

THE MASS SERIES : EDITIONS OF THE MISSAL AND WHY 1962?

BY FR IAN ANDREW PALKO, FSSPX

30,000-FOOT VIEW (SUMMARY) : THE SSPX USES THE 1962 MISSAL

- **Overarching Reason**
 - We cannot accept the *Novus Ordo Missæ* (published in 1969), because it presents a danger to the Faith.
 - Changes from 1964–1969, were experimental/transitional
 - Local bishops' conferences published these missals, not the Holy See
 - The changes included were inconsistent between places, and were based on permissions/decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and Consilium.
 - Thus, the Missal published in late 1962/early 1963 is the last official edition (*editio typica*) of the Missal before the introduction of the *Novus Ordo Missæ*.
 - We do not use the Missals from before 1962 because these were obrogated (superseded) by the 1962/1963 typical edition.
 - The SSPX is not Sedevacantist, so accepts John XXIII was a legitimate Pope and could issue and command use of a new typical edition.
 - None of the changes between St. Pius X and John XXIII touch on matters of Faith or are dangers to the Faith.
 - We don't get to do what we please. It's not **my** Mass, it's the Church's Mass, I say.
 - I hope to develop those ideas in this discussion.

THE ROAMING LITURGY

- **Myth : The Roman Liturgy was a universal, unchanging bulwark since at least Pope St. Gregory I.**
- **Reality : Until the Council of Trent there was little liturgical uniformity in the West**
 - Fr. Adrian Fortescue's *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy* details a great deal of the development.
 - *Angelus* (May-June 2023) "From Peter to Gregory" I detail a lot of the development
 - What was fixed by St. Gregory I was the Canon
 - But even here, the *Communicantes* and *Nobis Quoque* would add local Saints (even after 1570), and also in places add the name of the king/emperor to the *Te igitur*
 - The *Agnus Dei* was not added to the Roman Rite until at least the 7th century.
 - The elevation of the host and chalice are from the late middle ages (12th century) and was not universal until the end of the 13th cent. (the Carthusians still lack this).
 - The genuflection before and after the consecrations is not universal until the 16th century
 - Consider the Dominican Rite and the Roman Rite at present day
 - The Dominican Rite was created in the 13th century, over the course of about 100 years, adapted from various Gallican, Mozarabic, and Roman elements in the places where the Dominicans were established.
 - The whole of the prayers at the foot of the altar are different.
 - The chalice is prepared at the beginning of the Mass
 - The Offertory is significantly shortened from the Roman, and the host and chalice are not offered in the same manner.
 - The Roman Canon is used, but the positions of the hands are far different.
 - Even in the Roman Rite, few places had exactly the same set of prayers, even if all were similar.

- When St. Pius V issues *Quo Primum* he provides a version of the Missal that was used by the curia in Rome
- Even then, less than 40 years later, Clement VIII would make textual changes to the missal and rubrics by *Cum sanctissimum* (1604).
 - In the absolution of the priest following the *Confiteor*, the 1570 text employed “omnium peccatorum” but since this was not considered to absolve unconfessed mortal sins, “omnium” was removed.
 - The *Dirigatur Domine* from Ps. 141 said during the incensation of the altar, was removed from the first incensation and retained only at the offertory.
 - The *Hæc quotiescumque* is said during the elevation in 1570, but before the elevation (as it is now) after 1604.
 - The 1570 text has the priest bless the faithful like a bishop, but not after 1604.
 - Where publishers had changed the Old Latin texts out for the Vulgate, they were mandated to restore the originals.
- Following Clement’s revisions, 30 years later Urban VIII would:
 - Revise all of the hymns of the Breviary (substituting classical Latin versions compiled by Jesuit scholars)
 - Restore the use of the Vulgate in place of the Old Latin in the Missal that Clement VIII removed
 - Reword the rubrics to make certain things more clear.
- St. Pius X reforms the calendar and Breviary:
 - Breviary reform was a massive and unprecedented change.
 - *The Angelus* (Sept 2003) Fr. Paschal Thullier *St. Pius X : Reformer of the Liturgy*
 - Complete rearrangement of the Psalms so that unless a major feast occurred during the week, the whole 150 psalms would be recited.
 - Matins now 9 psalms (or parts) on all days
 - Previously 9 on great feasts
 - Sundays 18 psalms
 - Ferias 12 psalms
 - Reason for so many is that the minor hours (Prime-None) were always Psalm 118 divided into 11 sections.
 - By 1904 only 85 days in the year when weekday psalms were said, and *no single week* where the whole psalter was said.
 - What changed
 - Matins now always 9 psalms (or parts)
 - Sunday and Major Feasts : Ps. 118 for the minor hours
 - Redistribute the rest of the psalms throughout the week, so even on normal feasts or ferias the weekday psalms would be said, and most weeks the whole psalter said.
 - Only 125 (vs 280) feasts that disrupted the weekday psalter.
 - Yet, it was a *significant departure from tradition*
 - Whole arrangement of psalms was entirely new
 - Departure from 12 psalms at Matins (Rule of St. Benedict, Desert Fathers)
 - No longer psalms 148, 149, 150 to end Lauds (namesake)

- **What the Council of Trent did was to stop the local modifications of the liturgy without these changes being approved by the Holy See**
 - Essentially, to reduce the possible impact of Protestant rebellion vis-à-vis the liturgy (and especially the Mass), changing the rites was reserved to the Pope.
 - This is not a matter of doctrine, but practical discipline.
 - We know this because the rites were being changed before 1570 locally, and there was no objection
 - Popes continued to make changes (normally by addition)
 - Several Popes added feasts
 - Benedict XV added the Preface for the Dead and that of St. Joseph
 - St. Joseph's name was added to the Canon in late 1962 (but this idea was already planned under St. Pius X)
- **Important point: Quo Primum is not some infallible decree never permitting any change to the liturgy after 1570.**
 - The fact that changes were made well before modern times is proof that no Pope felt they were so bound,
 - The appeal to *Quo Primum* is a weak argument.
 - Fundamentally misunderstands the nature of Papal authority and infallibility.
 - Infallibility is not a positive power to enact certain things, but
 - A positive power and negative power which exists to protect the Faithful
 - Positively to make clear what we must believe
 - Negatively to prevent a Pope from binding us to believe what is false
 - Infallibility only applies when the Pope is binding the whole Church, to reject an error (which directly or indirectly touches on a matter of Faith) or profess a truth of Faith as a revealed truth concerning Faith or Morals, when intending to invoke this supreme authority.
 - Quo Primum only concerns the Latin Church,
 - Innocent III's Decretals establishes the principle that "the intention of the person who establishes a prohibition cannot be to bind his successors who will have after him not only an equal power but an identical power to his own, since an equal has no authority over his equal."
 - And in speaking about Holy Orders, Pius XII, in *Sacramentum Ordinis* clearly says, "Everyone knows that what the Church has established, she can also modify and abrogate".
 - At best *Quo Primum* establishes a very high bar to meet before changes are made (similar to St. Thomas' principle on the changing of law),
 - But even then, changes were made, albeit infrequently.
 - The break is in 1969, and this for a very clear intention, which is not a Catholic motive (Ecumenism).
- **The Problem of choosing a Missal, and rejecting the Novus Ordo is not a rejection of the possibility of change, but the manner of change and the kinds of changes made**
 - The Pope certainly has the power and right to change the liturgy, and to impose these changes on the Church. (*Quo Primum*, *Divino afflatus*, etc.)
 - While the power comes from God, by the Pope being earthly head of the Church, the regulation of the non-essential parts of the liturgy is a disciplinary (human) law.
 - When exercising a legislative power, the legislator is not free to do whatever he pleases, but is bound by the Divine Law, and also by moral principles.

- St. Thomas Aquinas give us a very sage principle about changing law/customs/disciplines (ST I:II q. 97 a. 2).

- His general principle is simple:

Human law is rightly changed, in so far as such change is conducive to the common good.

- But he then gives a broader principle, saying that even if the change produces something better, mere change itself causes a harm. That is especially true for things which derive from long-standing customs:

To a certain extent, the mere change of law is of itself prejudicial to the common good: because custom greatly assists in observing laws, seeing that what is done contrary to general custom, even in slight matters, is looked upon as a serious matter. Therefore, when a law is changed, the binding power of the law is diminished, in so far as custom is abolished. Wherefore human law should never be changed, unless, in some way or other, the common good be compensated according to the extent of the harm done in this respect. Such compensation may arise either from some very great and every evident benefit conferred by the new law; or from the extreme urgency of the case, due to the fact that either the existing law is clearly unjust, or its observance extremely harmful.

- From this we could say that a Pope can certainly change a discipline, even the liturgy, but given the liturgy but there is danger here:
 - It may be that just because something seems superfluous, it is not, and we simply do not appreciate or understand it sufficiently.
 - By introducing a change (even if prudent), there is a risk of opening “Pandora’s Box” and more easily tolerating other changes without sufficient reflection.
 - The change must be for the common good.
 - While generally this is an evaluation that the Pope alone has the grace of state to decide, when he fails in prudence here and it is serious enough matter, we should object.
 - Certainly any change which risks the diminution of our Faith, makes the rites more ambiguous, or less clearly an expression of the Catholic Faith, or the stated motives are not Catholic, this change is absolutely unacceptable, immoral, and an abuse of the power to change the liturgy.
 - Here is the problem with the Novus Ordo.
 - The reaction to this:
 - Principled (SSPX position): accept the last official rites from before the Novus Ordo, and then wait for the hierarchy to solve the problem
 - Personalist position : do what we prefer and what we feel like is the better rite.

MY PREFERENCES...

- We will talk about the older Holy Week and what the SSPX uses in the next episode
 - The SSPX uses grosso modo the 1956 Holy Week reform published in the *Ordo Hebdomadæ Sanctæ Instaurandus* (substantially the same as the 1962 Missal)
 - I use this, but if it were up to me, I would much prefer the older rites but at the newer times
 - But it’s not up to me or my preferences, ***and that’s a good thing***
 - **There’s a grave danger in using personal preference to direct the liturgy**
 - Liturgy is the public prayer of the Church, ***not of priest or individuals***
 - To follow one’s preferences is no different than the Novus Ordo principles of *sui juris ad libitum* modifications as the priest and liturgy committee see fit.

- The priest is meant to be formed by the liturgy in obedience to the rubrics and gestures he is commanded to do,
- He is not supposed to mold the liturgy to fit him.
- It is always objectionable to see a priest where the way he says Mass is strikingly different than other priests.
 - We all have idiosyncracies and speeds
 - But the priest is not meant to draw attention (but disappear)
- And this is the heart of the problem with the man-centered approach to liturgy found in the Novus Ordo, which is an amorphous mess that can be anything from liberal Protestant to orthodox Catholic depending on options and what the priest may decide to insert and change.
 - Here is the source of the Crisis in the Church (in Faith and Liturgy)
 - There is no consistency in liturgy or in the teaching of the Faith
 - The Novus Ordo is a danger to Faith (lesser or greater), but perhaps a very orthodox priest could lessen this danger, yet because it almost always is a serious danger, I would say “stay away” because we cannot put our Faith in danger.
 - But when someone asks me if they should go to a diocesan or other TLM group when travelling, I must say, “I don’t know what you will find, and so I cannot recommend it, nor can I say that it’s a danger to your soul.”

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE SOCIETY IN OBJECTING TO CERTAIN THINGS

• The Principle of Archbishop Lefebvre

- When it is a matter of Faith and Morals, and one is commanded to do something contrary to Catholic teaching, or something that would endanger his Faith, he must not do this.
- However, when it is a matter of prudence, and the Faith or Morals are not put in danger one cannot disobey the legitimate authority.

The basic principle of the Society’s thinking and action in the painful crisis the Church is going through is the principle taught by St. Thomas Aquinas in the *Summa Theologica*. That one may not oppose the authority of the Church except in the case of imminent danger to the Faith. (Msgr. Marcel Lefebvre, *Superior General’s Letter*, April, 1983.

• The Principle of St. Thomas Aquinas

- St. Thomas lays out this principle in a few different places, but most clearly when describing fraternal correction of one’s superior (ST II:II q. 33, a. 4, ad 2):

One who is not an equal can reprove privately and respectfully... but, it must be observed that if the faith were endangered, a subject ought to rebuke his prelate even publicly. Hence Paul, who was Peter’s subject, rebuked him in public, on account of the imminent danger of scandal concerning faith, and, as the gloss of Augustine says on Galatians 2:11, “Peter gave an example to superiors, that if at any time they should happen to stray from the straight path, they should not disdain to be reproved by their subjects.”

- The act of rejecting the command of a superior is just a lesser form of this correction, and a protection for self from sin.
 - We can never put our Faith in danger for a lesser good, even obedience
 - There is a hierarchy of virtues
 - Faith is a theological virtue, which directly reaches God
 - Obedience is a moral virtue, and even then only a part of Justice.
 - So, if the command, even of a Pope, or the proffering of some liturgical change presents a real harm to our Faith, we have a duty to resist it.

- If the command or even some liturgical change does not present some danger to our Faith, then it must be accepted.

APPLICATION OF THIS PRINCIPLE

- **The Novus Ordo Missæ (1969)**

- Cardinal Ottaviani in the letter he personally wrote and attached to the *Short Critical Study of the New Rite of the Mass* says :

Despite its brevity, the study shows quite clearly that the *Novus Ordo Missæ*—considering the new elements widely susceptible to widely different interpretations which are implied or taken for granted—represents, both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was formulated in Session 22 of the Council of Trent.

- But what was critical is his use of this same principle of St. Thomas Aquinas and Msgr. Lefebvre to describe the problem :

The "canons" of the rite definitively fixed at [Trent] erected an insurmountable barrier against any heresy which might attack the integrity of the Mystery.

- So, at the very least the Novus Ordo removed those barriers, and put the Faith in danger.
- In *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform* various SSPX theologians presented to Pope John Paul II the three places where the Society judges the Novus Ordo presents said danger to the Faith (in the rite itself, absent any particular *ars celebrandi*):
 1. The Ministerial (Ordained) Priesthood is reduced and confused with the "Priesthood of the Faithful".
 2. The nature of the Mass as a renewal of the propitiatory sacrifice Christ offered on Calvary reduced and replaced with the idea of the "Lord's Supper" and the Mass as a memorial meal only.
 3. The diminution of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.
- All of these three dogmas regarding the were defined by Trent, so this is the heart of the matter and by reducing the Faith in these, there is ample reason to reject this Missal.
 - For those who in good conscience judge this Missal to be this kind of danger, it would be sinful for them to attend this Mass or say it (even if they were wrong).
 - For those who in good conscience did not understand this danger, they were not committing sin.
- It is not for us to go into an exhaustive detail, but let us just mention a few things for each of these problems :
 1. The Ministerial (Ordained) Priesthood is reduced and confused with the "Priesthood of the Faithful".
 - a. The GIRM explanation for the *Orate Fratres* (which the reformers wanted to remove) says, "The meaning of the prayer is that all the faithful now gathered together unite themselves with Christ in praising the wonderful works of God and in offering sacrifice."
 - b. The CCC describes the priest as "...it is [Christ] himself who presides invisibly over every Eucharistic celebration. It is in representing him that the bishop or priest acting in the person of Christ the head presides over the assembly, speaks after the readings, receives the offerings, and says the Eucharistic Prayer."
 2. From Sacrifice to Memorial Meal

- a. The original 1969 GIRM defines the Mass as a “the sacred gathering of God's people, presided over by a priest, to celebrate the Lord's Supper.” Only later after objections was a passing reference to sacrifice added.
 - b. The traditional Offertory which is clearly sacrificial in tone was replaced with a made up Jewish table blessing (which claims to be from a Seder meal, but isn't), in which the “gifts” become our “spiritual food ... [and] drink.”
3. The diminution of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.
 - a. The traditional rite has 14 genuflections, the New has 3.
 - i. In TLM a genuflection was made before uncovering or touching and after covering or putting down the sacred species.—In NO the host is simply touched and chalice often uncovered without any reverences.
 - ii. At the Consecration, immediately after the Words, but before showing the species, the priest genuflected.—In NO the genuflection happens only after the elevation (which could be understood in the Lutheran way, of the Faith of the people making Christ present).
 - b. There is a emphasis of the Presence of Christ in “His Word”—Even the CCC tend to put the Real Presence and God's Word on the same level
- We mentioned in passing the *ars celebrandi*. By this we mean how a priest offers the Mass.
 - I was shocked when a priest once told me “The Novus Ordo is not a Catholic Rite.”
 - He then explained what he meant was that it removed explicitly Catholic elements and so was ambiguous and nebulous.
 - It could be made more specifically Catholic by certain “ars celebrandi”.
 - It also could be used by some Protestants without any qualms.
 - So, this is why we cannot use the 1969 (and following) Missals
- **The Transitional Missals (“1965” and “1967”)**
 - Strictly speaking there are no “1965” or “1967” Missals.
 - These were regional variations produced by bishops' conferences to incorporate vernacular and various changes suggested by Vatican II and the Consilium.
 - There are no official “Editio Typica” from this time, and these interim rites were not meant to be permanent.
 - Some places never made any changes and kept using the last edition typical of early 1963 (when St. Joseph's name was added to the Canon), which we often call the 1962.
 - These “transitional” rites were substantially the same as the 1962 Missal, with certain optional parts, and with vernacular, and some changes in rubrics.
 - A fair argument could be made that some of these changes were simply to accustom people to the Novus Ordo, but
 - Not all changes necessarily must be seen in that light,
 - None of these changes seriously introduce or reduce things that bring up those three problems, nor do any undermine the Faith, per se.
 - Nevertheless, while at the beginning of the time of the SSPX some of these “transitional” rites were used, because of the variety of ways in which these rites were done from place to place, it was decided to follow the last typical edition, *grosso modo*.

- **The Pre-1962/1960 Missals and Breviaries**

- We do not use these for a very specific reason : they have been authentically obrogated (they were replaced by a new code of rubrics in 1960, and a new typical edition).
 - We can use the texts of these Missals, and often have to do so, but we must
- We leave Holy Week aside (because that's a much more involved topic).
- Applying St. Thomas Aquinas' principle as explained by Msgr. Lefebvre : none of the changes to the rubrics or liturgy up to 1962 put the Faith or Morals in danger.
 - The changing of the classification of feasts
 - Formerly feasts were classified as simple or double.
 - Unsure where this came from
 - Doubling of antiphons, or perhaps two sets of Matins during middle ages
 - Double feasts were further broken down into 1st class, 2nd class, greater/major double, double, semidouble.
 - New classification was to divide into feasts/ferias and give these four classifications.
 - Changing this doesn't touch the Faith, and is simply practical.
 - The suppression of most of the octaves, many vigils, and even the elimination or downgrading of certain feast days, may be lamentable, but do not touch on the Faith
 - For example, the change of the Feast of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel from a Major Double (III class equivalent) to a Commemoration (on a feria, allowing the use of the Mass), does not call into question any Catholic doctrine.
 - The elimination of the overlapping octaves of the St. John the Baptist and Sts. Peter and Paul (which sometimes also included an overlap of the octave of Corpus Christi or the Sacred Heart, does not undermine any doctrine.

THE 1960 RUBRICS

- On March 23, 1955, Pius XII issued *Cum nostra hac aetate*. This modified the Roman Calendar and also some of the rubrics for the Mass and Breviary.
 - This was seen as the first step towards a more general revision of the rubrics
 - The Semi-Double rank was eliminated, the days with this rank becoming simple feasts (except the Vigil of Pentecost, which was upgraded to a Double)
 - Many vigils were suppressed, retaining only Christmas, Pentecost, the Ascension, the Assumption, St. John the Baptism, Sts. Peter and Paul, and St. Lawrence.
 - Octaves except Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost were suppressed.
 - The Feast of St. Joseph the Worker (May 1) replaced the Solemnity of St. Joseph (Wednesday in the Second Week of Easter), and to accommodate this Sts. Philip and James, Apostles were moved to the open day on May 11.
- To complete this work, John XXIII issued a new set of rubrics with *Rubricarum instructum* in 1960.
 - The Pope intended to have the Council tackle the principles of a General Liturgical Reform, but his text clearly suggests that these rubrics are meant to be a relatively fixed solution
 - What also suggests the Pope intended these to be a long-standing set of rubrics and that the General Reform would not depart much from them, is that he commanded new typical editions of Breviaries and Missals be printed.
- To show they are not "Bugnized" or "Modernist" we need only look at the fact that they were modified twice in the next 7 years, then entirely thrown out, and the Novus Ordo rubrics look nothing like these.

THE BUGNINI PROBLEM

- It is especially the case with the Holy Week changes that we will discuss next time, but, Fr. Annibale Bugnini was on the Commission that suggested changes from 1948–1962, then involved on the Preparatory Commission for the Liturgy at Vatican II, before becoming the chief architect of the Novus Ordo Missæ.
- It is often rumored or flat-out said that he was a Freemason.
- Traditional Catholics frequently bring up his name in a very pejorative sense:
 - The Novus Ordo is rightly called Bugnini’s “baby” and clearly bears his signature, yet
 - The 1960 Rubrics are often said to be “of Bugnini”
 - The 1956 Holy Week revisions are also said to be sourced from him.
 - He ends up being the scapegoat for all liturgical changes, and if he was in anyway involved a change must be tainted.
- Talking about him is a bit of a red herring, but worth a short amount of time
 - **Why a red herring?** Because the question is not who was involved in the changes, but if those changes are legitimate.
 - It seems his influence was overstated before Vatican II, but let’s presume the worst.
 - Assume that
 - Fr. Annibale Bugnini had an intimate role in the changes from 1951–1962.
 - He was a Freemason, bent on the destruction of the liturgy.
 - None of that is an argument against what happened prior to the Novus Ordo.
 - Evil people can do good and evil things,
 - People with evil intentions do not always get their way,
 - Evil people often lie about themselves and their work,
 - These questions about Freemasonry and the degree of influence are something historically important, but not theologically or liturgically.
 - Real questions :
 - Do the changes affect the Faith?
 - Do they diminish the clarity of the liturgy expressing Catholic doctrine?
 - Worthwhile read is Yves Chiron’s *Annibale Bugnini : Reformer of the Liturgy*. Also, the memoirs of Cardinal Federico Antonelli.
- Fr. Annibale Bugnini was born in 1912.
 - Ordained a priest at age 24 in 1936.
 - Studied theology at the Angelicum for 2 years, writing a dissertation on the liturgy and the Council of Trent.
 - He was a parish priest near Rome for 10 years, and then was appointed as a professor at the Urbinum, later as a professor of liturgy at the Lateran.
 - During this time, he took over editorship of *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, a dying liturgical journal
 - In 1948 he was appointed Secretary of an ad hoc Papal Commission (*Commissio Piana*) to study a possible general reform of the liturgy. (less than 12 years a priest)
 - The Secretary of such a Commission simply compiles the materials to be addressed and communicates these things around.
 - The Prefect (usually a Cardinal or Archbishop) is the one who reports to the Pope directly.
 - The 1948 Commission had only six initial members, and most were high-ranking prelates, so Bugnini did not have a leading or highly influential role.
- He will later become infamous (among traditionalists) from his work on the *Consilium* (*Consilium ad Exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia*)

- This was the Pontifical Council that was responsible for implementing Vatican II's *Sacrosanctum Concilium*
- It superseded the Congregation of Sacred Rites in most functions, and was responsible for the 1965/67 Missals.
- It eventually produced the *Novus Ordo Missæ*.
- In his memoirs *La Riforma Liturgica*, Bugnini makes sweeping grand claims of how instrumental he was in the changes during the 1951–1962 period.
 - He also claimed that all of these changes were intended as a bridge to the *Novus Ordo Missæ*.
 - He is the only one who makes this connection, and others like Cardinal Antonelli dispute this
 - This claim is seized upon by many who refuse the 1962 Missal
 - For example, the nine priests who abandoned the SSPX in 1983, ostensibly over rejecting John XXIII and his successors as Popes, claimed Bugnini was responsible for the 1962 Missal, so refused it.
 - In reality they rejected John XXIII as Pope, so refused, but Bugnini was their main argument.
 - Recent scholarship shows this is at best a massive misrepresentation, and most likely a bald-faced lie.
 - Bugnini was disliked by John XXIII, and was removed from his position and professorship because his liturgical ideas had become too progressive.
 - This was just as the schema for *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was being drafted, and the head of the preparatory commission Cardinal Gaetano Cicognani was unwilling to sign off on things he considered dangerous openings.
 - Bugnini went to the Cardinal's brother who was Cardinal Secretary of State to pressure him for a signature.
 - The Cardinal signed, but then soon after, Bugnini was fired from his teaching position and the Preparatory Commission.
 - This would normally have been career-ending, and this is where some posit his supposed association with the Freemasons may have begun (that he is possibly promised to be restored to a good curial position if he will follow their agenda).
 - Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli (Prefect of the Congregation of Rites under Paul VI) was frequently Bugnini's opponent on the various liturgical works.
 - Antonelli's memoirs were recently published in edited form by Msgr Nicola Giampietro in *The Development of the Liturgical Reform: As seen by Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli*.
 - These memoirs dispute Bugnini's claims.
 - Antonelli suggests Bugnini played no major role in the liturgical changes before his appointment to the Consilium in 1964.
 - The best modern scholarship suggests that it is impossible to know if Bugnini was a Mason or not. There is circumstantial evidence and rumors, but no solid proof.
- Summary : While he was instrumental in the *Novus Ordo Missæ*, until after Vatican II, his role in actually affecting any of the changes seems very limited.
 - It's simply false to attribute the 1962 Missal, the 1960 Rubrics, the 1956 Holy Week, the 1951 Holy Saturday Vigil, or any other changes or documents to Bugnini personally.
 - That's why it's a red herring, and we should be intellectually-honest enough to look at the changes in themselves
 - Are they contrary to the Faith?
 - Are they prudent?

WHY DOES THE SSPX USE SOME VARIATIONS IN THE 1962 MISSAL

- **If the principle is that we don't do what we personally want, but what the Church wants, isn't it hypocritical to have variations from the 1962 Missal.**
 - There are three ways that one can act:
 1. *Secundum legem* — In accordance with the law (doing what the law commands)
 2. *Contra legem* — Against the law (violating an explicit command)
 3. *Præter legem* — Outside the law (doing what the law neither forbids, nor commands)
 - The Roman Liturgy has always had local variations and different ways that various religious communities would celebrate the liturgy on some practical points.
 - The SRC existed to solve these problems, and would either forbid a practice; forbid its introduction or expansion while asking it be prudently eliminated; tolerate a practice; or permit a practice.
 - Normally the SRC would allow practices which were *secundum legem*, and *præter legem*, except when they could cause confusion
- **Why does the SSPX keep the Second Confiteor?**
 - The revision of the rubrics under John XXIII says at no. 503, that the Confiteor is omitted when Communion is distributed at Mass.
 - This does not forbid the use, but instructs something that was customary be omitted.
 - Keeping it where it had been customary for a long time is *præter legem*, because there is no explicit command that it is forbidden to use this Confiteor.
 - The 1962 Pontifical disagrees with the 1960 Rubrics on this question
 - As mentioned at no. 503 the Rubrics instruct that the Confiteor before Communion is omitted.
 - The 1962 Pontifical directly instructs the use of the Confiteor before Communion (at Ordination Masses).
 - While the 1956 OHS instructed the omission of the Confiteor before Communion on Holy Thursday, the 1962 Missal removes this reference to the omission, and *requires* the *Confiteor* before Good Friday's Holy Communion
 - Almost everyone who says the TLM since 1960 has always kept it, even Cardinals and Popes.
 - The PCED in 2018 which deferred to local custom (like SRC common "tolerated").
- **Why does the SSPX use the 1956 Holy Week and not the 1960/1962 Missal?**
 - The only official publication of the OHS was in 1956. If it were reprinted with changes made in 1960, these were local unofficial editions.
 - When the SSPX began, there was not unity on what was used, but most widely available was the 1956 OHS.
 - We retain the "knocking at the door" on Palm Sunday
 - This is not forbidden, nor commanded, so is *præter legem*.
 - The 1956 changes do not provide any instructions on the order of the procession, and allow the singing of any hymns, providing 7 Gregorian antiphons, a hymn, and a Psalm that may be sung or omitted, the hymn is the same *Gloria Laus* that in 1955 and before ended the procession at the door.
 - Because it is entirely possible to perform the traditional antiphonal singing of the *Gloria Laus* and knocking at the door, within the rubrics of the 1956 Holy Week, we have retained it for the clear symbolic value since the beginning of the SSPX and because it was the long-standing custom.
 - We omit the Second Confiteor on Holy Thursday (following the 1956 rubrics)

- We sing “Oremus. Flectamus genua. Levate.” before the prayer for the Jews on Good Friday, but retain the “perfidious” text.
 - John XXIII expressed this wish for dubious reasons which could question certain aspects of the Faith;
 - No official OHS was issued with this change;
 - Keeping “perfidious” is not a slur, but clearly specifies the Jews for which we pray : not those who have converted and been Faithful, but those who have abandoned the true Faith, and thus the true Covenant.
- We should talk more at length about the whole Holy Week issue.