cross. This Sacrifice of the Cross is at the heart of the Church, as it is at the heart of the thinking of our Lord, at the heart of the divine plan of salvation. The Mass is essential to the Church, to the world, to any city.

With Archbishop Lefebvre gone, no bishop at that time possessed the courage to continue his work. One must never forget that. Our battle was always centered on the Mass. Thus, if Archbishop Lefebvre had not consecrated in 1988, his priestly work would have been finished. How can you maintain a seminary if you cannot ordain seminarians? How could you perpetuate the sacrifice of the Mass if there were no longer any priests? These are the simple reasons that allowed me to support the perspective of the consecrations by Archbishop Lefebvre.

A Long Evolution

Q. Do you think that the same reasons would be valuable today? Or are there any dangers in waiting for a reconciliation?

A. Today, the conditions would not allow for what was done in June of 1988. Several of my confreres will, perhaps, hit the roof when they become aware of this interview. It does not

matter. I am free to state my judgment, and I never liked yes men.

Why would the consecrations not be reasonable today? Because many Roman officials have changed and now acknowledge the very difficult situation in which the Church finds herself. Cardinal Castrillon’s Mass of May 24, 2003 is not burning straw. This is the fruit of a long evolution which began, it seems, around 1992, with the publication of a series of books of Cardinal Ratzinger and a series of conferences, homilies, and an interview with Cardinal Stickler. At St. Mary-Major, Cardinal Castrillon spoke for the Church by recalling the “right of citizenship” of the Mass of St. Pius V.

Pope John Paul II’s encyclical *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* vivit is also very important. Additionally, I think that there is a danger in seeing this conflict last for ages. The Church is a visible and hierarchical society. If one lives too long in an autarchy, one ends up losing the meaning of what a hierarchy is. We are thus in danger, the time passing and the opposition remaining, of forgetting Rome and organizing ourselves more and more outside of Rome. This needs to be acknowledged.

This is why we must always remain in contact with Rome, not only for them to progress in the right direction, but unceasingly to remind ourselves of their good memory. We are of the flock. If we remain satisfied with our situation, then there is a danger of “psychological schism.” The young people are of my opinion. I call it as it is. The SSPX leadership thinks I exaggerate, but our younger generations have never known a normal ecclesiastical situation. Thus I have accepted “this Canadian exile” for my ideas.

Q. Why do you believe that the reconciliation of Bishop Rifan and his priests is a positive step not only for the traditionalists of Campos, but for every traditional Catholic?

A. One reason is the danger of schism which I just expressed. Secondly, my friendship with these heroic priests has led me to experience their traditional parishes and their numerous works. I have especially seen even here the problem of the Mass. The attitude of Rome is new. Rome gave the Mass to our friends, the priests of Campos. And this freely and without condition. Rome recognizes their right, their *facultas* to celebrate the Traditional Mass in all the churches of their apostolic administration. I studied their statutes at length. So, for me, these things are going in the right direction in favor of the Mass.

The Campos agreement did not require the compromises made by the *Ecclesia Dei* institutes in 1988. Campos received a frank recognition of the right to the Tridentine Mass without having to recognize that the new Mass is "legitimate and orthodox." They were simply asked to recognize the validity of the new Mass. Archbishop Lefebvre always recognized and

A. Yes and greatly so. This encyclical is truly a positive sign on the doctrinal and liturgical level. One sees here an authority that is newly aware of the drama which affects the Church and her liturgy. The liturgical reform, such as it was conceived and applied after the Council, has denatured the liturgy by not respecting its end. The liturgy is essentially worship rendered to God. The priest offers, in the name of the people, "for the living and the dead," for the people who are united to this action, the sacrifice of Christ which renders to God "all honour and all glory."

The Catholic liturgy has a transcendent dimension. It orients us toward God. It subjects us to God. There is a similarity between the Roman liturgy and the heavenly liturgy. Read the *Book of the Apocalypse* of St. John and you will see that heavenly worship is directed toward the Father and the Lamb of God, the paschal Lamb to whom the angels and the elect sing and magnify the power, the divinity, the glory, the sanctity of God. The Sanctus

the sense of what is possible. To ask too much is to ask for nothing. The Holy Father has spoken. We must help and participate in the liturgical restoration in the Church.

Diversity Of Rites

Q. At the time of the Mass of May 24, 2003, Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos said during his homily: "The old Roman rite thus conserves in the Church its right of citizenship in the heart of the multiformity of Catholic rites whether Latin or Eastern. What unites this diversity of rites is the same faith in the eucharistic mystery, thus its profession has always assured the unity of the holy, catholic, and apostolic Church." Do you believe that this affirmation is correct or not?

A. Yes, I have greatly appreciated the words of Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos on May 24, 2003. They were not pronounced lightly. They were weighed by the cardinal. He knew their

"We are thus in danger, the time passing and the opposition remaining, of forgetting Rome and organizing ourselves more and more outside of Rome."

Fr Paul Aulangier

taught that the new Mass was valid. There is a great difference between "validity," "legitimacy," and "orthodoxy." Something can be valid without being legitimate and orthodox.

Q. Many priests of your Society, including Bishop Fellay, have praised the new encyclical of the Holy Father *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*. Do you consider the new encyclical to be a positive sign on the doctrinal and liturgical level?

of our Mass is a divine praise. All this is, for many, lost, so much so.

The Catholic hierarchy is finally aware of it. It is never too late in order to do good. It wants to correct the "shadows." How can one not rejoice at this? This is yet another reason why I favour our superiors legalizing our situation in the Church. It is necessary today to be inside with a recognized right of the Mass of St. Pius V on the altars of Christianity. One must have

importance, their repercussions in the Church, their effects and consequences. He paid attention, believe me, to what he was saying. He recognized the right of the Tridentine Mass in the Church. He stated the law for good: The Mass of St. Pius V has never been abolished canonically by any authority in the Church, and certainly not by Pope Paul VI. This was, in 1986, the answer given by the Commission of Cardinals appointed by John Paul II.



Fr. Aulagnier meets with Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos and Bishop Rifan

This commission, at the time, stated the law. This did not please the modernist wavelength. One had, out of weakness, hushed up the affair. It was necessary to wait until 1995 for an ecclesiastical authority, Cardinal Stickler, to dare reveal the thing and state the law publicly: “The Mass has not been abolished.”

Today, everyone says this. All the cardinals who thought over the question are saying this. Cardinal Medina says this, after having said quite the opposite in 1999. Cardinal Arinze as well. He is the prefect of the Congregation of Divine Worship. He is the authority on this subject. As for Cardinal Stickler, he is a canonist whose authority is recognized. Cardinal Ratzinger, who is the workhorse of liturgical restoration in the Church, says it in all his recent books. He also assisted Pope John Paul II in the editing of the Holy Father’s latest encyclical we have mentioned. This new honesty is extraordinary. Almost 40 years have gone by where everyone said quite the contrary.

Additionally, the return of the Mass of St. Pius V will not be done in one day. It takes its time, little by little. Regarding liturgical plurality on which Cardinal Castrillon is rooted, I am, of course, in favor to the degree where the “reform of the reform” will allow the rite of the parishes to come closer, little by little, to the Traditional rite. In herself, the Church has always respected liturgical diversity. Take note of the attitude of

Pope St. Pius V! Here, there was a matter of a rite which will re-traditionalize. The only condition required is that the rite in question expresses the Catholic faith.

Apostolic Administration

Q. In the context of these positive stages, is a reconciliation of the SSPX with Rome possible in the near future?

A. One Mass does not establish a custom. Thus I will speak about restoration of normal relations between Catholics of goodwill. This restoration is more than desirable. It is necessary. In a month? In three years? I do not know. Yet the more that time passes, the more the restoration becomes urgent. But again, minds must be prepared.

Q. Do you think that the recent transfer of Bishop Williamson to Latin America has a link with the eventual reconciliation of the SSPX and Rome?

A. I believe it was simply routine. One should not imagine conflicts or hidden reasons where none exist. Granted, Bishop Williamson is one of the most firm opponents to a reconciliation with Rome. But that has nothing to do with his transfer to Argentina. He will likely remain opposed in La Reja. He is suspicious in nature. And suspicion leads to error. He thinks that “the Romans,” as he likes to say, have not changed. It is his opinion. This opinion is dominant with Bishop Fellay today, but will it be tomorrow?

Q. Considering your friendship and close proximity with Archbishop Lefebvre, do you think that he would have accepted the offer of reconciliation that Rome had recently presented to the SSPX in the line of the accords of Campos?

A. I sincerely believe that today Archbishop Lefebvre would have

accepted an accord with Rome. He would have been, perhaps, more cautious and demanding on certain points than Bishop Rangel, but the archbishop would have gone to the end this time. The requirements Rome demanded of the Campos traditionalists are these: the recognition of Pope John Paul II as the legitimate Successor of Peter, the recognition of the Second Vatican Council interpreted in the light of Tradition, the recognition of the validity of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, and a free discussion of the Council that avoided dialectic and polemic. Archbishop Lefebvre had already accepted this in 1988. One should not be afraid to say this, and I wish someone would tell me why they should not be accepted today.

With regard to the obligation of the Campos priests to study the Council, I would like someone to show me the harmfulness of such a thing. One can reasonably criticize what one knows. How did the SSPX have symposiums, form its position except by studying the Council? Our position is certainly not that of the Roman hierarchy. Thus today a free discussion of the Council is indispensable. Yesterday, it was impossible. And for this, it is very important to know the Council. It is amusing that, with us, there are taboos. One needs to set these aside. Archbishop Lefebvre would have asked some precise questions concerning the Council.

Additionally, through an apostolic administration, we would have better protection today than in 1988. A personal apostolic administration would change nothing of what we do and of what we are. It is the ideal situation. It would basically espouse the reality that we live and that we are familiar with. It is organizational pragmatism that would establish “legally” in the eyes of all what we do, which is fundamentally legal and legitimate.



The Vatican's new realism about Islam

By Robert Spencer

The semi-official Jesuit magazine *La Civiltà Cattolica* has done nothing less than shock the world by publishing a scathing criticism of the mistreatment that Christians suffer in Islamic societies.

Why so shocking? It's a sharp break with Pope John Paul II's long-standing policy toward Islam, which some have characterized as "dialogue to the point of extremism." Nothing is published in *La Civiltà Cattolica* without the approval of the Vatican Secretary of State - so this blistering article presumably corresponds to the views of some very high placed Vatican officials, if not the ailing Pope himself.

The *Civiltà Cattolica* piece represents the first indication that any Catholic Church officials recognize the dimensions of the religious conflict that jihadists are waging against Christians and others around the world. Up to now the signals have all been in the other direction: the Pope has been such a relentless proponent of dialogue with Islam that Rome's criticism of the persecution of Christians in Muslim countries has been muted. And in a paroxysm of enthusiasm for peace and brotherhood, he actually kissed the Koran on May 14, 1999, during an audience with several Muslim officials from Iraq and the late Chaldean Catholic Patriarch, Raphael I Bidawid.

Aghast attendees preserved the moment in pictures, which now can be found on numerous websites.

The Koran kiss

Certainly the Pope's Koran kiss was a moment that would have appalled the saints and martyrs who encountered in Islam a relentless and implacable enemy over many centuries of the

Church's life. But perhaps those great souls were mollified by this new *Civiltà Cattolica* article, which is just the opposite of naïve and appeasement-minded irenicism. The article brushes aside decades of misleading historical revisionism about the Muslim conquests, daring to point out that "in all the places where Islam imposed itself by military force, which has few historical parallels for its rapidity and breadth, Christianity, which had been extraordinarily vigorous and rooted for centuries, practically disappeared or was reduced to tiny islands in an endless Islamic sea."

Civiltà Cattolica also counters the dozens of misleadingly incomplete analyses of jihad that Muslim advocacy groups have used to befuddle the public over the last few years. Jihad, it points out, "has two meanings, both of which are equally essential and must not be dissociated, as if one could exist without the other. In its primary meaning, jihad indicates the 'effort' that the Muslim must undertake to be faithful to the precepts of the Koran and so improve his 'submission' (islam) to Allah; in the second, it indicates the 'effort' that the Muslim must undertake to 'fight in the way of Allah,' which means fighting against the infidels and spreading Islam throughout the world. Jihad is a precept of the highest importance, so much so that it is sometimes counted among the fundamental precepts of Islam, as its sixth 'pillar.'" The only meaning of jihad you will get from American Muslim spokesmen is the first. Is there some reason why they don't want you

to know that radicals are acting on the second all over the world today?

632AD

Contrary to another prevailing myth, that Christian-Muslim enmity began with the Christian Crusades, the article states: "All of Islamic history is dominated by the idea of the conquest of the Christian lands of Western Europe and of the Eastern Roman Empire, whose capital was Constantinople."

Warfare was initiated by the Muslim armies that swept into Syria and other Christian areas of the Middle East within just a few years of the death of Muhammad in 632. The first Crusade wasn't called until 1095.

"In reality," says *Civiltà Cattolica*, "for almost a thousand years Europe was under constant threat from Islam, which twice put its survival in serious danger." Now, in its radical, terrorist form, it is doing so again - but up until now no one at the Vatican, and precious few elsewhere, have taken much notice.

The article also speaks forthrightly about the traditional Islamic doctrines that radical Muslims exploit in order to subjugate non-Muslims. Hindus, Buddhists, and others, classified as "idolaters" because they are not listed as "People of the Book" (that is, people with a revealed scripture) in the Koran, are given a harsh choice: "convert to Islam, or be killed." Jews, Christians, and other "People of the Book," however, have a third choice: "Muslims must 'fight them until their members pay tribute, one by one, humiliated' (Koran, Sura 9:29)."

This is the foundation of 'dhimmitude', the inferior status that traditional Islamic law mandates for Christians and Jews in Islamic society, ensuring that they feel themselves "humiliated" in myriad ways.

What about Islamic tolerance? Another myth. "According to Muslim law," *Civiltà Cattolica* notes correctly (and courageously), "Christians, Jews, and the followers of other religions assimilated to Christianity and Judaism (the 'Sabeans') who live in a Muslim state belong to an inferior social order, in spite of their eventually belonging to the same race, language, and descent. . . . The 'people of the Book' (Ahl al-Kitab) becomes the 'protected people' (Ahl al-dhimma). In exchange for this 'protection,' the 'people of the Book' must pay a tax (jizya) to the Islamic state." Dhimmis could avoid this tax by converting to Islam, but often that way was blocked as well: "Muslims, especially in the early centuries, did not look favorably upon such conversions, because they represented a grave loss to the treasury, which flourished in direct proportion to the number of the 'dhimmi', who paid both the personal tax and the land tax."

The dhimmitude

The tax was accompanied by numerous humiliating regulations. "As for the freedom of worship, the 'dhimmi' are prohibited only from external manifestations of worship, such as the ringing of bells, processions with the cross, solemn funerals, and the public sale of religious objects or other articles prohibited for Muslims. . . . The 'dhimmi' may maintain or repair the churches or synagogues they already have, but, unless there is a treaty permitting them to own land, they may not build new places of worship, because to do this they would need to occupy Muslim land, which can never be ceded to anyone, having become, through Muslim conquest, land 'sacred' to Allah."

And if a 'dhimmi' rejected this "protection"? "According to the gravity of each case, the penalty could be the confiscation of goods, reduction to slavery, or death - unless the person who had committed the crimes converted to Islam. In that case, all penalties were waived." How tolerant.

Although the laws of dhimmitude are not in force today except where the Sharia is the law of the land, *Civiltà Cattolica* correctly notes that they remain as cultural hangovers, making for discrimination, harassment, and sometimes even persecution of Christians even in ostensibly secular or semi-secular lands such as Egypt,

Western countries: Europe, the United States, Canada, and Australia." The article also details the sufferings, and sometimes the cold-blooded murder, of Christians today in Pakistan, Sudan, and elsewhere - by Muslims who saw their actions as just by virtue of the complex of 'dhimmi' laws.

One of the most disheartening aspects of the post-9/11 world has been the general unwillingness to acknowledge the true nature of the conflict. Donald Rumsfeld just drew flack when he recently remarked: "We are in a war of ideas, as well as a global war on terror." But radical Muslims are waging a war of ideas, on behalf of their

“All of Islamic history is dominated by the idea of the conquest of the Christian lands of Western Europe and of the Eastern Roman Empire, whose capital was Constantinople.”

Pakistan, and Syria. Moreover, the institutionalized oppression and inequality of dhimmitude, as I explain in my book *Onward Muslim Soldiers*, is still part of the Sharia that radical Muslims are trying to impose everywhere. "Radical Islam," says *Civiltà Cattolica*, "which proposes that shari'a law be instituted in every Islamic state, is gaining ground in many Muslim countries, in which groups of Christians are also present. It is evident that the institution of shari'a would render the lives of Christians rather difficult, and their very existence would be constantly in danger. This is the cause of the mass emigration of Christians from Islamic countries to

vision of a society constituted according to Islamic law. If the West is unable to counter this vision successfully with ideas of its own, no amount of daisy cutters and high-tech weaponry will be able to forestall its ultimate defeat. A key first step to fighting and winning a war of ideas is having the courage to point out the deficiencies of the competing ideas. Clearly someone at the Vatican has gone from kissing the Koran to reading it, and has at last taken this step.

(*Robert Spencer is the director of Jihad Watch and the author of *Onward Muslim Soldiers* and *Islam Unveiled*.)



Dame Felicitas Corrigan OSB

Dame Felicitas Corrigan, a Benedictine nun who died on Tuesday 7 October last, aged 95, was a spiritual mentor to the poet Siegfried Sassoon and the actor Alec Guinness: Sassoon declared that she was the only person truly to understand his verse; Guinness wrote 800 letters confiding his family troubles to her.

She proffered them spiritual guidance from her cell at Stanbrook Abbey, the enclosed Benedictine convent in the Malvern Hills. She had entered the community in 1933, taking the community's traditional title of Dame and the religious name Felicitas because her birthday fell on the feast of SS Felicity and Perpetua.

Although the community is home to England's oldest private printing press, founded in 1876, it achieved national literary prominence only when Dame Felicitas wrote *In a Great Tradition*, her stimulating account of the friendship of the former abbess, Dame Laurentia MacLachlan, the playwright George Bernard Shaw and the printer Sydney Cockerell.

Cockerell met Dame Laurentia in 1907 when he called to discuss improving the quality of the printing press. He introduced her to Shaw, and thus initiated an unusual and at times difficult friendship between "Sister" Laurentia and "Brother Bernard".

Best of friends

The book was such a success that it later became a stage play, *The Best of Friends*, and was turned into a film, starring Sir John Gielgud. In 1986, Dame Felicitas wrote a more detailed account of the friendship in *The Nun, the Infidel and the Superman* (1986), which included some recently discovered letters from Shaw.

Among her many other friends were Rumer Godden, whose novel *In this House of Brede* was set in a convent

based upon Stanbrook, and a group of Japanese who came to Stanbrook annually to hear Dame Felicitas play the organ.

They had read her biography of Helen Waddell, the Presbyterian poet who grew up in Japan and wrote Japanese verse; in the course of writing the book Dame Felicitas had taught herself to write the Panka, a form of Japanese verse.

She was born Kathleen Corrigan at Everton, Liverpool, on March 6 1908, one of the eight surviving children of an Irish taxi driver. Aged four, she had decided to become a nun, but delayed entering the Poor Clares at 17 to help to pay for the education of her younger siblings and to take a degree in English at Liverpool University.

Young Kathleen first visited Stanbrook to do a course on Gregorian Chant. After being left alone for three days, she had decided to abandon all idea of a vocation, and to buy some cigarettes and the *News of the World*; then Dame Laurentia, the abbess, called her in and persuaded her to stay.

Dame Felicitas's first book, *Any Saint to Any Nun*, a collection of letters written by saints to nuns, ranging from 375 AD to the 19th century, was published in 1946. Thirteen years later, she met the poet Siegfried Sassoon, who allowed her to select 24 poems which charted his religious journey towards Catholicism in *A Path to Peace*. He was so satisfied with the result, which was printed with customary elegance at Stanbrook, that he declared he wished all his work to

be published there and made the nuns a recording in which he read his poems.

Shared loss

The following year Cockerell introduced Dame Felicitas to Alec Guinness, with whom she maintained a 40-year correspondence. Guinness wrote the foreword to *George Thomas of Soho*, her book about a poet with muscular dystrophy. Together, the actor and the nun would lament the death of the Latin liturgy in the Church.

Just before the Vatican Council opened in 1963, she produced *The English Hymnale*, a collection of Latin hymns used in pre-Reformation England. But since publication would involve a lengthy wait for Vatican approval, she brought it out minus a title page, so that technically it did not count as a book.

Ironically, although she loathed the change to an English liturgy, and believed that women could not compose, Dame Felicitas was considered to have written one of the finest English settings for Compline in English.

Her study of Sassoon, *Poet's Pilgrimage* (1973), largely focused on his late conversion to Catholicism, and earned a glowing review from Dennis Silk, the Warden of Radley, in *The Sunday Telegraph*; but it was strongly criticised in some other publications for ignoring the ambiguities surrounding Sassoon's sex life.

In 1976, her biography of Helen Waddell, whose translations of medieval Latin verse Dame Felicitas had earlier edited in *More Latin Lyrics*, attracted

continued page 23

Fraternity of St Peter to set up an Australian House of Formation

In March 2004 the Southern Cross Region of the Priestly Fraternity of St Peter will take its first steps toward establishing a regional seminary.

This will take the form of a new House of Formation in which to conduct a preparatory year or year of spirituality. The Church recommends such a year in which candidates develop their spirituality according the particular charism of the community they propose to join – in this case, the Priestly Fraternity of St Peter.

The Church views this year as one in which candidates prayerfully consider the Fraternity as the community in which to realise a potential priestly vocation, while the Church through the Fraternity prayerfully considers whether the candidates do have such a calling. It is a year of grace and discernment. At the conclusion of this year of spirituality, the Fraternity and the candidates make a decision about whether they are being called by God to incorporate into the Fraternity. They are then vested in the cassock, and commence priestly training. The next stage of formation is the two years of philosophical formation. The General-Council of the Fraternity will consider whether to establish this stage within Australia during the course of the first year of spirituality.

The Fraternity of St Peter currently has two international seminaries. The Seminary of St Peter in Wigratzbad, Germany and Our Lady of Guadalupe Seminary in Nebraska, USA. Wigratzbad began very soon after the founding of the Fraternity in 1988. Our Lady of Guadalupe Seminary followed in 1993, at first beginning, as we are, with the year of spirituality. As the Fraternity of St Peter expanded outside of Europe

and America, the Superior-General has seen the need for some local formation to commence in these new regions.

The Fraternity in Australia is also taking advantage of an idea, used with great success, of candidates visiting and working in Fraternity houses for a year even before entering the year of spirituality. The understanding of the work of the Fraternity is heightened, together with the sense of brotherhood among members. Some young men have already taken advantage of this programme.

The inaugural vocations retreat for the Southern Cross Region was held at Carcoar, NSW from December 5-7th. Nine young men attended to hear talks, in a prayerful atmosphere, on the nature of vocation, and the different types of vocations, especially that of a Clerical Society of Apostolic Life of Pontifical Right, using the Classical Roman Rite, and, importantly, within the context of the new evangelization called for by Pope John Paul II.

The Fraternity is fortunate to have access to fine academic programs within Australia delivered by the Centre for Thomistic Studies in Sydney and the John Paul II Institute in Melbourne. Because of these, we will not be under the necessity of developing an entire in-house philosophical and theological system of studies as we have had to do overseas.

The Fraternity is still deciding on a place to commence the house of formation. We have been blessed with some generous offers, which will certainly allow us to begin our programme next year. We are still hoping for a fitting place for the long term to prepare the Fraternity's 'men of the Church.' The initial year of formation will be attached to the Fraternity's Regional House in

Girraween, NSW. We ask for your prayers and support that this work will assist Christ to send more labourers into the work of his harvest.

Fr Laurence Gresser FSSP
Regional Superior
Fraternity of St Peter – Southern Cross Region
(02) 9688-4287
southerncross@fssp.net

Donations:

FSSP Australia
PO Box 46,
Pendle Hill, NSW, 2145

continued from page 3

The American prelate made reference in his preface to a forthcoming Vatican document on liturgical norms, which is expected to appear sometime late this year or early in 2004. (A draft version of the document, which sets out clear norms for the proper celebration of the Eucharistic liturgy, was rejected by the Roma Curia, apparently because it was judged too strict; a corrected draft is expected soon.) Cardinal George said that the new norms should help to foster greater devotion to the Eucharist. He expressed the hope that "we are at the dawn of a truly fruitful renewal for the liturgy of the Catholic Church."

In his preface, Cardinal George indicates his support for those Catholics who are attached to the traditional liturgy. He also appeals to the Catholics who have become separated from the Holy See since the Lefebvre schism of 1988. Relations between the different branches of the traditionalist movement are generally more cordial in the U.S. than in Europe, where tensions are more pronounced.

Devotion does not a Catholic prove

In his report to the October congress of the International Una Voce Federation retiring President, Michael Davies, reported on recent discussions with Cardinal Arinze, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship.

"In July Mr. Davies, and Dr. Turrini Vita, President of Una Voce Italy, had a long meeting with Cardinal Arinze ... He was very friendly and listened to all that was said with great attention. He is under the impression that if the norms that he intends issuing before the end of the year result in the new Mass being celebrated without abuses, then opposition to it would cease, and so would the demand for the 1962 Missal. It was made clear to him that this was not the case, and that with or without abuses the 1970 Missal is unacceptable to members of the Federation."

These dry lines set out with wonderful economy why the movement to restore the classical liturgy of the Western Church will not go away.

Cardinal Arinze is an orthodox prelate, a good and witty man. He has been working on a disciplinary document on the celebration of the new Mass and had this to say about it:

"You might sum up the words of our document with words that echo the final words of the Mass: the do-it-yourself Mass is ended. Go in peace"

Many of us have savoured this. There is no doubt about it, Cardinal Arinze has done something we should emulate. The best way of dealing with that theatre of the absurd which Catholic life has become is to mock its practitioners off the stage.

It would be a mistake to imagine, however, that the traditional Mass movement is a response to the abuses of the new Mass. We have all heard, of course, people lament, "Oh, if only they would say the new Mass devoutly, I'd be more than happy." And there are many who belong to traditional mass communities who, in the first instance, were drawn to them to escape disorder and iconoclasm in the typical Catholic parish. For those, however, that stay in traditional Mass communities, the issue is not devotion. The issues are the symbolic content of the liturgies in question and the revolutionary nature of the very idea of a "new" Mass.

Devout deceits

Devotion is apt to deceive. The Protestant preacher thumping his pulpit is a devout man. The Anglican divine toiling with Book of Common Prayer and communion table is a devout man. So too, in their ways, are the Buddhist bonze and the animist shaman. But, from the Catholic perspective, their devotion "doesn't signify". Their devotion is not a warrant for the truth, goodness, or efficacy of what they represent or claim to do. Yet their devotion has a sincerity and attractiveness. No doubt they help to explain why quite a few Catholics have turned their backs on the rigid, anti-devout style of the modern Catholic parish and resorted to preacher, divine, bonze or shaman.

Much the same can be said of Catholic priests. Among them are men incapable of devotion but who are the acme of truth and goodness. There are others for whom devotion is an instinct while they themselves are frauds. So far as the Catholic authenticity of their persons and works are concerned, their being devout is neither here nor there.

True devotion, in the Catholic sense, is not easily to be had. It is a formidable thing and it strikes one like a great light when recognised. It is also a delicate balance of elements, two of them essential: *orthodoxy* in belief and teaching and *orthopraxy* in action and style.

The problem for the traditional Catholic with the new liturgy is not that it, or its celebrants, are undevout. The problem is that it is heteropractic and (perhaps unintentionally) heterodox in its symbolic content.

Consider first its heteropraxy. The idea of designing a new liturgy and imposing it under pain of sin (*disobedience*) is a revolution. The people who devised this liturgy, and enforced it, could not have done so had not their minds been informed by the intellectual influences of the Reformation and Enlightenment more deeply than they (or we) could possibly have imagined.

A Catholic who sets out to create a new Catholic thing is either a fool or a knave. This is not to claim that "new" ways of being Catholic have not arisen throughout history. They have. But when they have, and they have survived, they have been found not to have been the work of human genius. They turn out to have been a gift given through the hands of someone able to receive and respect a thing not of his own making: a saint, in short. Even these "new" ways, however, have invariably been refinements and developments of existing modes of life, and their relevant principles, taken to a higher and usually more demanding level. Where no specific saint-founder is concerned, the development of the "new" takes place as an accumulation of practices - of established principles and themes imitated, embellished, and re-articulated

with constant reference to normative forms and criteria of judgment.

Enlightened prelates

To create something “new”, in the modern sense of making a break with the past, requires there to have been a Reformation and an Enlightenment, and for men subsequently to have been shaped under the impress of their defining ideas. The chief of these is that of revolution: of revolution chiefly in religion and culture. A new Mass and liturgical calendar – complete with echoes of October 1793 (Year I, II, III) – could hardly have been conceived without it. More importantly, no one could have been found to carry forward the project had not a generation of Church leaders been formed for whom the Reformation and Enlightenment had become their cultural compass.

In arguing that the new Mass is a revolution is not to claim that the new represents a complete disconnection from the past. The new, even in the modern sense, rarely does. Texts survive wholly (or almost wholly) or in part. Certain actions and symbols remain, even if simplified to the point of *naïveté*. Feasts and fasts remain, even if their realization is usually trivial. To claim, however, that the significantly named *Novus Ordo Missae* is an “authentic development” of the former liturgy is like claiming that a meeting house made of beams and glass and stone torn from the ruins of a cathedral constitute a genuine development in architectural form.

The last line of defence for the “New Order” is for its proponents to “fess up” to the revolution and justify it on the grounds that the Church has been obliged to “baptise” the Reformation and Enlightenment because they dominate modern culture just as, it is alleged, the Fathers had to do when Graeco-Roman culture and paganism

dominated the world into which the Church was born. It is a powerful-seeming argument, but for one thing: to “baptise” the world created by the Reformation and Enlightenment means rejecting Catholic history and that, in turn, involves denying core Catholic beliefs which that history communicates to subsequent generations. Ultimately, it means rejecting God Himself. Against such a fall the symbolic content of the new Mass cannot stay us.

To address such problems something more than rubrical discipline and greater devotion will be needed. Indeed to believe that these things have any central relevance to dealing with the pathologies in view requires an error of judgment categorical in nature. Greater discipline and more devotion will compound rather than address the crisis in worship and faith. For if discipline and devotion are called for, then we must be talking about true devotion and true discipline,

The symbolism in which the
new Mass has been cast is at
odds with the meanings which
orthodoxy attributes to it

So to our second consideration. Conservative defenders of the new worship regime point to the tireless teaching of the post-conciliar pontiffs about the Sacrifice of the Mass, the character of the priesthood, and the Real Presence. Nothing, they say, could make it clearer what the Mass means. Agreed. Nothing could make it clearer ... except for this: the symbolism in which the new Mass has been cast is at odds with the meanings which orthodoxy attributes to it – or, where the conflict is not patent, banality empties the liturgy of its defining significance. This explains, in part, why in the First World (with the exception of the USA) Catholic communities have been ravaged and why, among those who continue to practice (and here the USA is not exempt) diffidence, ambivalence, and even hostility, widely characterize attitudes to pivotal doctrines relating to the role of the priest, to the sacrifice of the altar, and to the Real Presence.

and these are necessarily orthopractic. But how can we orthopractically make use of heterodox symbols? While the logical contradiction involved will not prevent people from trying to reconcile the impossible, the psychological and spiritual damage done in the attempt will be, as it has been already, enormous.

Rome is confronted, therefore, with a problem the existence of which it still steadfastly denies. The liturgical policies it has implemented since the Second Vatican Council have set up at conflict within the Church, and within the very souls of almost every Western Catholic. It is a conflict that cannot be resolved except by rejecting the tension itself either by apostasy or by restoring the traditional body of liturgical texts and symbolism.

Cardinal Arinze’s heart is in the right place, but his thought has yet to follow.

- Editor



Our Lady of Clear Creek

Over the years *Oriens* has watched with admiration and hope the foundation at Clear Creek, Oklahoma, of a new daughter house belonging to the Benedictine community of Fontgombault in France. An Australian traveler, **Alison Hope**, recently visited Clear Creek and gave us her impressions.

Each pair enters separately, hooded monk followed by black-robed server, walking with quick, intent steps, withdrawn hush or deliberate pace. Nine altars stand about the sanctuary and choir, each occupied by a priest who proceeds to set up shop with familiar deliberation – the chalice here, the paten there – swift, economical movements. Then the church is full of movement, like the disturbed fluttering of bats against a dark roof, caught only as a kaleidoscope of sharp movements in the corner of the eye.

I watch the Mass unfolding at the altar before me; I kneel, pray, sit in the dim morning light, conscious of a sea of motion and the sounds of rustling. At the *Non sum dignus*, the deliberate pounding of chest after chest has a mesmerising quality. The liturgy has been referred to as a dance, but it is only here, in a room of duos performing the same movements in their own time, that you see the full expression of the dance. The effect is more a falling silent than appreciation. Slowly each world passes. The hoods are raised and in swift soft steps, one after another, they leave the room, anonymous in their cloth and shaven heads. Silence descends, like the silence at the end of a rainstorm.

To fly from Kansas to Oklahoma is to leave behind a chessboard of farms for a rich untended green, wound through with rivers and coves.

Those to whom I mention this impression say that it doesn't sound much like Oklahoma, the dustbowl of the thirties; but I didn't see any dust. Into Oklahoma from the east runs a range of mountains called the Ozarks; and murmuring through the west edge of the Ozarks is Clear Creek, a shallow stream winding past a few houses and a monastery which takes its name from the creek, the Benedictine Monastery of Our Lady of Clear Creek.

The monastery surprised me twice: first, the Brittany beauty of its setting; and second, the bare functionality of its buildings. For a church, the monks of Clear Creek endure a steel rectangle, like a large 1970s garage, within which they must steam each summer. The monks have given its interior every affordable splendour, from velvet-curtained confessionals to French candlesticks, but not even the kind medieval face of Our Lady, whose statue gazes patiently over the congregation from an alcove in the right wall, can entirely dispel the ghosts of cobweb and tractors. By the church stands a second shed, recently barred from the public eye by a fence marking the enclosure. One monk, marvelling at the new sense of privacy, remarked that he didn't know why they had not earlier rolled this stone across the entrance.

Log cabin pioneers

Within the enclosure, a driveway curves away toward a grand log cabin, presently housing the refectory and sleeping quarters. The enclosure grounds hold a smattering of wooden huts, from which male visitors periodically emerge to cluster by the sheepfield for an evening conversation or to move churchwards. Twice a year, on the feasts of *Corpus Christi* and the Rogation Days, the enclosure gate is opened to allow women through as part of the procession – in honour of Our Lady, one monk remarked to me. Marian feasts run close to the heart of Clear Creek Monastery, whose formal title is Our Lady of the Annunciation of Clear Creek Priory and whose motherhouse is the Abbey of Our Lady of the Assumption of Fontgombault, near Poitiers in France.

It was always with a shade of envy that I watched male visitors troop off to meals with the monks. It is one of the lots of women never to share the experience of dining as part of a monastic community, for the enclosed female orders keep their enclosure not only against males but against any external intrusion. However, the guesthouse set aside for female visitors and families is consolingly comfortable. A two-storey cabin formed of heavy logs and sitting at the base of a dappled Ozark hill, it used to be the caretaker's home in the days before the monks arrived in 1999, when



Sketch model of the church and monastery planned for the Benedictine foundation at Clear Creek, Oklahoma.

Clear Creek Monastery was a ranch. Like many old houses in country US, the guesthouse has a two-seater swing suspended from the verandah roof. Of all the technology I encountered in America, this was my favourite. No backyard swing or rocking chair has the grace or the 1950s innocence of the two-seater suspended swing.

At night, if you happen (like me) to be a city girl staying at the guesthouse on your own, the Ozarks can seem a little close for comfort. Locals assured me that there are no bears in Oklahoma but, as I lay listening to whatever those animals are that snuffle in the woods outside, I was struck for the first time by the fragility of flyscreens.

Sobered and watchful

In the guesthouse garden is a caravan used to hold overflow when the guesthouse is full. There, the night world seems even closer. From the bed, you can watch the stars glimmer and shift in that northern sky and you may be woken in the early hours, as I

was, by the peculiarly eerie sound of a coyote howling in the woods. The dogs guarding the sheep bark sharply in reply and, plunged suddenly into consciousness of the drama lived out each night in the sheepfield opposite, I am reminded of the Compline psalm: *be sober and watchful, for your adversary, the devil, circles like a raging lion, seeking whom he may devour*. The monks were warned, I was told, not to try keeping sheep in these woods; but with the sheep they brought sheep dogs and so far they have lost no sheep, though some mornings the dogs show in blood the costs of their defence.

In the morning, the dew on the grass and the bounding exultation of lambs in the field opposite defy the eerie dramas of the night. Beneath the sunshine and the distant call of the monastery bell, Clear Creek breathes serenity. The monastery bell, rung twice before each office, is a call to liturgical prayer, the Benedictine *raison d'être*. The monks chant Matins and Compline privately but the remaining Hours of the Divine Office are open to all visitors. Lauds

(at around 6.15am) is followed by a silent cascade of low Masses. Low Mass at Clear Creek, even more than the conventual or high Mass at 10am, is worth experiencing – your own parish may be able to present a superb high Mass but you are unlikely to witness there nine low Masses unfolding simultaneously. Like Vespers at 5 pm, high Mass is offered with full ceremony every day. A semicircle of five or six choir monks ebbs and flows between the stalls and the centre of the choir to chant the propers. On Sundays after Mass, the congregation mingles outside the church with the Guestmaster and Prior, soaking in sun and conversation or pottering through the monastery shop.

However, this scene will not last beyond another year or two, for the foundations to a permanent church have been laid further down the road. In May this year, the bridge to the new church was finished – a miniature *Pont du Gard* paved with native stone, arching twice over a tributary of Clear Creek to the site where the future monastery is, as one monk put it, shooting up like a 13 year old.

Just as flat shadows on the ground reflect nothing of the complex integrity of a person, these sketches portray nothing of the reality of life in a monastery. They may even be so far from the truth as to be illusions, like my aerial impressions of a lush forested Oklahoma. They are, nonetheless, what a stranger's eyes saw - the response not only of a laywoman to a house of Benedictine monks but also of an Australian to the unexpected cloister of the Ozark forests amidst the comfortable burger joints of mid-West America.

O

Thomism without caricatures

After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism; by Fergus Kerr
OP; Blackwell, Oxford, 2002.

Reviewed by Dr Tracey Rowland

Fergus Kerr is Regent of Blackfriars Hall (Oxford) and Senior Lecturer in Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Edinburgh. He is also one of that rare breed of British academics who has studied in Europe and is at home with the Continental mind. As the title of the book indicates, there is no one single version of Thomist thought, but many different and competing interpretations.

The author begins his account of the various versions with reference to late nineteenth century “Leonine” Thomism, so named after Pope Leo XIII who endorsed the study of Thomism in *Aeterni Patris* (1879). Kerr cites the criticism of Alasdair MacIntyre that the effect of the Leonine revival was a distortion of classical Thomism by its being presented as an answer to the problems of Cartesianism. MacIntyre’s point is that it is anachronistic to read into Aquinas answers to problems only raised by or after Descartes, and that the effect of “epistemologising Thomism” was that it proceeded to re-enact the disagreements of post-Cartesian philosophy. Whatever the justice of this criticism, Kerr concludes that the “standard outsider’s view of Thomas today owes everything to Leonine Thomism: at worst arid Aristotelianism, at best a combination of natural theology and natural law ethics which satisfies some and repels others”. Against such a background, Kerr declares his intention to destabilise the common caricatures of Thomism which are the cause of so much scholarly ridicule.

Caricature I God is a Substance

One of the first caricatures with which Kerr deals is that of St Thomas’s notion of substance. Here he argues that the classical Thomist idea of substance has been occluded by reading later and certainly alien (for example, Lockean) interpretations of substance into Thomas’s language. Far from having a substantialist ontology of self enclosed monadic objects, Kerr argues that Thomas’s cosmological picture is of a constantly reassembling network of transactions, beings becoming themselves in their doings. In the language of contemporary theological anthropology, “to be” is to be a “substance-in-relation”. Such a reading, favoured by the American scholars William Norris Clarke and David Schindler, and Cardinals Ratzinger and Kasper, steers Thomism away from the rocks of post-Enlightenment deism and at least some of Heidegger’s criticisms of Thomist metaphysics.

Caricature II Five Ways are “proofs”

A second caricature relates to St Thomas’s Five Ways or “proofs” for the existence of God. Attention to the Five Ways is much greater in Anglophone countries than in Europe. The Europeans tend to the view that St. Thomas’s Five Ways cannot be abstracted from his physics and astronomy. Kerr notes that Edward Sillem has listed ten interpretations of the Five Ways, each different from the other, some conflicting, most (he thought) unknown in Britain. He concludes that Thomas’s arguments for the existence of God read quite differently depending on whether one comes to them

with the presuppositions of Thomists like Cardinal Zigliara (1833-93) and Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange (1877-1964), or alternatively with the approach of Etienne Gilson (1884-1978) and Marie-Dominique Chenu (1895-1990).

Kerr also agrees with the judgement of T.C. O’Brien that to portray St Thomas as the proponent of a philosophical discipline about God, complete in all but Trinitarian details, is another caricature. Accordingly, Kerr believes that the proofs of God’s existence, which come early in the *Summa Theologica*, cannot be transposed from their theological context into philosophy of religion courses. This is because “pre-Christian philosophy is always already religious; natural reason is always already engaged in metaphysical, ethical and indeed scientific investigations, which finally imply the dependence of the world on the unique ‘principle’; which is both beginning and end of all that exists”. In other words, Kerr’s position is that if Thomas’s Five Ways are exercises in natural theology, this “natural theology always already includes a certain theoretical and practical ontology, spontaneous and primordial – in effect, a communion in being”.

Caricature III Complete opposition to Post-modernity

How one construes the relationship of Thomism to post-modernity depends on the subsidiary question of what one makes of the relationship between Thomism and the culture of modernity. Thomist scholars in Anglophone countries who are still trying to make the Catholic faith acceptable to post-Enlightenment conceptions of rationality are usually hostile to Heidegger or at least ignorant of his criticisms of modernity. However, Kerr observes that in the predominately Catholic countries where Thomas Aquinas is still most seriously studied, the local philosophers with whom Thomists choose

or feel compelled to interact are mostly Heideggerian in their presuppositions. Oddly as this seems to scholars in English speaking circles, Catholic philosophers and theologians in Europe now tend to take for granted Heidegger's history of Western philosophy as a history of the "forgetfulness of being". This does not however mean that they end up in exactly the same position as Heidegger. Catholic scholars in the continental mould often follow von Balthasar's defence of Aquinas from Heidegger's indictment by arguing that behind Aquinas's understanding of Being is Plotinus not (as the common Anglophone caricature holds) Aristotle.

As a generalisation it can be said that whereas Thomists in Anglophone countries tend to concentrate on the project of making Thomism respectable to the 'modern mind', Thomists on the continent are fighting alongside the post-moderns in the battle *against* modernity, but they stand apart from the post-moderns in their (the Thomists') defence of the intellect's capacity to know the truth. From the typical Continental perspective, those in Britain, Australia and the United States who seek to accommodate Thomism to the culture of modernity are attempting to occupy ground vacated by the enemy some two to three generations ago.

Caricature IV Natural Law is Ethics without God

The standard caricature of Thomist natural law presented by Kerr is the idea that natural law provides guidelines for moral reasoning for those who don't believe in God or otherwise lack a theological framework. This caricature severs the relationship between natural law and the eternal law in the mind of God. In the words of Russell Hittinger: "what began for the Christian theologians as a doctrine explaining how the human mind participates in a higher order of law is turning into its opposite." Thomas's account of natural law has been extracted from its theological context and deprived of its vital connections with beatitude and

virtue. Hittinger concludes that the end result is the paradox that the precepts of the natural law are represented as what every human being is supposed to know by nature, while at the same time being the pronouncements of church authority ("Cartesian minds somehow under church discipline").

In this section of the work the author does not discuss the arguments of the New Natural Law School of John Finnis, Robert George and Germain Grisez which is the focus of many of Hittinger's criticisms. He merely acknowledges that a treatment of the way in which the New Natural Law school departs from classical Thomism would require a separate work on its own.

Caricature V Grace Perfects Autonomous Natural Order

By far the most divisive issue in twentieth century Thomism was the relationship between nature and grace, and in particular Henri de Lubac's criticism of the standard post-Tridentine interpretation of the relationship. The intellectual battle was fought over the meaning of the following passage from the *Summa*:

In one way, beatific vision or knowledge is beyond the nature of the rational soul in the sense that the soul cannot reach it by its own power; but in another way it is in accordance with its nature, in the sense that by its very nature the soul has a capacity for it, being made in God's image.

According to de Lubac, out of fear of the Reformation doctrine of the depravity of human nature, such theologians as Cajetan opened the way for Tridentine Catholics to so much emphasise the value of nature that they ended up juxtaposing nature and grace and treating their relationship as essentially extrinsic. For de Lubac, the extrinsicist account was a distortion of classical Thomism which tragically and unwittingly fostered secularism.

Kerr concludes that few now doubt that de Lubac was right in holding that human beings retain an innate capacity for ultimately enjoying the bliss of eschatological communion with God, though this is granted only by a supernatural gift. However he suggests that de Lubac's challenge of the extrinsicist position was deliberately provocative – that at least some of the fireworks which surrounded the publication of *Surnaturel* might have been avoided had de Lubac not overtly named names. In particular he suggests that de Lubac's categorisation of the grace-nature interpretation of anti-modernist champion Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange and his fellow Dominican A-D Sertillanges of Le Saulchoir, in the same box as George Tyrrell (the most notorious of the modernists) was not a pacific approach to the problem. One may however argue, in de Lubac's defence, that Garrigou-Lagrange was such a fierce guardian of the post-Tridentine tradition that with or without the specific reference to his holding an intellectual position in common with a modernist, there would have been a strong reaction from this venerable old lion at the Angelicum.

Conclusion

Like many works on Thomism, the author began his project of destabilising caricatures with some biographical details about the life of St. Thomas. Though the story has been rehearsed many times, the fact which stood out in this reading was that St Thomas and St Bonaventure were admitted to the Divinity Faculty in Paris, *only at the command of Pope Alexander IV*. Their appointments had been opposed by the local hierarchy who feared the reaction of envious less well educated diocesan clergy. Without the fortitude of this Pope, there may never have been such a thing as Thomism.

For all those interested in contemporary intellectual schools within the Church, this work is very valuable.

Michael Davies sums up the case

Liturgical Time Bombs in Vatican II: The Destruction of Catholic Faith Through Changes in Catholic Worship; by Michael Davies; Tan, Rockford Illinois; 2003.

Reviewed by Dom Alcuin Reid OSB *

In 1996, as part of my research into twentieth century liturgical reform, I wrote to all Fathers of the Second Vatican Council then still living—some five hundred or so bishops throughout the world—in the hope of recording their recollections of the conciliar debate on the Sacred Liturgy, and of obtaining their assessment of the liturgical reforms enacted in the name of the Council. To the second of my questions: “What are your recollections of the Conciliar debate on the Sacred Liturgy?” one missionary bishop (a holder of a doctorate in Philosophy) replied:

Horrible. If we judge the debate on the Liturgy as we have it today. Very few bishops would be proud to say that they had a hand in it...In my opinion the debate on the Liturgy has been hijacked. The Council gave permission to “experiment” not to “finalise;” it was to *reform*, not to *change completely*.

The same prelate replied to the later and more specific question: “How faithful were the [post-conciliar] Consilium [charged with the application of the Council’s Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy] to the mandate given them by the Holy Father?” with a curt “Eh. Come off it! How many bishops do you think will answer the remaining questions?”

Clearly a nerve had been touched.

The liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council—and that encompasses the work of the Council, the Consilium and indeed of Pope Paul VI—is very much a live issue, even with some of the Fathers of the Council itself. Simply asking my questions prompted rather prickly responses from some prelates.

Straight shooter

Michael Davies, for whom this issue has, in latter decades, become a cause, is a straight-shooter. His numerous works on the Council and on the various aspects of the liturgical reform that followed it are relentless in their exposition of the nature and causes liturgical dissolution that the Roman rite of the Catholic Church has experienced since 1964. The familiarity of the voice and of the message of any veteran campaigner can often deafen ears to its substance and to its import, and Davies’ efforts may well suffer somewhat from that. However, in 2003 even Pope John Paul II has formally acknowledged in *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* that “dark clouds of unacceptable doctrine and practice” are present in the Church’s liturgical life and, at the time of writing, there is much talk abroad of reasserting long-since lost liturgical discipline.

It is, then, timely for Michael Davies to have written *Liturgical Time Bombs in Vatican II*, for the “question” of the Liturgy is very much under consideration at the present. The fundamental message

of the book is contained in its title: the Conciliar Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium* contained elements that would later explode and wreak havoc; or, in the words of Father Aidan Nichols OP, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* “carried within it, encased in the innocuous language of pastoral welfare, some seeds of its own destruction.”¹

In demonstrating how such a grave state of affairs could come to be, Davies looks, briefly—this book is a short essay and but whets the appetite for further study of the issues it raises—at the twentieth century Liturgical Movement. Rightly, Davies states that the Liturgical Movement sought “liturgical renewal within the Roman rite, but a renewal within the correct sense of the term, using the existing Liturgy to its fullest potential.” And, following the recently published short study of the Liturgical Movement by Father Didier Boneterre,² Davies correctly asserts that the ground for erroneous liturgical reform was laid by the didacticism of some later Liturgical Movement enthusiasts, and by the consequent reformism which they espoused, which had far too much in common with the Enlightenment liturgical reforms condemned by Pope Pius VI in 1794 and deprecated by Pope Pius XII in his 1947 encyclical *Mediator Dei*.

Enigma

The enigmatic figure of Archbishop Annibale Bugnini looms large very early in the ascendancy of the Liturgical Movement reformists. Davies, of course, clashed personally with Bugnini over the question of the prelate’s alleged masonic affiliation, and here Davies’ presents clear arguments in support of his claim. I have to confess to always having wondered whether the question

of who was or was not a mason amongst the curia—clearly in itself a gravely irregular and scandalous thing for any prelate to be—is not a distraction from the critical assessment of the liturgical reforms? Surely the reforms themselves, and indeed Bugnini’s published *apologia*,³ clearly enunciate the principles upon which the reforms were built, regardless of any corruption of the persons responsible? And surely a sound critique of those principles and of the ensuing reforms would neither gain nor lose from such sordid detail?

But Davies is right to point the finger at Bugnini, for he pushed for ritual reforms that served his view that a didactic and radically simplified Liturgy was what modern man required well before the Second Vatican Council. And, given Bugnini’s appointment as Secretary to the Council’s Preparatory Commission for the Liturgy, there is no doubt that he was ideally placed to see to the preference of his ideas. However, as Davies makes clear, Bugnini was not named Secretary of the Liturgical Commission during the Council itself, and was sacked from his Roman teaching post at the same time. Under the new Pope Paul VI, however, he was named Secretary of the post-conciliar Consilium and resumed his interrupted work.

Consequences unforeseen

It is important to note that the Fathers of the Council did not draft the *schema* on the Sacred Liturgy which they were called upon to debate;⁴ this was done under Bugnini’s co-ordination, who for more than a decade prior to the Council had been pushing for a general reform of the Liturgy along the lines of his questionable principles. Thus, Davies asserts, some proposals, moderate enough when read with a traditional mindset, were inserted which were later to prove capable of exploitation in a most radical manner. It is also important to note that hardly

any of the Council Fathers, for whom radical liturgical reform cannot be said to have been a burning issue, could have been expected to foresee such consequences.

For the “time bombs” which Davies identifies (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*’s call for “active participation” and for “legitimate variations and adaptations,” its recognition of the (not in any way primarily) “didactic” utility of the Liturgy; its observation that the Liturgy contains “elements subject to change,” its *permission* for the use of some vernacular in the Liturgy), were considered by the more than 2,000 bishops as merely proposals for a moderate reform—indeed an organic development—of the traditional Liturgy. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*’s paragraph 23 itself honours the principle of organic development and declares that “there must be no innovations unless the good

7th December 1963⁶ did not suspect the presence of such time bombs.

One question Davies does not discuss merits some examination: were these time bombs maliciously planted with a view to the destruction of the traditional Liturgy, or were they simply proposals for moderate reforms which were later exploited well beyond the bounds of their original intent and meaning? In other words, was there a plot, or did Bugnini et al. become drunk on the elixir of power and change and boldly push further and further with the ensuing years? As has been said, one can identify a set of operative principles espoused by Bugnini for many years prior to the Council which are consistent with his activities after it. But that does not prove a conspiracy. And there were many other, sound, players in the work of reform who did not operate from such flawed principles.

One cannot escape the fact that the Liturgy and attitudes to it are utterly central to the practice of the Faith. Tampering with the liturgy is risky. To revolutionise it is to court disaster.

of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them.” And the call for active participation was merely repeating that of St Pius X made in 1903. Archbishop Lefebvre, who would later write “let us then admit without hesitation that some liturgical reforms were necessary,”⁵ himself signed *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. No, the Fathers of the Council who signed *Sacrosanctum Concilium* on the

Also, one cannot forget that Bugnini was in public disgrace during the Conciliar debate on the Liturgy itself, and was therefore denied the influence he had previously enjoyed.

There is simply not enough hard evidence to gain a conviction on a conspiracy charge, however much suspicion abounds. On the available

continued page 24

Traditional Masses in Australia

Note: this directory covers Sunday Masses only. For other times, use contact details provided.

VICTORIA

ARCHDIOCESE OF MELBOURNE

Contact: FSSP Melbourne Chaplain Fr Glen Tattersall

Ph 03 9583 9926

Fax (03) 9583 7981, melbourne@fssp.net

Website: <http://fssp.net/melbourne.html>

Caulfield

St Aloysius' Church

233 Balaclava Road

Sunday, 11.00am (Sung Mass)

East Kew

St Anne's Church

Cnr Beresford & Windella Sts

Sunday, 8.30 am

Black Rock

St Joseph's Church

Balcombe Rd

Sunday, 10.30 am

Oak Park

St Francis de Sales Church,

626 Pascoe Vale Rd,

Sunday 5.00 pm

Geelong

St John's Church,

St David St., North Geelong

Sunday 11.30 am

DIOCESE OF SANDHURST

Bendigo

St Francis Xavier Church

Strickland Rd

Sundays & Holy Days, 9.30 am

DIOCESE OF BALLARAT

Skipton

St John's Church

Cnr Anderson & Wright Sts

3rd Sunday, 5.00 pm

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Perth/WA Masses, contact: Rev. Michael Rowe

Ph/Fax: (08) 9444-9604

rowe@webace.com.au

ARCHDIOCESE OF PERTH

Palmyra

Our Lady of Fatima Church

10 Foss Street

Sunday, 12.00 pm

Perth

St John's Pro - Cathedral

Victoria Avenue

Sunday 7.30 am & 9.15 am

TASMANIA

ARCHDIOCESE OF HOBART

Lower Sandy Bay

Presbytery: 036 2252157

St Canice

15 St Canice Ave, Lwr Sandy Bay

1st Sunday, 11.30 am.

NEW SOUTH WALES

ARCHDIOCESE OF SYDNEY

Darlington

Chapel of the Resurrection

St Michael's College, City Rd

Sunday, 10 .00 am

Lewisham

Contact: Fr L Gresser Ph (02) 9688 4287

Fax (02) 9896 6284

E-mail: southerncross@fssp.net

Website: <http://www.maternalheart.com/>

Chapel of the Maternal Heart

Cnr West & Thomas Sts

Sunday, 10.00am

DIOCESE OF PARRAMATTA

Doonside

St John Vianney

Cameron St

Sunday, 11.00am

Girraween

Contact: Fr L Gresser Ph (02) 9688 4287

Website: <http://fssp.net/sydney.html>

Regional House of

Fraternity of St Peter

33 Heather St, Girraween

Sunday, 8.00 am

Lawson

Our Lady of the Nativity

254 Great Western Highway

Sunday, 5.00pm

DIOCESE OF WAGGA WAGGA

Contact: Diocesan Office - 0269215667

Albury

Holy Spirit Church

Lavington

Sunday, 3.00 pm

Wagga Wagga

Mount Erin Chapel

Edmondson St

Sunday, 11.00 am

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

ARCHDIOCESE OF ADELAIDE

St Peters

Contact: Rev Fr G Small: 0883621644

Holy Name Church

Payneham Road

Sunday 9.30am

A.C.T.

ARCHDIOCESE OF CANBERRA

Dickson

Contact: Fr J Fongomie FSSP 0410 121 588

Sts Peter & Paul Church

Boake Place, Garran

Sunday, 11.30 am

Anstralian National University

John XXIII College Chapel

Sunday, 8.30 am

QUEENSLAND

ARCHDIOCESE OF BRISBANE

Contact: Fr G Jordan, S.J.: 0738780638

Buranda

St Luke's,

Taylor Street, Buranda

Sunday, 9.15 am

DIOCESE OF TOOWOOMBA

Toowoomba

Holy Name Church

190 Bridge St

2nd Sunday, 11.30 am

DIOCESE OF ROCKHAMPTON

Nth Rockhampton

St Mary's Church

Nobbs St

2nd Sunday, 7.30 am

DIOCESE OF CAIRNS

Cairns

Contact: Mr Bob Stewart 074 095 8066

Our Lady, Help of Christians

18 Balaclava Rd

Second Friday, 7.00pm Oak Park

St Francis de Sales Church,

626 Pascoe Vale Rd,

Sunday 5.00 pm

Continued from page 12

uniform praise. It won the James Tait Black Memorial Prize and was followed in 1993 by *Between Two Eternities*, an anthology of Waddell's verse.

Kin of the spirit

Asked by an interviewer whether she was at a disadvantage, having never met Waddell, Dame Felicitas robustly replied: "I think the communion of saints is stronger than we realise. You haven't got to meet a person in the flesh really to get to know them, to affect one another very deeply at a spiritual level."

Dame Felicitas wrote for three hours a day, and often dispatched as many as 12 letters at a time. A selection of her work was contained in *A Benedictine Tapestry* (1991), which demonstrated her combative spirit.

Though always quick to praise female achievement, Dame Felicitas was more at ease in the company of men, whom she would hold spellbound with her stories. At a crucial moment, she would pause,

lift one eyebrow, adjust her wimple then sit back to gauge their reaction. When a listener unused to this technique asked, "And then what happened?" Dame Felicitas would lean forward on the table and say, "Shall I carry on?"

She was also a specialist in bringing ex-priests back to the Church. Only two years ago, while convalescing at another convent, she met an elderly man who told her he had been a priest many years ago. He burst into tears when she told him, "To me you are still a priest," and knelt down to request his blessing. Soon afterwards he wrote to his bishop, asking permission to become a priest once more.

In later life, Dame Felicitas admitted her strong character made obedience a chore: "I don't easily obey. I won't say I am dissident, but I am honest and speak out. There has been a dry rot in many communities where everyone says 'Yes, Mother, yes, Mother'. I would say 'No, Mother, I don't agree'."

As prioress, Dame Felicitas always asked new nuns if they had brothers, since brothers made a woman better at taking knocks. While her novices appreciated her kindness, they also feared a rapier-like tongue, which prompted one to remark: "You've tossed and gored half a dozen people before breakfast."

Nevertheless, Dame Felicitas had a ready sense of humour, and recognised her own faults. She openly acknowledged that she found the Abbey life at times trying, saying: "Your life is ordered by another from morning to night. It seems a little thing to say, but when I get to heaven I will have tea served in a china pot and newly-made thickly buttered toast. . . There is no way I can make these things here. Our life is regulated in little and big things - always by bells."

- *The Telegraph*, London

O

Fr George Gabet: new N. American District Superior

ELMHURST, Pennsylvania-Father Arnaud Devillers, FSSP, Superior General of the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter announced recently the appointment of Father George Gabet, FSSP to the position of North American District Superior.

Father Gabet succeeds Father Paul Carr, FSSP who has completed a three-year term as District Superior. Father Carr has been assigned to the Fraternity's International Headquarters, Wigratzbad, Germany as General Secretary.

Father Gabet was born in Fort Wayne, Indiana where he attended Bishop Dwenger High School. Upon graduation he entered Ball State University, Indiana, where he received a Bachelor of Science degree. Following graduation he worked for five years as a medical technologist for the American Red Cross. During this

time Father Gabet was active in pro-life, a young men's prayer group and served as an usher for the Latin Mass in Fort Wayne. Father Gabet continued his education at Indiana-Perdue University and was working towards a master's degree when he realized his call to seminary. In 1991 he entered St. Peter's Seminary, the Fraternity's international seminary in Wigratzbad.

Father Gabet was ordained to the diaconate in 1996 by Bishop Wolfgang Haas, then Bishop of Chur-Zurich, Switzerland. In 1997 he was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop John. M D'Arcy, Bishop of Fort Wayne-South Bend. Following ordination Father Gabet was assigned to the Community of St. Peter in the Diocese of Tulsa, Oklahoma. In 1998 he was transferred to St. Patrick's Parish in the Archdiocese of Omaha,

Nebraska, where he served for two years. Upon reassignment to the Diocese of Tulsa Father Gabet became pastor of the Parish of St. Peter where he has served for the past three years.

The North American District of the Fraternity, which maintains its headquarters in the Diocese of Scranton, Pennsylvania, has nearly 50 priests serving in 25 dioceses throughout the United States and Canada. The Fraternity's English speaking seminary, Our Lady of Guadalupe Seminary, is located in the Diocese of Lincoln, Nebraska and has over 60 men in priestly studies.

The Fraternity was established in 1988 by the Holy See. Its 150 priests are present in more than 60 dioceses spread over 15 countries. During 2003, 19 members of the Fraternity were ordained to the priesthood.

O

Continued from page 21

evidence, it seems that at present we can only say that the death of some key personages, the election of a new Pope and his subsequent rehabilitation of Bugnini—with whom Paul VI maintained extraordinarily frequent contact and in whom he placed much confidence—and the spirit of the age, all combined to give to Bugnini and his allies the opportunity to explode the time bombs even if they had not originally been placed in the schema with conspiratorial intent.

And explode them he did, and without much delay. To take but one by way of example, *Sacrosanctum Concilium's* permission for the introduction of *some* vernacular into the Liturgy (cf. article 34) was, within six months, being interpreted as a licence for the progressive application of the vernacular into the Liturgy, as a preparatory paper for the April 1964 Plenary Session of the Concilium indicates. Father (later Cardinal) Antonelli,⁷ who was Secretary of the Liturgical Commission during the Council, objected to this, annotating his copy of this paper to the effect that if we speak of progressive application, then we shall arrive at the point where everything is in the vernacular, and that would be contrary to article 36 no. 1 of the Constitution. Of course, we know that this is precisely what

has happened. In the words of Bugnini himself; “It cannot be denied that the principle, approved by the Council, of using the vernaculars was given a broad interpretation.”⁸ A very “broad interpretation” indeed! And the same may be said about the other principles or permissions for moderate reform (Davies’ “time bombs”) approved by the Council mentioned above.

No punches pulled

Davies catalogues various aspects of the consequent downward spiral of the Roman rite, not hesitating to attribute to it the pastoral disaster and massive loss of faith and practice that first world countries have experienced since the Council. There is much by way of qualification and discussion one may wish to introduce into such an assessment, but again, this is a brief book, and one cannot escape the fact that the Liturgy and attitudes to it are utterly central to the practice of the Faith. Tampering with it is risky. To revolutionise it is to court disaster.

And, in an appendix “The Fruits of the Liturgical Reforms,” Davies cites some pretty hard and up-to-date statistical evidence—if evidence be needed—that we are suffering from such a disaster. Those who speak of the unfettered “renewal” the Church has supposedly experienced since the

Council need to face these facts. They also need to appreciate the causal link between the state of the Church today and the liturgical reforms (and abuses) enacted in the name of the Council. Other appendices provide some significant material demonstrating the protestant influence in the preparation of the new liturgical rites, and evidence that no formal permission is necessary for the celebration of the traditional rites.

The claims of this book are as striking as they are serious. Davies pulls no punches, and for that we may be thankful, for the urgency of the crisis in the Church does not permit of ostrich-like obfuscation. Whilst there is much more study and discussion to be done in respect of what has happened to the Roman rite in the past four decades, there is perhaps an even greater need for concerted and immediate action to stop the haemorrhaging of the very fountain of life-blood of the Church that is her Sacred Liturgy. For stating this clearly and succinctly we must, once again, express our gratitude to Michael Davies.

(*Dom Alcuin Reid is a Benedictine monk of Saint Michael's Abbey, Farnborough, England, and holds a PhD from the University of London. His book *The Organic Development of the Liturgy* is to be published early in 2004.)

O

(Endnotes)

1 “A Tale of Two Documents: *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Mediator Dei*” in: A. Reid ed., *A Pope and A Council on the Sacred Liturgy*, St Michael's Abbey Press, 2002, p. 12.

2 *The Liturgical Movement: Guéranger to Beauduin to Bugnini*, Angelus Press, Kansas City 2002. I have a number of reservations about Father Bonnetterre's study which, in my opinion, indulges in the *a posteriori* attribution of too much ‘guilt by association’ in respect of the good and sincere efforts of many persons involved in the Liturgical Movement. My own forthcoming work *The Organic Development of the Liturgy* (St Michael's Abbey Press, 2004) seeks to afford such persons a fairer historical assessment.

3 *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville 1990.

4 It must also be said that this *schema* was the first to be debated on the Council floor, and, unlike others, it was not sent back for redrafting before its debate, hence the influence of its drafters was not insignificant.

5 Cited in: Davies, *Liturgical Time Bombs in Vatican II*, p. 26.

6 Not 1962, as page 11 of the book asserts.

7 The doctoral study of Nicola Giampietro OFM Cap., *Il Card. Ferdinando Antonelli e gli sviluppi della riforma liturgica dal 1948 al 1970*, (Pontificio Ateneo San Anselmo, Rome 1998), provides an important insight into the workings of the Concilium from the point of view of a prominent insider who became increasingly distressed at the direction of the liturgical reform. There is as yet no English translation, however the essay of Dom Charbel Pazat de Lys OSB, “Towards a New Liturgical Movement” in: *Looking Again at the Question of the Liturgy with Cardinal Ratzinger*, (St Michael's Abbey Press, 2003), pp. 98-114, quotes at length from Father Giampietro's work.

8 *The Reform of the Liturgy*, p. 110.