of those who desire to attend this Mass do so not because of a mere preference, or resistance to change, or nostalgia, but because they are cognizant of the superiority of the old Mass. They do not base their conclusions on preferences or feelings, but on objective truths.

Their desire for the Traditional Mass may have been influenced by the poor fruits of the New Rite of Mass over the past several decades* - by their fruits you shall know them (Mt. 7:16) - such as a huge drop in Mass attendance, widespread loss of belief in the Real Presence, greatly reduced reverence, significantly fewer conversions, widespread loss of faith, etc., by the many liturgical abuses common to the New Mass, or by concerns of high-ranking prelates, such as Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci who stated that:

> "[T]he Novus Ordo Missae - considering the new elements, susceptible of widely differing evaluation, which appear to be implied or taken for granted - represents, as a whole and in detail, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent, which, by fixing definitively the 'canons' of the rite, erected an insurmountable barrier against any heresy which might attack the integrity of the Mystery."
>
> And: "[T]he new liturgy will delight all those groups hovering on the verge of apostasy who, during a spiritual crisis without precedent, now wreak havoc in the Church by poisoning Her organism and by undermining Her unity in doctrine, worship, morals and discipline."
>
> And: "To abandon a liturgical tradition which for four centuries stood as a sign and pledge of unity in worship, and to replace it with another liturgy which, due to the countless liberties it implicitly authorizes, cannot but be a sign of division - a liturgy which teems with insinuations or manifest errors against the integrity of the Catholic Faith - is, we feel bound in conscience to proclaim, an incalculable error."
>
> And: "We have limited ourselves above to a short study of the Novus Ordo where it deviates most seriously from the theology of the Catholic Mass. Our observations touch upon deviations which are typical. To prepare a complete study of all the pitfalls, dangers and psychologically and spiritually destructive elements the new rite contains, whether in texts, rubrics or instructions, would be a vast undertaking."

Note that Cardinal Ottaviani had "formerly headed the Vatican's Holy Office, which had the charge of protecting the integrity of the Catholic Faith".

Or, they may have come to the realization after learning how closely the New Mass parallels Protestant 'worship services' or by discovering that the changes incorporated into the New Mass parallel the changes made by the 16th century *Protest*-ant 'Reformers' who purposely instituted those changes to destroy the belief of Catholics. They may be troubled by the unprecedented fabrication of a Mass by men in the 1960's and that its creation was influenced by Protestant 'observers' - and that the person in charge of the New Mass' creation was a suspected Freemason. Perhaps they are troubled by the unprecedented manner in which the New Mass was imposed on the faithful and by the fact that the New Mass is now acceptable to many Protestants - always fierce opponents of the Mass - and that some Protestants have even used the New Mass in their own 'churches'. Perhaps they were troubled by the fact that those responsible for the creation of the New Mass stripped the prayers of the traditional rite of Mass of nearly all 'negative topics' (e.g. sin, judgment, hell, purgatory) and nearly all reference to the supernatural and to the Mass being a sacrifice. Or perhaps they have simply come to believe that God is more pleased with a Mass - the true re-presentation of Calvary - that is wholly focused on God, rather than one that seems to focus on our neighbor and 'self-affirmation'.

It is clear that the desire for the Traditional Latin ('Tridentine') Mass has much deeper roots than a simple preference or personal opinion, but it instead is based on objective truths. In fact, it seems well-nigh impossible that an honest, well-informed Catholic could successfully argue the superiority of the new rite of Mass over the old rite. Even if one was to ignore the decades of bad fruits associated with the new rite of Mass*, the differences between the two rites speak for themselves. *Note: For more on the various differences, refer to MyCatholicSource.com.*

** Note: This refers to the new rite as compared to the old rite, of course, and does not in any way refer to the Sacrament, which is the same in both Masses*

Myths / Clarifications

Unfortunately, many myths, misconceptions, and errors abound concerning the Traditional Latin Mass. The following is a brief attempt to address some of the more well-known myths / misconceptions / errors.

Error: The Traditional Latin Mass (and the Traditional Rites For the Other Sacraments) Was/Were Abrogated

Facts: In 1986, under Pope John Paul II, a commission of nine cardinals (including Cardinal Stickler and Cardinal Ratzinger, the future Pope Benedict XVI) voted unanimously that the 'Tridentine' Mass was never abrogated. According to Cardinal Stickler, "the answers given by the nine Cardinals in 1986 was 'No, the Mass of Saint Pius V (the 'Tridentine' Mass) has never been suppressed." The commission also determined that priests have the right to say the Traditional Mass (Cardinal Sticker said that "the nine Cardinals unanimously agreed that no bishop may forbid a Catholic priest from saying the Tridentine Mass"). Further, it has been widely reported that Pope Paul VI, the pope who imposed the Mass, told a priest that "Certainly, I never forbade celebration of the old Mass; I have only offered an alternative."

As Cardinal Ratzinger (the future Pope Benedict XVI) has said: "It is good to recall here what Cardinal Newman observed, *that the Church, throughout her history, has never abolished or forbidden orthodox liturgical forms. [To do so] would be quite alien to the Spirit of the Church.* An orthodox liturgy [is] one which expresses the true faith.... The authority of the Church has the power to define and limit the use of such rites in different historical situations, but she never just purely and simply forbids them! *Thus the [Second Vatican] Council ordered a reform of the liturgical books, but it did not prohibit the use of the previous books.*" (emphasis added)

Note that there are, at present, entire orders dedicated to the traditional rite and even an entire traditional diocese. And, especially note that on 7/7/07 Pope Benedict XVI (after "much reflection, numerous consultations, and prayer", and "having reflected deeply upon all aspects of the question, invoked the Holy Spirit and trusting in the help of God") issued his long-awaited Motu Proprio, 'Summorum Pontificum' along with an explanatory letter. Among other things, these documents admit that the traditional Latin Mass was "never abrogated" (and was "always permitted"). This Motu Proprio further states that *all* Sacraments may be received according to their traditional rites by those who request them.

Error: Attending the Traditional Latin Mass is Disobedient

Facts: The 'Tridentine' Mass has NOT been abrogated or forbidden! Attending licit 'Tridentine' masses is in NO WAY disobedient! Pope John Paul II called the desire for the Traditional Mass a "rightful aspiration", deserving of respect. Pope Benedict XVI formally acknowledged the priests' right to say the Mass and the laity's right to attend. He stated that the Traditional Latin Mass was "never abrogated" (and was "always permitted") and said that "What earlier generations held as sacred remains sacred and great for us too, and it cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful. It behooves all of us to preserve the riches which have developed in the Church's faith and prayer, and to give them their proper place." Even the Second Vatican Council states that all lawful rites should be fostered: "Finally, in faithful obedience to tradition, the sacred Council declares that *Holy Mother Church holds all lawfully recognized rites to be of equal right and dignity; that she wishes to preserve them in the future and to foster them in every way.*" (Second Vatican Council, Sacrosanctum Concilium, The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, December 4, 1963, emphasis added) And finally, the "Perpetual Indult" of Pope St. Pius V:

> "Let all everywhere adopt and observe what has been handed down by the Holy Roman Church, the Mother and Teacher of the other churches, and *let Masses not be sung or read according to any other formula than that of this [traditional, the so-called 'Tridentine'] Missal published by Us. This ordinance applies henceforth, now, and forever, throughout all the provinces of the Christian world*;.. This Missal is to be used by all churches, even by those which in their authorization are made exempt, whether by Apostolic indult, custom, or privilege, or even if by oath or official confirmation of the Holy See, or have their rights and faculties guaranteed to them by any other manner whatsoever... whereas, by *this present Constitution, which will be valid henceforth, now, and forever*, We order and enjoin that nothing must be added to Our recently published Missal, nothing omitted from it, nor anything whatsoever be changed within it under the penalty of Our displeasure... Furthermore, by these presents [this law], *in virtue of Our Apostolic authority, We grant and concede in perpetuity that, for the chanting or reading of the Mass in any church whatsoever, this Missal is hereafter to be followed absolutely, without any scruple of conscience or fear of incurring any penalty, judgment, or censure, and may freely and lawfully be used*. Nor are superiors, administrators, canons, chaplains, and other secular priests, or religious, of whatever title designated, obliged to celebrate the Mass otherwise than as enjoined by Us. We likewise declare and ordain that no one whosoever is forced or coerced to alter this Missal, and *that this present document cannot be revoked or modified, but remain always valid and retain its full force*... Therefore, *no one whosoever is permitted to alter this notice of Our permission, statute, ordinance, command, precept, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree, and prohibition. Should [anyone venture to do so, let him] know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.*" (Pope St. Pius V, Quo Primum, emphasis added)

(C) Copyright 2007, B.F.S. Permission granted to print and copy for non-commercial purposes (copyright notice must remain).

Myth/Error: The Latin Mass is Hard to Understand / People Don't Understand the Latin Mass

This is obviously untrue as proven by history. Remember that Catholics of all ages have understood this Mass for hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of years - even though many were illiterate, many were uneducated, few spoke Latin, etc. In fact, it can be argued that those who lived in previous generations understood the traditional Latin Mass even better (even though they may not have understood the language) than most Catholics today understand the 'modern' Mass - even though the 'modern' Mass is said in their native language! This is easily proven by the fact that recent studies have shown that close to 2/3 of Catholics no longer believe in the Real Presence! Not only is this a chief tenet of our faith, but failure to believe in it has serious consequences. As St. Paul warns in 1 Cor. 11:29: "For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment on himself." Obviously this an important truth of our faith that must be understood! Prior to the imposition of the Novus Ordo Mass, most all Catholics understood and believed in the Real Presence. As Bishop Hedley explains, "As for the people, it is abundantly possible for them to understand and follow the [Traditional Latin] Mass without either knowing Latin or possessing minute knowledge of the ceremonies. The Mass has broad features, which are easily brought within the comprehension of the least cultivated minds. It is easy to make the faithful realize what is the central point of the Mass - the consecration of Our Lord's Body and Blood." Sadly, many people who attend Novus Ordo Masses think the 'sign of peace' is the focal point of Mass.

It is clear that today's dire situation regarding lack of belief in the Real Presence is directly related to the many novelties in the Novus Ordo Mass, such as: Self-communicating (Communion in the hand), lay 'ministers', Communion received while standing, reduced signs of reverence towards the Holy Eucharist, demotion of the Tabernacle in many churches, texts in Mass that appear to deny the Real Presence (e.g. saying "Christ *will* come again" right after Christ is truly made present on the altar, the formula of consecration recited as a narrative, etc.), etc. In contrast, in the Traditional Latin Mass, the words, the sounds, the incense, the reverent silence, the behavior of the priest, the respect shown for the Holy Eucharist, etc. all help contribute to the ability of persons to distinguish the Body & Blood of the Lord in the Holy Eucharist.

Myth: You Need to Know Latin to Understand the Traditional Latin Mass

Again, this is untrue. Catholics of all nationalalites have heard - and understood - Mass *for most of the life of the Church* in Latin (even though many were not fluent in the language). It is easy to follow along in a Missal (which contains both Latin and English, and note that the priest usually reads the Gospel and Epistle in the native language just before giving the sermon (also in the native language). Further, after attending the 'Tridentine' Mass for a while, it becomes easy to understand what occurs in the Mass. In a short while, like so many others, you may come to have a deep appreciation for the glorious and majestic Latin language - "the language of heaven". Also, note that Jesus would have similarly used a 'dead language' (Hebrew) at the Last Supper - even though it was not the language commonly spoken by the populace.

Finally, note that once you understand some of the reasons why it is fitting that the Mass be said in the majestic Latin language (e.g. preservation of unity, creation of a sacred atmosphere, helps the Church maintain control, safeguards purity of doctrine, allows Catholics to "pray in one voice", eliminates the necessity for special Masses for those who speak different languages, connects us with our Catholic ancestors, ties us with the universal Church, spares the Church the trouble and expense of creating and constantly updating hundreds and hundreds of translations into the vernacular, etc.), you may begin to better appreciate this precious language. Remember also that the Church's enemies - both the Devil and the 'Reformers' - have expressed a hatred for the Latin language! Sometimes it is good to learn from one's enemies!

> *"In the attempt to suppress the Latin language of the liturgy and to replace it by the vernacular, there was a more or less premeditated scheme to undermine Catholic unity, to loosen the bond of union with Rome, to weaken the Catholic spirit, to destroy the humility and simplicity of the faith. Therefore, the Apostolic See at all times most persistently and inflexibly resisted such innovations; for it is an invariable principle of the Church never to alter the ancient liturgical language, but inviolably to adhere to it, even though it be no longer the [language spoken by the people]" (Gihr)*

Misconception: People Don't Participate in the Traditional Latin Mass

While there is a focus on *external* participation (e.g. responses, singing, 'sign of peace', etc.) in the Novus Ordo Mass, the Traditional Latin Mass instead focuses on *interior* participation. As Pope Pius XII has stated, "[T]he chief element of divine worship must be interior." (Pope Pius XII, "Mediator Dei", 1947) Mere external actions may make one feel that he or she is participating, but these actions may actually serve to reduce the participation that truly counts - *internal* participation - and may even serve as a distraction. In the Novus Ordo Mass, for example, there is so much noise and activity, it can make it difficult for parishioners to penetrate deeply into spiritual realities, but they are instead more drawn to mere externals (e.g. responding, singing, hand-shaking, etc.). *"The Mass was changed from interior participation to exterior participation. But what exterior participation can we really provide - the sacrifice is completed by the priest alone. Interior participation is personal, exterior is not - it's mechanical"*

Finally, it should be noted that the faithful do participate *externally* in a 'Tridentine' Mass (e.g. kneeling, standing, signs of the cross, striking one's breast, receiving Holy Communion, making any appropriate responses, participating in singing, etc.).

Misconception: The Priest 'Has His Back to the People' in the Traditional Latin Mass

Some persons used to the Novus Ordo (New Order) Mass of the 1960's sometimes complain that the priest "has his back to the people" in the 'Tridentine' Mass. This outlook may arise because such persons have no background in liturgical history, because they don't understand the reasoning for this orientation, or possibly because they are used to being "the center of attention" in the Novus Ordo Mass. In the 'Tridentine' Mass, however, the focus is not on the people, but on Almighty God, who from the earliest days of the Church has been represented as coming from the East. As Cardinal Ratzinger has stated,

> *"...a common turning to the east [the traditional position, wherein the priest and the people face eastward, and not each other]...remains essential. This is not a case of something accidental, but of what is essential.* Looking at the priest has no importance. What matters is looking together at the Lord." *(Cardinal Ratzinger, the future Pope Benedict XVI*, emphasis added)

Such persons may mistakenly believe the Second Vatican Council called for a change in orientation, but this is not true.

> "Mass facing the people is not once mentioned in any conciliar document. It has never been the general practice in any Apostolic Church, Catholic or [the schismatic] Orthodox. The invariable tradition has been to celebrate Mass facing the East, a symbol both of the Resurrection and the Second Coming." (Davies)
>
> "[N]o law mandating a celebration facing the people has ever been promulgated since the [Second Vatican] Council." (Davies)

Note that the facing of a particular direction for worship may be traced back even to the Jews:

> "Orientation, in its present sense of facing a particular direction, is a religious custom which long pre-dated Christianity. The Jews, wherever they lived in the world, turned to face the temple in Jerusalem when they prayed. So-called liturgical 'experts' today often attempt to justify Mass facing the people by stating Our Lord did not turn His back upon His Apostles at the Last Supper. Of course He didn't, but neither did He face them across a table. They were all on the same side, facing the temple! It is thus nonsensical to claim that we are returning to a practice of the Last Supper by adopting the practice of a celebration facing the people. Similarly, it is equally nonsensical to claim that having Mass in the vernacular is a return to what took place at the Last Supper. A major part of the Jewish paschal liturgy was conducted in Hebrew, as it is today. Hebrew was no more comprehensible to an ordinary Jew at the time of Our Lord than Latin is to an ordinary Mexican today, even though Aramaic (the language then used in Palestine), was derived from Hebrew, just as Spanish is derived from Latin." (Davies)

Further, it should be noted that Mass facing the people is not historical - contrary to the claims of some. Archeological evidence shows that the altars did not face the people - but faced eastward. The few notable architectural aberrations in no way support claims of Masses facing the people - rather the people and priest

(C) Copyright 2007, B.F.S. Permission granted to print and copy for non-commercial purposes (copyright notice must remain).