

# Una Voce New York

✠ Saint Gregory VII, Patron ✠

BULLETIN

December 2018

Vol. XXI, No. 3

## Some Tridentine Masses in Our Area

### St. Agnes's Church

*Every Sunday at 9:00 a.m.*

E. 43<sup>rd</sup> St. bet. Third and Lexington aves.,  
Manhattan

212-682-5722

### Holy Innocents Church

*Every Sunday at 10:30 a.m.;*

*Monday - Friday at 6:00 p.m.;*

*every Saturday at 1:00 p.m.*

128 West 37<sup>th</sup> St., bet. Broadway and Seventh  
Ave., Manhattan

212-279-5861

### Shrine of Our Lady of Mount Carmel

*Every Sunday at 10:30 a.m., Monday - Saturday at  
7:45 a.m.*

## Thirtieth Anniversary of the Tridentine Mass at Saint Agnes's

By God's grace, on January 22, 1989, the traditional Latin Mass was restored to the Church of Saint Agnes in Manhattan. It was celebrated on that day by the Pastor, Msgr. Eugene V. Clark, and the "Mass of the ages" has been offered without interruption at Saint Agnes's since that momentous occasion. Accordingly, a traditional sung Mass, followed by the singing of the *Tè Deum*, will commemorate this Anniversary on Sunday, January 27, 2019, at Saint Agnes's (143 East 43rd St., bet. Lexington and Third avenues). All are most welcome to attend.

## BULLETIN BOARD

### Traditional Mass Coffee Hour Restored at Saint Agnes's

After a hiatus of many years the coffee hour that for years followed the traditional Sunday Latin Mass at Saint Agnes's Church on East 43rd Street near Grand Central in Manhattan been restored with the gracious permission of the Pastor, Fr. Michael Barrett. Excellent coffee, doughnuts, bagels, and other delicacies are served to a very lively group who descend to the undercroft of the Church after the regular 9-o'clock *Missa Cantata*. Come one, come all !—after fulfilling the Sunday Mass obligation.

## POPE PAUL'S NEW MASS

### CHAPTER XX THE TABERNACLE

*The following is the first installment of Chapter XX of Pope Paul's New Mass, the third volume of the late Michael Davies's masterpiece, Liturgical Revolution. In this chapter, Davies documents the Neo-Modernist disrespect shown to the Blessed Sacrament through the impiety of separating the Tabernacle from the altar. In his writings, Davies lives on as the foremost defender of the traditional Latin Rite in the English-speaking world.*

*To separate tabernacle from altar is to separate two things which by their origin and their nature should remain united.*

—Pope Pius XII

Reverence for the Body and Blood of Christ was highly developed by the fourth century. A passage attributed to St. Cyril of Jerusalem, often cited as propaganda for Communion in the hand, warns the faithful against allowing the smallest fragment of the Host to fall to the ground:

For if you mislay any, you would clearly suffer a loss, as it were, from one of your own limbs. Tell me, if anyone gave you gold-dust, would you not take hold of it with every possible care, ensuring that you did not mislay any of it or sustain any loss? So will you not be much more cautious to ensure that not a crumb falls away from that which is much more precious than gold or precious stones?

The logical outcome of this developing sense of reverence was the practice whereby the priest placed the Host directly upon the tongue of the communicant. The Blessed Sacrament was reserved for the purpose of giving Holy Communion outside Mass from the earliest centuries, but it was not reserved specifically for the purpose of adoration until the tenth century. Prior to this the faithful came to their churches to pray before the altar upon which Our Lord descended when the words of consecration were spoken at Mass. From the tenth century onwards the Blessed Sacrament was generally reserved in a receptacle shaped like a dove suspended over the high altar; but fixed and locked tabernacles were also known and, indeed, prescribed by the regulations of Bishop Quivil of Exeter at the end of the thirteenth century, though in England they

did not come into general use before the Reformation had banished the Real Presence of Our Lord from English churches. One of the demands of the Western rebels in 1549 was: “We will have the Sacrament hange over the hyeyhe aulter, and there to be worshypped as it was wount to be.” The fixed tabernacle spread gradually but the practice of reserving the Blessed Sacrament in a receptacle suspended over the altar, or in a separate Sacrament-House, could still be found in such countries as Germany and Belgium until the decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of 21 August 1863 put an end to the employment of such receptacles.

In the Code of Canon Law, Canons 1268 and 1269 order that the Blessed Sacrament be reserved in an immovable tabernacle, which, as a general rule, should be placed in the center of the high altar (*in media parte altaris posito*) except in cathedral or conventual churches, where it should be placed on a side altar. It is advisable that the tabernacle doors clear the *mensa* (altar stone) by an inch or more. Two doors are more convenient than one. The tabernacle may be constructed of any durable material provided it is proof against damp. In shape it may be octagonal, hexagonal, square, or round and surmounted by a dome or apex and terminated by a cross or figure of the risen Lord. It should be firmly riveted to the altar, and may be gold inside or lined with wood covered with white silk.

Every tabernacle containing the Blessed Sacrament should be covered with a veil. This veil is the one essential indication of the Presence within the tabernacle, even more so than the lamp or lamps which burn before it. When the veil of the tabernacle, together with the frontal, follows the liturgical color of the day, the sequence of color brings out with a force beyond the power of words how Our Blessed Lord on

His altar and in His tabernacle identifies Himself with the feast of the Saint, as the Head with the members of His Mystical Body.

During the pontificate of Pope Pius XII neo-Protestant tendencies within the Church had already begun to manifest themselves. Attempts were made to detract from the honor rightly given to the Blessed Sacrament by claiming that the presence of the tabernacle on the altar diverted attention from the sacrifice. It was argued that if Christ were already present upon the altar in the tabernacle the impact of His being brought down upon the altar when the priest spoke the words of consecration would be considerably lessened. With typical perceptiveness, Pope Pius XII unmasked the true motives of those wishing to separate altar and tabernacle in an address delivered to the International Congress on Pastoral Liturgy, 22 September 1956. Less than eleven years later, the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued the Instruction *Eucharisticum Mystrium* repudiating the teaching of Pope Pius XII and endorsing that of the theologians he had condemned. This Instruction has proved to be a Magna Charta for neo-Protestant vandals within the Church.

In 1956 Pope Pius XII repeated the teaching of Trent on the Real Presence and explained:

He who clings wholeheartedly to this teaching has no thought of formulating objections against the presence of the tabernacle on the altar. In the instruction of the Holy Office *De arte sacra*, of 30 June 1952, the Holy See insists among other things, on this point: "This supreme Sacred Congregation strictly commands that the prescriptions of Canons 1268 (2) and 1269 (1), be most faithfully observed: 'The Most Blessed Eucharist should be

kept in the most distinguished and honorable place in the church, and hence as a rule at the main altar unless some other be considered more convenient and suitable for the veneration and worship due to so great a Sacrament . . . The Most Blessed Sacrament must be kept in an immovable tabernacle set in the middle of the altar'."

There is a question, not so much of the material presence of the tabernacle on the altar, as of a tendency to which We would like to call your attention, that of *a lessening of esteem for the presence and action of Christ in the tabernacle*. The sacrifice of the altar is held sufficient, and the importance of Him who accomplishes it is reduced. Yet the person of Our Lord must hold the central place in worship, for it is His person that unifies the relations of the altar and the tabernacle and gives them their meaning.

It is through the sacrifice of the altar, first of all, that the Lord becomes present in the Eucharist, and He is in the tabernacle only as a "*memoria sacrificii et passionis suae*." To separate tabernacle from altar is *to separate two things which by their origin and their nature should remain united*. (My emphasis.)

Some sections of Canon 1268 which Pope Pius XII did not include in the address which has just been cited are particularly relevant in relation to the post-Conciliar revolution. The section of the Canon which the Pope cited refers to the possibility of a more convenient and suitable place for the location of the tabernacle than the main altar. The Canon goes on to specify that in cathedrals, collegiate, or conventual churches where choral services are celebrated on the main altar it is advisable to reserve the Most

Blessed Sacrament in another chapel, but that in such cases “the altar at which the Most Blessed Sacrament is kept must be more beautifully adorned than any other, so that by its very appointments, it may the more effectively move the faithful to piety and devotion.”

Thus the situation before Vatican II was as follows: under normal circumstances the tabernacle was to be situated on the principal altar of the church; voices had been raised objecting to this practice on the grounds that it detracted from the sacrifice but Pius XII warned that behind these objections lay a tendency to lessen esteem for the Blessed Sacrament; the Pope stressed that tabernacle and altar should by their origin and nature remain united.

There is not one word in the teaching of Vatican II suggesting either that the tabernacle should be removed from the principal altar or that there is any objection to celebrating Mass on an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. The only reference to the tabernacle in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy occurs in Article 128. This Article will be quoted in full as it is another example of the “time bombs” referred to in *Pope John’s Council*. Although it gives no hint of changing altars to tables and demoting the Blessed Sacrament from the main altar, it leaves the way open to virtually any degree of vandalization in the sanctuary and gives national hierarchies *carte blanche* to act according to whatever whim happens to take them—or rather their liturgical commissions. [here] [proofing]

Along with the revision of the liturgical books, as laid down in Article 25, there is to be an early revision of the canons and ecclesiastical statutes which govern the disposition of material things involved in sacred worship. These laws refer especially to the

worthy and well-planned construction of sacred buildings, the shape and construction of altars, the nobility, location, and security of the Eucharistic tabernacle, the suitability and dignity of the baptistery, the proper use of sacred images, embellishments, and vestments. Laws which seem less suited to the reformed liturgy are to be brought into harmony with it, or else abolished; and any which are helpful are to be retained if already in use, and introduced where they are lacking.

According to the norm of Article 22 of the Constitution, the territorial bodies of bishops are empowered to adapt matters to the needs and customs of their different regions; this applies especially to the materials and form of sacred furnishings and vestments.

The Instruction *Inter Oecumenici* of 26 September 1964 reiterates the traditional position regarding the tabernacle. Article 95 states:

The Blessed Sacrament is to be reserved in a solid, burglar-proof tabernacle in the center of the high altar or of another altar if this is really outstanding and distinguished. Where there is a local custom, and in particular cases to be approved by the local Ordinary, the Blessed Sacrament may be reserved in some other place in the church; but it must be a very special place, having nobility around it, and it must be suitably decorated.

It is lawful to celebrate Mass facing the people even if on the altar there is a small but adequate tabernacle.

The next pronouncement on the position of the tabernacle comes in a document far more authoritative than any of the post-conciliar instructions on the

liturgy—the encyclical *Mysterium Fidei* of Pope Paul VI dated 3 September 1965. This document is a papal act. Pope Paul reiterates the traditional teaching in Article 66:

Liturgical laws prescribe that the Blessed Sacrament be kept in churches with the greatest honor and in the most distinguished position.

*(To be continued.)*

—Michael Davies

## **IOTA UNUM**

### **CHAPTER XVII MOBILISM**

*We are pleased to present another excerpt from one of the most impressive critiques of the Conciliar Church yet penned, Iota Unum, an encyclopaedic study written by Romano Amerio that reveals the breathtaking dimensions of the destruction wrought by the Second Vatican Council and those who have implemented it these fifty unhappy years. We here present the second section of Chapter XVII, “Mobilism,” with the kind permission of Sarto House. Iota Unum is available from The Angelus Press at 2915 Forest Avenue, Kansas City, MO 64109, or at their toll-free number, 800-966-7337, or their website at [www.angeluspress.org](http://www.angeluspress.org).*

#### **161. Mobilism in the new theology.**

[From our previous issue (July 2018): “Mobilism is to metaphysics what Pyrrhonism (the denial of reason —*Ed.*), with its attendant discussionism (manifested in the modern obsession with “dialogue” —*Ed.*), is to logic. It precedes Pyrrhonism, because doubt about the primacy of being is what causes doubt

about the primacy of knowledge. Mobilism is a characteristic of the post-conciliar Church, in which as Cardinal Alfrink says, everything has been put in motion and no part of the Catholic system is free from change: *nihil quietum in causa* (“Nothing in the matter is at peace.”)]

Mobilism has affected the practical attitudes of clergy and laity, who are now apt to value action for its own sake and to undervalue the end to which the action is directed. But it has also affected theology. Mobilism is now diffused in the mentality of the age. The doctrinal sources from which it came are no longer identifiable. They are rather like a now disused dye, the color of which can only be judged from cloth previously tinted with it. This theoretical mobilism that has pervaded Catholic thinking is solemnly professed in a large front page article in the *Osservatore Romano* [O.R., 3 March 1976], which is very important for two reasons. It attacks the doctrine of the unchangeability of the moral law [Cf. Pope Francis. —*Ed.*] that Paul VI had upheld in *Humanae Vitae*, and which flows from the metaphysical principle of the unchangeability of natures. The article also alleges there is change and becoming within God’s own nature.

The article questions the metaphysical foundation of Catholic theology which, in union with Greek philosophy of both the Platonic and Aristotelian schools and in harmony with Jewish tradition, has always regarded God as perfect Being, whose essence is to be and who is therefore not subject to change or becoming, since to become is to be lacking in being, and to come-into-being. God is thus distinct from creatures, whose being is imperfect, changing and temporal. The philosophical understanding of God is also in perfect accord with popular ideas, which reject any shadow of imperfection, non-being or lack

of being in God, and see Him as absolute immensity, eternity and totality.

The front page of the Vatican paper bears all those ideas about the changeability of the essential natures of things that it is impossible to reconcile with the Catholic faith, and which that faith has always rejected.

“The fact of being created in the image of God does not fix man in an *immobilism of essence*, but rather devotes him to a ‘*making himself*’ in the image of God. That is why it is legitimate to manipulate his own nature towards a good end.” This is to declare legitimate that manipulation of natural generative processes that *Humanae Vitae* has solemnly condemned as illegitimate. It is also to confuse man’s *moral* self-making with his *ontological* self-making, which is an absurdity. It is obvious that the writer’s idea of human freedom is not Catholic but existentialist and heterodox. In Catholic teaching, there is an unchangeable nature underlying man’s freedom, in conformity with which that freedom has to be exercised, and which specifies how it should be exercised: freedom does not mean creation; still less self-creation. (1)

The rejection of Catholic metaphysics is even more obvious in the following words that plunge God’s being into becoming: “The definition of God as *ens a se*, that is, as an active and dynamic essence that posits itself in being, offers the key” etc. “Man, analogously to God, creates himself, and can also be *seen to be an ens a se*.” The Catholic idea of God is here cast aside; namely that he is an *ens a se* not because he self-posites himself, but because he *is*; not because he unfolds his own reality through a perpetual need being perpetually fulfilled, but because he indefectibly and unimprovably possesses his own being. The God expounded in the *Osservatore Romano* is the god of the German idealists, not the God of the Catholic creed; it is the god

who says *ego sum qui fio* [“I am who becomes”], not the biblical God who says *ego sum qui sum* [“I am who am”].

The mobilistic man outlined here is equally heterodox. One can rightly say that man creates his own moral life, for because of his liberty he is *in manu consilii sui* [“In the hand of his own counsel” (Ecclesiasticus, 15:14)], but it is a metaphysical enormity to say that he creates himself and is an *ens a se*. Even using that expression analogically will not do because it takes away the difference between Creator and creature and lapses into pantheism.

The writer of the article concludes: “This nature is created by God not as a static reality and as a realization of a divine Idea perfect from the outset but as a dynamic reality designed to *autorealize* itself in the dynamic of history.” There are things here that will not bear examination. First, as we have said, man’s moral and metaphysical becoming are confused. Second, becoming is taken to be self-creation or, to use Gentile’s terminology *autoctisis*, and thus the whole Catholic philosophy of being, which has always refused to attribute creativity to creatures, is rejected [See *Summa Contra Gentiles*, Lib. II cap. 21]. Third, the Word is denied, whether in philosophy or theology, that is, there is a denial that the forms of created and creatable things exist eternally in God. This is to remove the firmament of divine thought that generates the world, time and becoming, and from which the immutability and absoluteness of human values derive. As Leopardi says, the man who denies the Word and the divine ideas, denies God.

We conclude as regards the essentials of mobilism, that becoming should not be thought better than being, nor the dynamic better than the stable, because becoming is an effect of non-being and a sign of

imperfection. A creature can become *inasmuch as it does not exist*, and lacks the principle that sustains it in being. It thus has to take on incessantly those determinations of being that it lacks. God, who is being at its most determinate, possesses the whole of being and all its possible determinations, in an absolute simple unity. If the divine action did not sustain it, the creature would fall of itself into non-being: its principle of stability comes to it from outside.

Mobilism is foreign to religion. The task of the Church is not to support and accelerate its movement, but to fix the spirit of man in the *firmamentum veritatis* ["Firmament of truth"] and to arrest its flight: *siste fugam* ["Stay your flight"], as Seneca said.

### **162. Mobilism in eschatology.**

The mobilism that attacks the divine being cannot but attack the participation in that being which constitutes super-natural beatitude. If deity is in becoming, deified man will be too, and man's final state will be not so much a *state* as a *motion* in search of something. This thesis is explicitly professed by Father Agostino Trapè, who says that man will indeed find his own integration in the vision of God but it will be a "vision that will be consummated not in staticness, even of a marvelous sort, but in an infinitely *dynamic search* for the Supreme Good. Thus nothing is so opposed to this inexhaustible journeying towards the earthly or heavenly possession of God as any sort of immobilism." I do not believe that the static conception of beatitude, which all schools of Catholic theology have upheld, constitutes the greatest possible opposition to genuine eschatology; I also seem to detect a contradiction in terms in the expression inexhaustible journeying towards the earthly or heavenly possession, since it refers to an infinite process of

acquisition which excludes the possession of the thing acquired.

Trapè's theory, which had already been anticipated by Gioberti in his *Filosofia della Rivelazione* at quite a different level of philosophical power, is false, because the Church teaches that man's condition as a *comprehensor* is quite different from his condition as a *viator* [a "comprehender" and a "wayfarer," i.e., in heaven and on earth]. To deny this difference is equivalent to removing the special kind of non-temporal duration in which the creature lives when it has been "freed from vanity," (3) to which it is now subject, that is, freed from becoming and non-being. It is also equivalent to shutting the creature up in time, making eternal life a continuation of time, and canceling both the divine transcendence and our analogical transcendence along with it. God is not looking for himself, he possesses himself; so too the beatified creature will not look for him either any more, but will possess him. In this regard, the idea of eternal life as an infinite continuation of life in time is a regression to the Elysian fields the pagans believed in. They could only imagine an other-worldly happiness as an undisturbed continuation of the delights of this world. Ovid depicts the happiness of the Elysian fields as *antiquae imitamina vitae* ["imitations of their old life"]. (4)

In the descent into the underworld in the *Aeneid*, happiness consists in athletic games, songs, music and even picnics in verdant meadows. (5) When applied to eschatology, mobilism thus leads to a definite immanentism that makes becoming something internal to God and moreover removes the truly transcendent quality of man's goal, by projecting present life into eternity and ignoring the leap to the "new heavens and a new earth."

- (1) In a volume of essays by various authors, *Il problema di Dio in filosofia e in teologia oggi* [*The Problem of God in Philosophy and Theology Today*], Milan 1982, p.34, L. Sartori maintains it is plausible that if God is conceived of as love and freedom “it is not clear that the dimensions of historicity (=becoming) that he might assume, not through necessity or through a need to ‘acquire’ or to ‘grow,’ but solely through his freedom, can be held to compromise his infinite perfection.” But it is clear that God’s freedom does not extend to His own nature, because the Perfect cannot become imperfect, or the Unchangeable changing. [The motive for change is improvement, so a change would prove God had been in need of improvement, and is subject to time as well. —*Translator’s note.*]
- (2) This mobilism regarding our heavenly end is disposed of by simply knowing the distinction between essential and accidental beatitude, and by a reading of Dante’s *Paradiso*.
- (3) Cf. Romans, 8:20-21.
- (4) *Metamorphoses*, IV, 445.
- (5) *Aeneid*, VI, 656ff.

*Romano Amerio*