

THE MASS SERIES : 1955 HOLY WEEK AND THE SSPX

BY FR IAN ANDREW PALKO, FSSPX

INTRODUCTION

- **Last week we discussed the 1962 Missal that the SSPX uses and why we use this Missal**
 - We cannot accept the *Novus Ordo Missæ* (Missal of 1969) because it is not a specifically Catholic rite (i.e. it is amorphous, ambiguous, and intentionally removed and modified the liturgy to eliminate elements that explicitly communicated Catholic truth.
 - As such it is more-or-less a danger to our Faith by omission
 - It is also a danger in that it suggests ideas that undermine the priesthood, the sacrificial nature of the Mass, and the real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.
 - It was not that the Pope could not change the liturgy, but that he could not change it in this way, morally or legitimately, because a discipline/law is for the common good.
 - We also saw that the various “Missals” from 1964–1969 were not official editions and varied from place to place, and were never intended to be permanent fixtures.
 - We also saw that out of obedience to the Pope who can modify the liturgy within certain bounds, we cannot choose something from before the last official edition of the Missal (in 1962).
- **Background**
 - When I first came to Tradition, I attended Mass with an independent priest who would do the pre-1955 Holy Week in its entirety
 - I am one who, if it were up to me, would use the older rites, but at the newer times. So, perhaps a good person to address this subject.
 - I am not going to argue that the pre-1956 was so problematic a reform was absolutely necessary to the degree it was done,
 - Nor am I going to argue that the post-1956 rite was good (or bad) in all of its parts
 - I am not going to argue that we must (on our own authority) go back to the pre-1956.
 - I am going to say that
 - The older is objectively better,
 - The older had some practical issues that should have been addressed to allow better understanding and participation,
 - The change in the time of the liturgy was certainly necessary and good,
 - Even if I think the older is objectively better, until the Church deals with this problem herself, we should keep the post-1956 rite and not act *sui juris*, except that the Church should grant some indulgence.
 - In the meantime, it is certainly worthwhile to study the subject and float ideas for an authentic reform when the Church does come to Her sanity.
 - When we look at these things, we need to steel man (as opposed to straw man) the opposite point of view.

WHY CAN WE NOT ACT SUI JURIS?

- We discussed this a bit in the last episode about the 1962 Missal, so I'd refer viewers and listeners to that discussion.
- Like I said, it would be my preference to do the older Holy Week, 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 restore-the-'54 crowd lauds the pre-1955 for **good reasons**, and laments the changes. (I tend to agree with many of their arguments, though some are specious and fail to steel man the opposing position)
 - **But those who implement it without permission to do so disobey the authority for their personal preferences**
 - Many so-called "independent priests" act *sui juris* and do whatever they feel like, which is the danger of such a position (though sometimes they have be "cancelled" for bad reasons and are "independent" for good reasons, though not all), but they are a law unto themselves, and often have no superior to guide them.
 - But a perfect example of the problem is the FSSP.
 - In 2018, they received a three-year permission from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith to use where the superiors judged prudent the pre-1956 ceremonies.
 - This was a three-year experimental permission.
 - It ended in 2020, without any extension, so there is no longer permission for it, nor is three years (which was intended as temporary) enough to establish a custom *contra legem*.
 - Many FSSP priest have not stopped using the pre-1956 ceremonies (some even modifying the times)
 - In some places where this permission was not used, with the transfer of priests, FSSP priests who had use this permission elsewhere have introduced them well after 2020, even against the will of some bishops.
 - The permission came with the obligation to use the new prayer for the Jews composed by Benedict XVI, but this was often not employed, and still is not.
- The Novus Ordo liturgical abuse crowd does the same for their liberal preferences. We don't get a pass for what we think is "traditional."
- These kind of things confuse the faithful, and unnecessarily create armchair liturgists, who are often want to argue with their pastors and pridefully speak as if they are experts in the field (which they have only read about online).
 - Some (even those who often are heavily involved in the parish normally) will abandon their normal parishes during Holy Week, one of the most liturgically-demanding times, because of their own personal preferences to attend the older forms.
- Some, like Dr. Peter Kwasniewski will argue that comparing the *sui juris* reversion to an older form to the Novus Ordo liturgical abuse crowd is a "false parallel", since even the SSPX does not follow the 1962 books perfectly, and in this case it is restoring a traditional practice, not adding a new practice
 - I'd take issue with the premise because the SSPX does follow the rubrics, and legitimate *præter legem* variations (which have come about for good reasons)
 - But even if this were true, that certain folks don't follow the rubrics 100%, doesn't justify the disobedience of others.

- Such doesn't solve the problem still that doing as we please (even when it involves restoring an older practice) turns liturgy into a personal choice of the priest.
 - 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.
- 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 mostly orthodox Catholic depending on options and what the priest may decide to insert and change.
- The discussion about the differences is fine, though, and a good academic debate, but a few things need to be remembered, which we will try to show:
 - The new Holy Week did not introduce anything which contradicts Faith or Morals
 - Whatever one may think about the prudence of it, it was Pius XII who approved it, knowing what it contained, and he did so for the experimental Vigil in 1951.
 - Many of the changes in 1956 are tied to different rubrical instructions, so, a proper "restoration" needs to take into account the rubric simplifications in 1956 and 1960, and reconcile these.
 - Any "restoration" of the earlier ceremonies needs to deal with the changing of times to move the ceremonies to their correct times (afternoon or evening).
 - At this point in time, this is a fine academic discussion, but when the Barque of Peter is in such a Crisis, it's not the ideal time to argue about the deck chair placement and insist on indults and changes, or start rearranging things ourselves.

THE CHURCH CAN AND HAS CHANGED THE LITURGY

- We also discussed in depth last episode that the Church has the power to, and has changed the liturgy throughout her history, even after 1570 and *Quo Primum*.
- Without needing to revisit that whole discussion, it is worth simply quoting St. Pius X on this point (who is no Modernist).
 - In the episode on Sacred Music, and also on the Participation in the Liturgy, we mentioned the *Votum* of Cardinal Sarto which was a long detailed treatise presented to the Holy See addressing the topic of liturgical reform and in particular Sacred Music.
 - Much of this *Votum* became the *Motu Proprio Tra le Sollecitudini* of St. Pius X, and the related Instruction on Sacred Music.
 - But in general he discusses the changes in the liturgy and when they are legitimate:

*The Holy See has the undeniable right to look after everything which concerns the sacred liturgy. She can modify it, or introduce new things into it which were never used before, or she can find a good substitute for the old ones which have been suppressed or lost ... [however] The Holy See does not approve anything which is clearly contrary to [the] traditions [of the liturgy]. Moreover, she condemns even by name all the abuses and unfitting novelties which are introduced now and then in one or other parts of the sacred liturgy. (Cardinal Giuseppe Sarto, *Votum*, (1893) pt. I.I.)*

- Now, the future Pope probably could not have foreseen that his successor (Paul VI) would approve the Novus Ordo Missæ which is clearly contrary to the traditions of the Church, but he is not here saying that the Pope cannot do something corrupt, rather, that the Holy See (when acting in a sane manner) is bound to approve only what is not contrary to tradition, and must condemn what is unfitting.
- The discussion in the *Votum* is in mainly speaking about Sacred Music, which obviously Cardinal Sarto did think had accumulated much of what was unfitting and contrary to tradition.

- He is simply outlining that a change is illegitimate not because it introduces something new, but when it is contrary to tradition, that is to say, contrary to the Faith.
 - **The Principle of Archbishop Lefebvre**
 - We did mention in the last episode that Archbishop Lefebvre used this same principle to judge that the SSPX must use the 1962 Missal, essentially:
 - What does not directly touch on the Faith or Morals cannot be something on which we have such an objection as to 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.)
- Whatever one may think about the 1956 Holy Week, whether aesthetically, liturgically, symbolically, or practically good or bad, it did not add or remove anything which would touch on the Faith.
 - Even the most objectionable changes (e.g. the "Paschal Mystery" reference on Good Friday) do not undermine or diminish any doctrine.
 - We could object to the new Good Friday prayer for the Jews of Benedict XVI on this grounds, though, and we do, hence the SSPX does not add this.
 - The conclusion is that we cannot simply use the older rites claiming "Tradition!"
 - This is not the case with the Novus Ordo Missæ, which is why we do reject this and disobey on this point.
 - As the Ottaviani Intervention very clearly indicates, the New Mass is a "striking departure" from the Catholic theology about the Mass.
 - But we do not, no matter how much we like it, substitute our own preferences (well-founded as they may be), for the authority.
 - Even Sedevacantists who reject John XXIII have no leg to stand on here, because it was Pius XII who approved the Holy Week changes, personally.
 - If they are contrary to the Faith, then they would seem to have to reject Pius XII as a legitimate Pope, but none (except the most crazy laymen) do.
 - If they are not, even if "tainted" by Fr. Bugnini's work (and they often claim), they are still approved by a Pope, and would argue that a legitimate Pope cannot promulgate a liturgical rite which is harmful to souls.
 - Thus, they are still operating on personal preferences, not obedience to the authority they accept as legitimate.

WHY ANY CHANGES AT ALL?

- We cannot go through a full treatise even in an hour-long podcast, but we can briefly look at what changed and see some reasons given for why it was changed.
- First, let us make a brief comparison of the rites on either side of 1956. This is mostly my own opinion, but I hope I've been able to isolate my biases a bit.
 - **What is better about the pre-1956 rite?**
 - With few exceptions, the older is far more practical (less need for servers and extra ministers, or moving things around, changing vestments, etc.)
 - This is because it had time to develop as an organic whole
 - When something is compiled anew (even from historical sources) several things tend to happen:
 - I. Narrow focus on one thing (e.g. the text of the rite or symbolism) ignoring other practical concerns (e.g. the ease of movement, keeping a large candle lit, need for servers, etc.)

For example :

In the older Good Friday rite, the veiled cross and candles were already on the altar (only the linens were stripped), so the transition to the adoration of the Cross from the solemn prayers of the faithful was natural without leaving the sanctuary.

Now, because the cross is stripped off the altar with candles on Maundy Thursday, it must be brought in in procession, which requires extra servers and movements

2. Blindness to the “Chesterton Principle” of seeing something we do not understand, and eliminating it because it seems superfluous or not congruous with the .

For example :

At the Paschal Vigil it was thought by the reformers looking at the rite at the fire, that the Paschal Candle which is a central element is never actually blessed because it sat inside the Church, and the priest never pronounced words over it. Thus they created a new rite in which it is blessed outside and brought in.

Historically, though, the Church did grant certain powers of blessing to the deacon (bread and new fruits, and to bless people like a priest after giving Communion). For a long time, the Præconium or Exultet sung by the deacon was considered a solemn blessing, since he inserted the grains of incense, and brought the blessed fire to the candle within the singing of a Preface (which is the way that the Easter Water is blessed, a Church consecrated, candidates for Order ordained, etc.)

The rubrics from the missal even say after this Preface “The blessing of the Pascal candle being completed, the deacon takes off his white vestments ...”

3. Forgetting that there are differences throughout the Church in how the liturgy is celebrated

For example : The rites for a parish where there will be baptisms should not be the same as the rite at a monastery where there should not normally be baptisms.

The rite at a monastery or Cathedral where there would be Canons often can be longer and more involved than a small country parish, and there were already variations in the older rites (the Memoriale Rituum was promulgated by the Holy See specifically for this purpose)

- The symbolism and logic of the older ceremonies make more sense, and follow a more understandable thread.

- **What was problematic about the pre-1956 rite?**
 - There are three major areas for complaint about the pre-1956 Holy Week, worth revision or at least addressing (because they made the ceremonies poorly attended and poorly understood)
 - The timing of the ceremonies (morning versus evening)
 - This came about most likely from the anticipation of Vespers, then the whole Office during Lent.
 - It was already being done by the 9th century, and there were several efforts to reform this in the 10th century.
 - Monks did not break their fast until after Vespers, so moved Vespers to just after noon
 - This is why Matins and Lauds were anticipated the evening before and became Tenebræ
 - Since Mass never occurred after Vespers (which ends the liturgical day) Mass became restricted to the morning, and the various ceremonies consider “Mass” were moved to the morning
 - Eventually Pope St. Pius V in 1566 restrict Mass to the morning throughout the year
 - As a result the Easter Vigil eventually was celebrated on Saturday morning.
 - Also, the timing made attendance by many effectively impossible.
 - The length of certain ceremonies
 - The Vigil ceremony with 12 prophecies (especially for smaller churches) is difficult to perform
 - The Cathedral Mass on Maundy Thursday would include the translation of the SSMM, the Blessing of the Oils, and make this ceremony extremely long and poorly attended, even by priests who needed to care for their parishes, and say Mass that day.
 - Simply changing the times introduces a few problems
 - The complication of blessing the Holy Oils at Mass, should the Maundy Thursday Mass be moved to the evening (and previously there was a Chrismal Mass separate from the evening Mass)
 - The Vigil included a section substituting for Easter Eve’s Vespers, does not make sense with a midnight vigil as Vespers was already said.
 - Changing the times also interferes with Tenebræ, and this then interferes with the morning ceremonies at the Cathedral.
 - So, any time changes need to also modify the rites at least somewhat.
 - Some of the changes are simply to accommodate the times, but indeed, the reformers took the chance to introduce more than just simplifications.
 - Some of these could be objectionable, but none are issues of the Faith
 - They simply are dangerous open doors to acclimatization to change (if the Pope can change this so easily...)
 - All that said, even if one thinks some or all of the changes imprudent, impoverished, or regrettable:
 - They were approved by Pius XII, personally,
 - They were not done in view of the *Novus Ordo Missæ* (or its principles),
 - None are a question of something unorthodox, or diminishing the Faith

THE BUGNINI PROBLEM

- Again, we mentioned Fr. Bugnini in the last episode at length, and don't want to extend this too much here, but he is often claimed to be the author of the 1956 Holy Week, and some reject it on this basis.
 - It is true that from 1948 he Secretary of the Papal Commission (*Commissio Piana*) to study and suggest things for a possible general reform of the liturgy.
 - The Secretary of such a Commission simply compiles the materials to be addressed and communicates this.
 - The Prefect (usually a Cardinal or Archbishop) is the one who reports to the Pope directly.
 - These Commissions often have many members.
 - It is also true that he will later become infamous (among traditionalists) from his work on the *Consilium* (*Consilium ad Exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgia*) and that the Novus Ordo Mass is very much his brainchild.
 - It is also true that in his quasi-autobiography *La Riforma Liturgica* he makes grand claims about all of the changes from 1950 to the Novus Ordo Mass being principally brought about by himself and Fr. Carlo Braga.
 - Much of his claim recounts in the 3rd person his role as editor-in-chief of *Ephemerides Liturgiæ* and a survey he sent out to solicit ideas for liturgical reforms.
 - The articles that analyzed these responses, more-or-less imitated the *Memoria* of the Historical Section Bugnini had already read
 - Effectively, it seems he tried to label himself through his publications as a great influencer, whereas he was engaging in academic dishonesty.
 - Also, Fr. Braga did not join the Pian Commission until late and attended only 4 meetings.
 - Later in *Ephemerides Liturgiæ* Bugnini and Braga wrote commentary on the changes of Holy Week, and would claim that these were critical in moving the changes along
 - But they had access to the report of the Historical Section, so were essentially paraphrasing or plagiarizing this and adding their own spin in their texts.
 - Based on more recently available evidence, especially a biography by Yves Chiron, and the memoirs of Cardinal Ferdnando Antonelli, Bugnini's claims on his influence seems to be a bald-faced lie.
 - He seems to have been a young priest, knowledgeable about pastoral liturgy, and good at organizing things, appointed Secretary of the Commission, and who had relatively little direct influence, an external forum to promote himself, and tried to patch up his own image after the fact.
 - The majority of the changes up to 1962 are based on Antonelli's work (along with others) at the Congregation for Sacred Rites' Historical Section, which since 1930 had been developing a broad historical treatise on the development of the Roman Rite, along with suggestions for a General Reform (*Memoria sulla Riforma Liturgica*)
 - Bugnini had almost nothing to do with this Historical Section or the report it generated.
 - His only role (as he was not a member), was copy editing on the drafts of the report, and producing an analytical index.
 - He made no textual contributions to the *Memoria*.
 - Later along in his book, Bugnini tries to wipe his adversary, Cardinal Antonelli from any involvement with the *Memoria*, attributing the work to Antonelli's assistant, Fr. Joseph Löw (despite it being signed by Antonelli).

- This despite, Bugnini's speech at Antonelli's consecration banquet in which he praised Antonelli's leadership role in drafting the *Memoria*.
 - Minutes of the *Commissio Piana* show very little influence from Bugnini.
- In short : Good historical evidence from more recent study, shows that changes from 1950-1962 are not from "Bugnini" nor bear much if any of his influence. **They are certainly not done in view of the Novus Ordo**, and any similarities are material in nature, only, not formally comparable.
 - (This from someone who likes the older rites ... "But Bugnini" is just a bad argument.)
 - Many of the critiques of the changes (even when they are very good) tend to start from a Bugnini-bias (*Post-hoc, ergo propter hoc* or *correlation-causation* fallacy)
 - Essentially : "The reformers were bad folks with bad motives as shown by the Novus Ordo they published later."
 - For example Gregory DiPippo (who has written a whole series in 2009 which is very valuable, but obviously biased towards proving some evil motives) wrote: "The people who did the reforming had no interest whatsoever in 'returning' to ancient traditions or maintaining them. They decided beforehand what they were going to do, and then found an excuse to do it in "ancient" sources."
 - They do not presume that imprudent changes by men who thought they were doing something good, which then were the opening for people to do actually evil things later. (Charitable default).
 - I'm not saying that solid critiques like Mr. DiPippo's are not welcome. I often agree with much of what he and others say, but
 - We cannot simply look at everything that changes as having origins in some guile-filled effort to undermine the Faith and move towards the Novus Ordo.

THE EASTER VIGIL REFORM

- **The major push for a more immediate reform of the Easter Vigil came to a head in 1950.**
 - The French and German Bishops, collectively, sent a petition to Pius XII asking for permission to move the Holy Week ceremonies to the evening. Their main reason was :

The ceremonies are celebrated without any faithful assisting.

Many priests, especially in cities and suburbs, who care for souls, and also not a few faithful who are active in Catholic Action, have repeatedly sent their Ordinaries requests that the various ceremonies be celebrated later in the evening or even at night because as they are unable to attend due to work.
 - For over 300 years, the Triduum was neither a day of obligation, nor a work holiday, so people often were obliged to work on these days.
 - This reasoning was also the major reason Pius XII would in 1953, grant permission for Masses after noon and rescind the prohibition of Pope St. Pius V.
 - The Cardinal Secretary of State in December 1950 passed these concerns to the SRC (and Commission) with the Holy Father saying he wished to concede this permission, but for that, certain parts of the rites needed to be changed to accommodate the evening ceremonies.
 - It was decided to begin with the Easter Vigil, since this was the most notably displaced ceremony.
- What did the older rite look like as compared with the newer?

[See PowerPoint slides for Paschal Vigil]

- Now, these changes discuss the *material* differences
 - The *Novus Ordo* and TLM are materially similar on certain points, too.
 - The question is rather, the *formal* and *final* aspect:
 - Do they change the meaning of the rite?
 - Do they change the purpose of the rite?
 - What were the intentions of the reformers?
 - Looking quickly at the *Novus Ordo*:
 - The changes do change the meaning of the rite (as Card. Ottaviani wrote)
 - The purpose is different (and humanistic, not about a Sacrifice offered to God)
 - The intention is to reduce the Catholicity of the Mass to a Protestant-style rite.
- What about the Paschal Vigil rite changes:
 - Do any changes change the meaning of the rite? No.
 - Do they change the purpose of the rite? No.
 - What were the intentions of the reformers :
 - The Principles that guided the reform of the Easter Vigil are stated by the Pian Commission itself :
 1. Retain everything belonging to the primitive rite found in the best tradition;
 2. Revive important element, which had been lost or modified, or those that became deformed;
 3. Restore the liturgical action of the Paschal candle and its position of material and symbolic centrality;
 4. Ensure that the people are able to follow the liturgical action consciously and actively rather than as passive spectators.
- Explaining the changes using Cardinal Antonelli's own descriptions and the notes of the Pian Commission:
 - The Reduction of the Blessing of the New Fire: Only one prayer because the second was a later addition from another tradition, and the third does not actually bless anything.
 - The use of the Paschal Candle to bring in the new fire and the marking of it were a restoration of the older practice
 - It was only when candles became so large that they could not be moved by the deacon that another candle was added, and the fire brought to the Paschal candle.
 - They do not mention the change in the deacon's role, however.
 - The Prophecies are treated as part of the Baptismal rite preparations, thus retained are:
 - The Creation narrative,
 - The Crossing of the Red Sea which was a symbol of baptism;
 - The joy of the Messianic Kingdom as told by Isaias, and the canticle of the vine,
 - The witness of Moses, being an admonition to fidelity to Baptism.
 - Since the prophecies were not part of any Mass, or even a "dry Mass" the use of the chasuble seemed out of place (and a needless changing of clothing).
 - Further, since there was a desire to remove the duplication of duties (the priest reading everything at the altar the minister sang or read) the priest remained at the sedilia (as a bishop remains at his throne).
 - Why a reduction to four? The group felt that most churches simply could not do all of these, especially when the duties fall on a single priest.
 - The number varied over the years, but at the time of St. Gregory the Great to the 12th century, the four that were retained were used, only later were others added.

- The Dominican Rite (1939) has only four.
 - The division of the litany follows the usage of the Middle Ages mention by Durandus with one part before and the second after the blessing of the font.
 - The change in location of the preparation of Baptismal Water was purely pastoral, so it could be seen, and while the original rite spoke of the “blessing of the font”, in fact this was always the blessing of Baptismal Water, not the physical font.
 - The renewal of Baptismal Promises is admittedly an innovation, though the motives expressed were to unite the elements of the Vigil ceremony and help focus attention on the theme of Baptism incorporating us into Christ’s Death and Resurrection.
 - Originally, the plan was to eliminate the Pro Vesperis entirely, and simply retain the antiphon as the Communion antiphon, but later it was decided to imitate the original rite.
- It was personally-approved by Pius XII, and permitted for use in 1951.

PALM SUNDAY

- **The principle changes to Palm Sunday are:**
 - A shortened ceremony for the Procession
 - The use of red vestments instead of purple during the Procession.
 - The shortening of the Passion narrative to remove the Last Supper and the Burial.
- What did the older rite look like as compared with the newer?

[See PowerPoint slide 10 for Palm Sunday]

- The Palm Ceremony
 - The Procession is very ancient (4th century) but did not enter the Roman liturgy until the 10th century.
 - The former rite for the blessing uses a Gallican source from the 8th century (*Bobbio Missal*)
 - This blessing first enters the Roman liturgy in the 12th century (in a reduced form from the *Bobbio Missal*)
 - The pre-1956 rite in it’s entirety is found in the Missal used by the Roman Curia in the 14th century (which was the one revised for publication in 1570).
 - The Gallican procession was made in honor of Christ the King, but later lost this character (due to the influence of Passion Plays) and became focused on the historical entry of Christ.
 - The argument of the reformers is that :
 - The Procession is the most important element, and so the long blessings which are not Roman in origin should be shortened.
 - The prayers were originally claimed to be options, and then all were said.
 - The character of a dry Mass is not a Roman liturgical practice.
 - The emphasis of the Procession should be on the Messianic King, not as much on the palms.
 - The use of Red was supposed to correspond to with the Royal Purple
 - Violet (liturgical color) is not Purple
 - Red is not really a royal color, though it is the Papal color.

[See PowerPoint slide 11 for Palm Sunday]

- Why look at the 1939 Dominican Rite?
 - Many of the what people who prefer the pre-1956 Holy Week will decry as “novelties” or “revolutionary” are not novel

- For example, often Palm Sunday and Good Friday is critiqued for the changing of colors as “novel” but
 - 1939 Dominican Rite Palm Sunday switched from white to violet.
 - Pre-1960 Candlemas switched colors between Procession and Mass.
 - Baptism changes from Violet to White
- The shortening of the Passion
 - There seems no good reason to truncate the full Paschal aspect of the Passion, but the argument was that since the focus is on the suffering and death of Christ.
 - There are some theological problems here, but not yet harmful to the Faith.

MAUNDY THURSDAY

- **The principle changes to Maundy Thursday are:**
 - The moving of the *Missa in Cena Domini* to the evening (after 4 pm)
 - The construction of a Chrismal Mass for the morning from older texts.
 - The inclusion of the Mandatum (an evening choir ceremony) optionally within the Vespereal Mass.
 - The fixing of a midnight end to adoration at the altar of repose.
- What did the older rite look like as compared with the newer?
[See PowerPoint slide 12 for Palm Sunday]
- Few critics object to anything of Maundy Thursday except a change with regard to Good Friday (and is best addressed then), because there were few changes
 - Omission of the Creed
 - Agnus Dei : third *miserere nobis*
 - Omission of the First prayer after Agnus Dei (Domine ... pacem) because the Kiss of Peace is omitted.
 - Benedicamus Domino on account of the Procession and continuation of the liturgy into Friday
 - In a sense, this is a more theologically correct practice, because the Last Supper, Crucifixion, and Resurrection form a unity in view of the Passover Sacrifice.
 - Christ ends the Passover by not completing the ceremony at the Last Supper, but instead substituting Himself, and “drinking” the fourth cup in His Crucifixion (then later in heaven after His Ascension).

GOOD FRIDAY

- **This is one of the most significantly changed rites apart from the Vigil, though on the surface it seems textually similar**
 - The altar is stripped bare, even of candles and crucifix.
 - Previously the candle and crucifix would remain
 - All linens and the antependium were stripped away
 - At the beginning of the Good Friday rite an altar cloth was placed on the mensa
 - A new prayer (absent in the older rite) is sung after the prostration
 - The idea of a Mass of the Presanctified (a “Mass” where there is no consecration, but previously consecrated hosts are used—an Eastern custom on penitential days—is eliminated so the chasuble is not used until communion.
 - The elimination of the use of incense
 - The simplification of the transfer of the Blessed Sacrament
 - Communion of the Faithful
 - The addition of three prayers after Communion

- What did the older rite look like as compared with the newer?
 - [See PowerPoint slide 13 for Palm Sunday]
- Most of the criticism here surrounds the changing of vestments and what seems like the elimination of the Mass of the Presanctified.
 - Vestments were also frequently changed in the older rite (there are fewer changes in the new)
 - The priest uses a black chasuble, and the major ministers folded chasubles to begin
 - The SD removes his folded chasuble for the second (or 1st) lesson, then puts it back on
 - For the Passion (if there are not an extra 3 deacons), SD removes his folded chasuble puts on a stole, and D removes his folded chasuble and wears only a stole
 - Just before the end of the Passion, SD puts on his folded chasuble again, and D puts on the broad stole over his stole, and then D sings the remainder like a Gospel
 - C and SD remove chasubles for the adoration of the cross
 - SD resumes chasuble for Mass of the Presanctified.
- The Mass of the Presanctified is reduced/eliminated, but not much more than other Latin rites had been (like the Dominican)
 - The 1939 Dominican rite follows the pre-1956 rite exactly until the Mass of the Presanctified.
 - After retrieving the host, the prayers are the same as with the new rite (there is no offertory, nor incensation of the altar) but the prayers begin with the *Pater Noster*
 - The difference with the new is that in the new wine is used in a chalice, the *Pater Noster* can be recited by all, there is Communion for all the faithful, and the three additional postcommunion prayers.
 - Why look at the 1939 Dominican Rite?
 - Many of the what people who prefer the pre-1955 Holy Week will decry as “novelties” or “revolutionary” are not novel
 - For example, often Palm Sunday and Good Friday is critiqued for the changing of colors as “novel” but
 - 1939 Dominican Rite Palm Sunday switched from white to violet.
 - Pre-1960 Candlemas switched colors between Procession and Mass.
 - Whether it was suitable to manufacture the post-1955 rite is a prudential questions, not a doctrinal question, but
 - The point is, these are not matters on which Faith or Morals is undermined (unless one wants to say that the 1939 Dominican rite is contrary to Faith and Morals)
 - It’s not.

OBJECTION : THE SSPX HOLY WEEK RITES ARE NOT 1962

- First, **this is true**, that if you attend the SSPX for Holy Week you will see a **few** differences from what you may read in a 1962 hand missal, but it will be substantially the same.
- We use the 1956 OHS (the only OHS that was published) out of practicality.
- **Most of these differences are retaining some practice præter legem.**
 - They are not *contrary* to the rubrics, but *beyond*.
 - The rubrics are silent on these things, or they could allow them.
 - **Palm Sunday** : We retain the old custom of knocking on the door with the cross during the *Gloria Laus*.
 - The 1955 rites instruct this to be done.

- 1956 OHS **omits** instruction. It neither prohibits, nor instruct it be done.
 - Instead the *Gloria Laus* is one of many *optional* antiphons and hymns included in the *Graduale* with, the rubric saying other hymns, even in the vernacular may be used.
 - Saving the *Gloria Laus* for when the crowd returns, and while doing so, knocking on the doors, does not interfere with the rite as presented in the OHS at all, and keeps the spirit of the Church.
- Doing this is no different than adding an outside altar during a procession with the Blessed Sacrament
 - This is not commanded, nor forbidden, but entirely outside of the rubrics for Corpus Christi or Christ the King.
 - One interrupts a procession (where the *Graduale* provides music, but mandates only one, just as on Palm Sunday), and adds in a much more extensive para-liturgical ceremony (Benediction).
- **Maundy Thursday** : The SSPX follows the rite precisely as given in the post-1955 OHS/Missal including the omission of the Second Confiteor.
- **Good Friday**: The SSPX uses the post-1955 OHS/Missal exactly, except one point : We retain the *Oremus* and *Flectamus genua* at the prayer for the Jews added under Pius XII, but do not keep the textual change requested by John XXIII.
 - Why was the genuflection added?
 - First, it's **not a genuflection** at least like we do towards the SSMM, cross, etc. (this is a gesture of honor to God)
 - What is the purpose of these *flectamus genua* in the liturgy?
 - It is a penitential, personal gesture of prayer. *NB* this difference.
 - Typically, it comes after the celebrant introduces a topic, suggesting prayers be offered for this purpose
 - Common on Ember Wednesday and Saturday (but the introductory part is now missing.
 - Done in the preparatory admonitions and prayers before various Ordinations, where all are invited to pray for those to be ordained
 - Done in the consecration of churches and altars, etc.

Dearest brethren, let us humbly entreat Almighty God that He would bless and guard this dwelling, repel darkness far from it, pour light into it, and permit the raging adversary no power, but that rather this be God's own house so that the enemy should have no permission to do harm herein.

Oremus. Flectamus Genua. Levate. (Collect prayer)

- It was the ancient form of the "Prayers of the Faithful" which exist only on Good Friday, and of which the "Oremus" at the Offertory is a remnant..
- The reason we confuse this *flectamus genua* act with genuflection, is often because priests do not properly execute this gesture or follow the rubrics, and simply say all quickly, without any break between them.
 - The Roman Liturgy doesn't add random genuflections or actions
 - So whenever we see what looks superfluous (like a random genuflection before a prayer), we need to ask for a reason.
 - Here, it is to provide time for personal prayer united to common prayer:

- After the celebrant presents the topic for prayer, the deacon invites the faithful to kneel for a time in order to offer their own prayers,
 - Then after a short time (the rubrics do not say how long, but parallel rubrics suggest *Aves*, *Paters*, or *Misereres*),
- The subdeacon (post-1960 the deacon) invites all to rise, and pray together via the priest as *ecclesia collecta*, the gathered church, (from where we get the “Collect” prayer), uniting all their individual prayers to his, thus this is the Body of Christ praying to the Father.
- Pius XII approved the change which adds this *fectamus genua*.
- It seems to have been the practice prior to about 800. (n.b. antiquarianism)
- Some claim it was because of sensitivity towards the Jews, but there is no evidence for this being the reason, most who object simply state this claim without citation of any evidence of this.
- Some (even experts) claim that we do not genuflect, because the Jews did in mocking Our Lord (even Dom Guéranger says this), but the Scriptures don’t record this happening:
 - The Jews mock Christ, but never do so by genuflection in the Scriptures,
 - Only the Roman Soldiers (for whom genuflection was a regular gesture) are unambiguously seen to be genuflecting in mockery of Christ as King, yet we do not omit the genuflection at the prayer for the pagans.
- In short, while it may be seen as novel (not done from 9th-mid-20th cent) and for this reason, objectionable, it is not a matter of the Faith.
- It is a prudential question, and it could be said to be possibly scandalous to add it if understood as a genuflection, but that is not what the *fectamus genua* is
- Why was the text changed?
 - Several requests since the 1920s had been made to Popes, but none agreed to do so, even Pius XII (who was asked to do this by Eugenio Zolli)
 - John XXIII did so *sui juris* without any explanation or reason.
 - One request argued that “the prayer is now being abused as an argument for anti-Semitism.”
 - The Holy Office examined the requests, and said it was not a question of doctrine or Faith, but was imprudent for several reasons:
 - The prayer was very ancient
 - If liturgical changes were made when private individuals or organizations requested changes, there was no limiting principle
 - “Perfidis” in Latin means a breach of contract/covenant, not “treacherous” and God Himself accuses the Jews of this frequently
 - Pope St. Pius V was not anti-Jewish
 - The Jews who remained faithless (according to St. Matthew) took responsibility for the crucifixion of Christ.
 - In fact, removing this word “perfidis” makes the prayer, in fact, more anti-Jewish than retaining it.

- Many of the Jewish race have converted, in fact most of the first disciples and Apostles were racially Jews. *They were not faithless, but continued into the True Religion.*
- The Pharisees and *those who kept the Jewish religion* have not converted and *are faithless*, because they keep an imperfect religion that by its profession rejects the Messiah who has already come to bring the perfection of the True Religion.
- The prayer is for the *faithless* to reject their faithlessness, to see Christ as the fulfilment of their now-false religion. It is not for the faithful Jews who already have, and praying without that term, makes the prayer ambiguous, possibly suggesting that the Jews who have converted are somehow second-class Christians yet somehow unconverted in some way.
- The change in the words touches on Ecclesiology and Veracity, even if it does not directly undermine a doctrine.

SUMMARY

- The SSPX keeps, *grosso modo*, the 1956 OHS, that is to say, the last official edition of the OHS that was actually published.
 - Certain changes were made in 1960 and 1961, but these were only later incorporated, at the time of the founding of the SSPX, such editions were not readily available.
 - The only change John XXIII asked for in changing the text of the prayer for the Jews, we do not keep, for several reasons we have mentioned above, namely, to ensure the prayer is truthful and accurate, and not a slander to those Jews who have converted.
- We do retain certain older practices, but not contrary to any rubrics, rather the rubrics allow these.
- The changes to Holy Week are sometimes quite clunky, and perhaps ill-advised, but
 - Pius XII approved them,
 - None touch on any aspect of the Faith (principle of Archbishop Lefebvre)
 - As much as we might like them, it is for the Church authority to allow them, or modify them.
 - Right now, for the sake of unity and discipline, the SSPX does not authorize their use.
- In the future, I certainly hope that good academic research is used to generate some authentic reform that returns some of the elements that were removed, and perhaps allows options for shorter ceremonies outside of larger churches (like on Ember Saturdays).