

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# New Life, Old Churchskins.

The initial implementation of Pastoral Liturgy  
in New Zealand, 1963 to 1970.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy in  
History.

Joseph Grayland

Massey University  
December 1996

## Abstract

In the period between 1963 and 1970 the Catholic Church's liturgy change dramatically. The event Catholics know as the Vatican II, produced the impetus for this substantial renewal of the Church and its liturgy, which was then implemented throughout the world. The new liturgical practice was known as Pastoral Liturgy.

In New Zealand the liturgical reforms were directed by the bishops and implemented by them according to the only model of Church leadership they knew, a top-down model. In parishes too this model was often followed, resulting in confusion for both Laity and Clergy. Pastoral Liturgy's underlying theology challenged the methods of Episcopal authority, the role of the priest and the role of the Laity, as much as it changed ritual worship patterns.

This study necessarily begins with the Liturgical Movement in Europe and the Document *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. This contextualises the liturgical changes in New Zealand in their wider context and helps the reader to see these changes as part of a bigger movement within the Church. The role of the Episcopal Conference and the activities of the St. Paul's group are compared to give an illustration of the different levels of interest in liturgical renewal within the New Zealand Church. The varied response of the Catholic people to the renewal and the common memory of having not been consulted during the period is evaluated in light of the modern needs in the Church.

## **Acknowledgment.**

Writing this thesis has been possible because of the support, encouragement and practical assistance of many people, both family and friends. Among those who have made it possible are the Pastoral Team of St. Patrick's Parish, Palmerston North. To Fr. Kevin Neal, Anne-Marie O'Connor and Sr. Michelle O'Meara, my gratitude for your support and especially to Rosemary Wyse who helped me focus my thoughts and fix up my grammar, my heartfelt thanks. To Dr. Peter Lineham who supervised this project, thank you for your direction and help in formulating the material I found into a thesis.

I would also like to acknowledge the generosity of those who agreed to be interviewed and took the risk of entrusting their memories to my writing. In having sought to honour their trust throughout the work, I hope that the final product, even if not perhaps mirroring their individual opinions, will stand on its own merits

The archivists of the diocese of Auckland, Christchurch and the Archdiocese of Wellington have also helped me by opening their collections to me and offering practical help as I searched through the material in their collections. To Fr. Bruce Bolland and his staff in Auckland, Sr. Mary de Porres in Wellington and Fr. Kevin Clark of Christchurch, I wish to express my thanks.



# Table of Contents

Abstract

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations 1

Glossary 2

Timeline 4

Preamble 8

Introduction 9

Chapter One. Pastoral Liturgy. 14

Chapter Two. Who is driving the reforms? 24

Chapter Three. From one day to the next. 44

Chapter Four. Confusion, Response and Reaction 66

Chapter Five. A change in conflict with culture? 82

Conclusion 94

Appendix 1: Liturgical Instruction, 1964. 101

Appendix 2: Statistics, Archdiocese of Wellington. 111

Appendix 3: Edwards Wanganui survey. 112

Bibliography. 114

## **Abbreviations:**

**ACA**     Auckland Catholic Archive

**WCA**     Wellington Catholic Archive

**CAC**     Christchurch Catholic Archive

**Del.**     Delargy Papers.

**Lis**     Liston Papers.

**Lit '54**     Liturgy Notes and Letters 1954-1978. Wellington Archdiocese.

**GRIM**     General Instruction to the Roman Missal

**SC**     Sacrosanctum Concilium, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy

**ICEL**     International Committee for English in the Liturgy

**CPC**     Catholic Publications Centre, Auckland.

**AAS**     Acta Apostolicae Sedis.

## **Glossary:**

**Alleluia or Tract** It has been replaced by the responsory psalm.

**Canon** See Eucharistic Prayer

**Collect** the opening prayer of the Mass.

**Concilium** The Vatican organisation responsible for producing and publishing the new ritual texts which was set up after the conclusion of the Council.

**Concelebration** the participation of more than one ordained minister in a liturgical celebration.

**Dialogue Mass** a pre-Vatican II low Mass in which the congregation responded vocally to the presider, taking the parts that normally were recited quietly by the altar servers.

**Episcopal Conference** the periodic assembly of bishops of a particular region or country for the purpose of addressing pastoral issues.

**Eucharistic Prayer** Central prayer of Thanksgiving in the Mass, containing the Institution Narrative commonly referred to as the consecration.

**Eucharistic Minister** A lay minister who assists with the distribution of Communion.

**Gradual** the psalm verse sung between the first reading and the Alleluia.

**Introit** entrance prayer consisting of a short antiphon, psalm verse and doxology.

**Last Gospel** John 1:1-14 read at the conclusion of the Tridentine Mass.

**Latin Rite** the popular but inaccurate name for all the religious usage's of the Church in the Roman Catholic West.

**Lector/Reader** a lay person who reads from the scriptures at Mass.

**Ordinary** parts of the Mass which do not change, though the sung compositions may vary: the Kyrie, Gloria, Creed, Sanctus, Lamb of God. Ordinaries supply a consistent structure that is filled out by the liturgical proper.

**Proper** the variable parts of the Mass which reflect the season or feast the such as the: entrance antiphon, opening prayer, chant after the first reading, the preface, prayer over the gifts, Communion antiphon and post-Communion prayer.

**Post-Conciliar** the church structure or liturgy after the, or as a result of the Second Vatican Council.

**Pre-Conciliar** the church structure or liturgy before the reform of the Second Vatican Council.

**Rite** any repetitive ceremonial with fixed rules comprising all the liturgical rites and usage's of a particular tradition of worship.

**Rubicism** a slavish fidelity to rules or rubrics of liturgical celebration.

## Timeline:

**4 December 1963:** *Sacrosanctum concilium* The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy was published.

**25 January 1964:** *Sacram liturgiam*, Motu Proprio on the Sacred Liturgy.

**April 1964:** Permission from Rome to use Layman's Missal as a basic Text.

**16 May 1964:** *Decreta ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia in Nova Zelandia* given in Rome allowing English in some parts of the Mass, scripture readings and rituals of sacraments and sacramentals

**10 July 1964:** Letter from McKeefry to the Bishops, enclosing directives for Priests throughout the country and explaining the changes. Copies were also sent to the *Tablet* and *Zealandia*.

**4 August 1964:** Statement of the Conference of the Marist and Mill Hill priests requesting Maori in the Mass.

**Sunday 16 August 1964:** Implementation in New Zealand of Decree *De Sacra Liturgia*.

**26 September 1964:** *Inter oecumenici* 'The Instruction on the Proper Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy'.

**14 November 1964:** *Probatum seu confirmatum Ordinarium Missae et Ritus Matrimonii lingua "maori"*, approving the Maori marriage ritual.

**19 Nov. 1964:** McKeefry's letter to the Concilium seeking further use of the vernacular in Mass and in the Ordination and Consecrations rites, as approved for Australia. He sought approval to use the Grail psalter, *Tantum Ergo* in English, the

New Testament in Maori and copies of *Libellum Missale* in accordance with *Res Secretarias N12* for concelebration.

**24th November 1964:** Permission given to use the translation requested by McKeefry on the 19th of November 1964.

**2 March 1965:** McKeefry to bishops advising of more changes to come in the Mass.

**1st June 1965:** Letter to priests allowing the use of the layman's Missal as the basic text.

**7 March 1965:** Implementation of *Inter oecumenici*, The Instruction on the Proper Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

**27 April 1965:** Use of the vernacular in the Preface permitted by Rome. Published in the *Tablet* 16 June 1965.

**30 May 1965:** Lay readers used in Dunedin parishes for the first time.

**20 October 1965:** Photo spread in the *Tablet* of a Mass in Christchurch at the opening of Charity Week with the priest facing the people. p35.

**27 February 1966:** Bishops' Pastoral Letter for First Sunday of Lent 1966 sent to priests.

**3 November 1966 to 7 December 1967:** Weekly articles in *Zealandia* by Delargy which refer to liturgy, change and the difficulties being experienced.

**22 - 29 January 1967:** Christian Life Week in Auckland.

**4 May 1967:** *Tres abhinc annos*, The Second Instruction on the Proper Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

**19 May 1967:** Letter from Sneddon to Bishops telling them *Tres abinc annos* will come into effect on June 29 1967.

**9 June 1967:** Approval for use of English in the Ordination rite in *Consilium ad Exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia*.

**29 June 1967:** Implementation of *Tres abinc annos*.

**30 July 1967:** Statement by Bishops that application has been made for the Canon of the Mass in English.'

**29 October 1967:** Memo to the bishops from Bishop Kavanagh regarding the preparation of booklets for the Canon of the Mass in English.

**23 January 1968:** *Instantibus pluribus*, The Instruction on the Vernacular with norms for the translations of the Graduale simplex received from Rome.

**23 May 1968:** *Prece eucharistica*, promulgating three new Eucharistic Prayers and eight prefaces.

**July 1968:** *Humanae Vitae* was published.

**8 October 1968:** Sneddon to O'Dea, *Tablet* editor saying there will be no implementation of the vernacular Canon until after January 1969.

**1 December 1968:** The first Sunday of Advent and the introduction of CPC Mass leaflet.

**February 1969:** CPC editions of *Holy week for the Choir* and *Holy Week for the People* published.

**3 April 1969:** *Missale Romanum*, Apostolic Constitution on the Roman Missal.

**6 April 1969:** *Ordine Missae*, promulgating the new Order of Mass

**25 May 1969:** Introduction of the Lectionary for Mass.

**8 June 1969:** Introduction of new Prefaces and Eucharistic Prayers

**October 1969:** Report by Rev. Barry Edwards on the liturgy questionnaire in Wanganui.

**26 March 1970:** The first *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum*, promulgated. with the 'General Instruction of the Roman Missal'.

**5 September 1970:** *Liturgiae Instaurationes*, The Third Instruction on the Correct Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy was published.

**October 1970:** Broadcast Mass from Cathedral in Auckland. Celebrant: David Blake; Preacher: Brian Arahill: Music: Douglas Mews.

**4 November 1970:** Telecast of the New Mass from Holy Cross Chapel, Mosgiel.

**18 November 1970:** Letter from Snedden to Bishops regarding the approval of the ICEL Holy Week texts.

**29 November 1970 1st Sunday of Advent** Implementation of the first *editio typica* of the *Missale Romanum*, the New Mass. The main changes were the options for the entrance rite, a psalm between the readings, the simplification of the Offertory rite and the introduction of the sign of peace in the communion rite and the options in the concluding rite.



## **Preamble:**

Five years ago, during a meeting at the Pastoral Centre in Palmerston North, I was sitting with a group of Catholic women having a coffee break. Our discussion ranged over many things but came to ground on the issue of the Church's liturgy in the 1990's. All these women had lived through the changes in the 1960s, as the Church entered a new era.

They remembered the Church as a law-bound reality, rigid and inflexible, demanding total adherence to its maxims and they remembered the struggle to be faithful to the Church which would never change.

When the unchanging Church changed, so too did many commonly held practices, and some members experienced a sense of betrayal. What they had held holy and sacred was now unimportant or even wrong.

At the end of our conversation one of the women said *'Someone needs to admit that the Church changed without telling us why it was happening. It all changed over night'*.

That was the beginning of this thesis. The task then was to find out if the women were right, or if their memory mirrored a later response to the period of change. Now several other questions have arisen seeking answers. How were Catholics prepared for the implementation of Pastoral Liturgy and what if anything inhibited that preparation? What process of implementation was employed by the Bishops' during this time? Were the clergy and laity formed in the new Pastoral Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, or merely informed about it? Does the need for process, consultation and informed debate reflect more the Church of the 1990's than it does the Church of the 1960's? It is with these questions in mind that I set out on this thesis.

## Introduction.

For the New Zealand Catholic Church of the 1960's the initial implementation of the vernacular Mass was a crucial moment, but worship in vernacular languages, was not in itself the goal of the reforms. The goal was the implementation of Pastoral Liturgy, which required vernacular languages, to express the new vision which the Church had accepted. Pastoral Liturgy, enfolded on a Sunday by Sunday basis, renewed the way Catholics related to the world around them and to each other. The greatest change brought by the Second Vatican Council was not just in the liturgy, or in the style of Religious Life for example, but in the way Catholics in worship, living and theology perceived themselves. It is remembered as a change which took many Catholics by surprise.

Generally the Catholic culture in New Zealand has been characterised by a narrow exclusive network of social, educational and political interaction based on religious duty and identification. There is however, more evidence to suggest that New Zealand Catholics were more a part of the social fabric, than they were distinct from it. The rising number of mixed marriages [marriages between a Catholic and a person of another religion or no religion], within the Catholic Church during the 1950s and 1960s is evidence that Catholics were not an isolated group within New Zealand society, but were continually influenced by opinion and belief outside the Church itself.<sup>1</sup> By the 1960's New Zealand Catholics were not a recognisable ghetto class.

At the beginning of this century Catholics formed the majority of the poorer groups, but by the 1950s and early 1960s Catholics were represented at all levels of New Zealand society. Catholics derived their sense of identity from many different sources both ecclesiastical and secular. Religious attitudes tended to reflect a very narrow Irish Catholicism with its inherent clericalism and piety. For example, Catholics in New Zealand were not allowed to attend other Christian Churches without the express permission of the local Bishop or Parish Priest. It was not uncommon that parents of children attending state schools instead of convent schools, were threatened with excommunication by some parish priests. Also, by the 1960s New Zealand Catholicism reflected local cultural trends such as nominal Christianity,

---

<sup>1</sup>Archdiocese of Wellington, Marriage Statistics, 1956- 1979, Vicariate for Marriages. see also, Diocese of Auckland Marriage Statistics, 1950-1980. ACA.

uninterest in religion and growing materialism as they too enjoyed a growing national prosperity. But, in the Mass' rituals and obligations, one finds the central difference between the Catholic community and all the other Christian communities. Not the least of which was the moral obligation on all Catholics to attend Mass each Sunday.

In the 'Irish Catholic' memory the Mass had been vilified by Protestant reformation rhetoric and had become the symbol of Catholic resistance. While the Mass set the Catholic identity, it did not inhibit New Zealand Catholics from taking part in the social and political life of the nation. Nor did the prohibitions of the Church inhibit a significant number of Catholics from choosing not to attend Mass. However, given its central role in the Catholic identity, the changes in the Mass are the most important of all change in the Church, because the Mass is where the majority of Catholics directly experienced the change in the Church's self-understanding and in their own religious identity.

The period 1963 to the end of 1970 is a short but important period, which begins with the publication on 4 December 1963 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, that set the agenda for change. The period ends with the implementation in New Zealand of the Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, [3 April 1969] in its final version on the First Sunday of Advent, 29 November 1970. It had taken over eighteen months for the original instruction to be published as *Missale Romanum*, in its *editio typica* form on 26 March 1970.

*Missale Romanum* completed the revisions and reforms which had appeared in the years between 1963 and 1969. It also completed the full implementation of the vernacular in the Roman liturgy and gave the future direction for ongoing development. In this short period of time the Roman Catholic Church's worship moved from the exclusive use of Latin to use nearly 350 different languages, from the priest with his back to the congregation facing the altar, to priest and people facing each other. Critics of the changes called it the 'Protestantisation' of the Roman Liturgy. Luther had won, they said, and Calvin was victorious. Many Anglicans for example, commented that there was very now little difference between their Communion Service [Eucharist] and a Catholic Mass. For some a unique symbol of difference had been lost.

It was a momentous change and as such, it is vital to one's understanding of any subsequent changes in the Catholic Church. The style and symbols of Catholic rituals are not arbitrary, but expressive of a particular understanding of God. As such they form within Catholics their religious and faith perspective, which is itself in turn influenced by the culture of the world in which they participate.

Religious adherence constitutes an important cultural identity, which does not stand apart from an individuals' social identity. Catholicism here, like New Zealand pakeha culture in general, looked to Europe for identity and leadership. The changes in the Church during the 1960s mirrored, in many ways, those in the New Zealand culture. The liturgical changes became the flashpoint where the ideal of theology met the reality of culture, head on.

As a historical work, this thesis will focus on one major question: was the Catholic Church in New Zealand prepared for such a momentous change and once underway how did the Church prepare for and implement the new reforms? The task of the liturgical historian is not only to chronicle the movement and changes of liturgical actions through time, but to offer an understanding of the times and the attitudes which formed the particular practices and how these reflect both the people who formed them and their culture.

A particular memory which is central to this work concerns the laity not having being prepared for the changes and that the resulting confusion and difficulties of the 1970s, 80s and 90s is the result of the piecemeal implementation of the new Mass. While there are many examples of articles in the two Catholic publications of the day explaining the new liturgy, there was an inhibiting factor which prevented the laity from taking a full and active part in the reforms. Throughout this thesis this inhibiting factor will be discussed from various sides, because it is not a single concrete factor, but rather a multiplicity of influences acting upon the Church at all levels. These indicate a breakdown between the nature of Pastoral Liturgy and the new model of leadership it demanded and the attempt to implement renewal using old methods of change and authority, which the bishops, clergy and laity were accustomed to.

In discussing the method of change it is important to remember the options available to Catholics in the 1960s were limited by the hierarchical structure, clericalism and the

absence of laity from the decision making forums of the Church, at both diocesan and International levels. This factor is considered throughout the thesis.

Chapter one places liturgical renewal in its wider church context. The Second Vatican Council Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, sits within the context of the nineteenth and twentieth century's Liturgical Movement. This context is important because it shows that Catholic worship world-wide was in a process of change. It allows us to see that the reforms of the Vatican Council were part of an ongoing development, which gave the reforms a credibility, supported by theological scholarship. Many New Zealand Catholics were unaware of this context.

Chapter two asks whether the New Zealand Church was ready for such a change and finds that it was not. It was not a Church on the verge of change, but rather a Church surprised that anything had to change, though there are always instances to the contrary. For instance, the story and efforts in liturgical development by the St. Paul's group at the National Seminary and its later influence on liturgical developments in the 1960s. Also discussed is the place of the bishops, both as an Episcopal Conference and as individuals whose personalities impacted on the implementation of the of the post-Conciliar liturgy.

Chapter three looks at the reforms and describes how they occurred, following generally on the directives of the Roman Consilium. This chapter details the people who were central in this process, showing the importance of priests to the work of renewal and the uncharacteristic lack of clear direction to them from the hierarchy.

Chapter four measures the reaction to the changes, both prior to and after 1970. The negative reaction will be shown to have begun in earnest after 1970, rather than before and this reaction reflects the change in the people as that of the general period. This chapter also discusses the question of lay formation and the factors contributing to or inhibiting this formation.

Chapter five reflects on the 1960s New Zealand society in general and its relevance to contemporary church culture. The liturgical changes revealed divisions within the Catholic community which owed more to secular individualism than to faith practice.

One who is a Catholic, and a priest cannot reflect impassively on the changes in the Church. Though one born during these changes can to some extent regard them as historically interesting they are also essentially formative. I view the changes from the uncomfortable of position being in the transition. The dust of the liturgical renewal has not yet settled and the need to understand the changes is still obvious. Though I did not have to change my religious ritual from before 1964 to after, or adjust to the changes between 1964 and 1970, I have experienced unrest of this period. I have no hankering after the past, nor any particular desire to dismiss it as irrelevant, rather my interest is in finding out why the New Zealand Church is still dealing with issues which should have been addressed thirty years ago.

To achieve the objective of the thesis it has been necessary to use archival material, as well as material from several interviews conducted with various Church-people, lay and cleric. These particular people were identified by their Church involvement at an official level during this time, or their subsequent commentaries on the nature of the New Zealand Catholic Church.

The archival material comes from the Diocesan Archives of Wellington, Auckland and Christchurch.<sup>2</sup> This, together with material from the New Zealand *Tablet*, *Zealandia*, contemporary commentaries and the most recent liturgical publications form the basis of the research.

This thesis is not the first time the issue of liturgical change has been addressed and it will not be the last. The issues surrounding liturgical changes are bigger than any one discipline, and go too deep into the Catholic psyche to be understood simplistically. Dealing with a complex network of interrelationships between theology, worship, New Zealand culture and change makes any cause and effect analysis extremely problematic. It is this which makes the historical study of liturgy worthwhile and fascinating. The agenda of renewal over a significant period of New Zealand Catholic Church History, highlights the question: Was the Church trying to breathe new life into old churchskins?

---

<sup>2</sup>Regrettably I received no response from the Dunedin Diocesan Archivist.



## Chapter One: Pastoral Liturgy.

Catholic belief is expressed in liturgical ritual actions and expressive of a shared understanding of God. To look at the liturgy of the Church is not an arbitrary choice, but rather a way to consider who Catholics are. Prior to the 1960s, the word Liturgy was not a familiar one in Catholic circles. Even now it is a relatively new concept, which the liturgical movement of the nineteenth century popularised. The Latin adjective *liturgicus* and noun *liturgia* were first used to describe the Byzantine practice of worship as it pertained to Eucharistic worship. A much later development saw the word liturgy referring to the entire ritual worship of the Western or Roman Church.<sup>3</sup>

Most authors try to define the word liturgy according to its nature and essential character, which is problematic because liturgy is a living reality. People do liturgy, that is to say, people give worship to God according to common ritual patterns, which use symbols of shared meaning. Here already a definition emerges, which grapples with a reality which is many sided, able only to be understood in the doing.

Liturgy though is not a purely anthropocentric reality. It is not simply to be understood as, 'the outward or visible part of divine worship or...an ornamental ceremonial'<sup>4</sup>, it is an action in which the divinity of God is central to its meaning and its effect. Liturgy does not only describe human participation, but it also describes and celebrates God's participation in human affairs. In *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,<sup>5</sup> the nature of liturgy and its necessity for the Church's life is explored, indicating the centrality of liturgy to Catholic self-understanding.<sup>6</sup> To understand Catholics, one must first of all understand the ritual worship which continually forms them.

---

<sup>3</sup>A.G.Martimort, 'Definitions and Methods', in *Principles of the Liturgy* (ed) Aime Georges Martimort, (Minnesota, 1987), Vol 1., p8.

<sup>4</sup>Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, (Rome, 1947).

<sup>5</sup>SC., section one of chapter one

<sup>6</sup>,ibid., No. 7. 'Rightly, then, the liturgy is considered as an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ. In the liturgy, by means of signs perceptible to the senses human sanctification is signified and brought about in ways proper to each of these signs; in the liturgy the whole public worship is performed by the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, that is, by the Head and his members'.

Liturgy understood theologically is the visible element of a supernatural reality. Essentially the liturgy is comprised of the sacraments and is a sacred sign which effects that which it signifies. The distinction between sacramental and non sacramental signs is important in terms of the efficacy of the sacred reality. Liturgy is a twofold dynamic: the earthly community's adoration and petition of God and God's redemption of the human community. The people, empowered by the Spirit of Christ, are themselves being changed by this action. Worship in the Catholic sense is continually active and always in the present tense.

The Mass is not the only Catholic liturgical action, all sacramental rituals are liturgical actions, as is the Prayer of the Church. As the primary Catholic action the Mass forms the model for all other liturgy. As an action, the liturgy of the Mass exists only at the time it is being celebrated. It is for this reason that it is often unintelligible to those who attend it, but do not participate or share in the common meaning ascribed to the symbols.

*Sacrosanctum Concilium* was approved by the bishops gathered at the Second Vatican Council and promulgated by Pope Paul IV on 4 December 1963. This constitution was the first formal document issued by the Council. As such, it was an indication of the enormous amount of work which had taken place in the preceding decades. Much of the formative work is due to two influences. Firstly the liturgical movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and secondly, 'Catholic Action' and its rediscovery of the place of the assembly.<sup>7</sup>

As the liturgy in the west first developed, it relied heavily on the Church in Rome, which used Latin in its liturgical rites. Latin was the language of the city, of its commerce and law as well as its religious ritual. Over time most Western Churches adopted the rituals of Roman worship together with Latin, so that 'by the middle of the fourth century at the latest, the liturgies of the west were being celebrated in Latin

---

<sup>7</sup>A movement in Western European Churches which had a new missionary impulse and was expressed in various movements like, the Young Christian Workers, Christian Family Movement, Catholic Youth Movements, as well as in the liturgical movement.



rather than Greek.<sup>8</sup> Some Churches, such as in England, were founded as Papal missions and so automatically used the Roman Rituals. Other churches, such as the Celtic church became subsumed into the Roman Church and began to lose their liturgical uniqueness they adopted Roman rituals.

In the period before the fourth century the Mass' ritual was very diverse where improvisation by the priest or bishop in the ritual prayers was the norm. Development of liturgical texts grew between the fourth and eighth centuries, but it is not until the Carolingian period that the Roman Rite 'would become the liturgy of the greater part of the West.'<sup>9</sup>

From the ritual texts, the sacramentaries, one sees that the key distinction between the Roman liturgy and those of the Gallician, Spanish and Eastern rites is the Eucharistic Prayer. The Roman Liturgy had only one Eucharistic Prayer or Canon, while the others had several, though the Roman prayer had variable Prefaces. The place and uniqueness of the Eucharistic Prayer has been important in the reform of the Mass throughout the centuries. The sacramentaries contain many liturgical prayers, but only the briefest of instructions as to how the rituals were to be performed.<sup>10</sup>

The influence of the Roman ritual and its gradual acceptance by churches outside of Rome continued, so that when Charlemagne decreed the use of the Roman liturgical books in the Frankish Kingdom 'his actions simply brought to term a movement already under way.' Unifying the empire through the use of one liturgical practice, meant that 'the centre of vitality for the roman Liturgy...was to be found no longer at Rome but wherever the imperial court of the Carolinians and later Ottonians resided and in the greatest of the Frankish monasteries.'<sup>11</sup>

In the monasteries of the West during this period, the practice of ordaining many members as priests became common, while the Eastern Churches retained the practice of ordaining a priest only when there was a need for one. The presence of

---

<sup>8</sup>P. M. Gy, 'History of the Liturgy in the West to the Council of Trent' in *The Church at Prayer, Principles of the Liturgy* (ed) A.G. Martimort, (Minnesota, 1987), Vol. 1, p.45.

<sup>9</sup>*ibid.*, p.47.

<sup>10</sup>The Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries.

<sup>11</sup>Gy., p.54.

so many priests in one place wanting to celebrate Mass brought about the development of the private Mass, which by 1200 was a regular practice. It necessitated the availability of extra altars and from this developed the practice of building altars against the walls of the churches as a space saving device. While ancient theology had viewed the priest at the altar with the people gathered with him, facing east to the rising sun, their backs to the darkness of the west, this practical necessity developed a theology which explained the priest as one who led the people to God; practical reality led the change in theology. At these Masses the priest did everything, assisted only by a server. The sung parts were spoken or omitted and everything took place at the altar. It was during the eleventh century that for the first time, there appeared the 'complete missals' for saying the Mass and the low Mass became the norm.

The language, architecture and theology conspired against the involvement of the people and they became viewers rather than participants. Many different forms of piety grew up and were used by the people as a means of personal involvement, because they were so cut off from the action of the Eucharist.

At the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century, the Church attempted to reform the liturgy, by returning to the rites and practices of the Fathers.<sup>12</sup> This decision produced the Roman Missal of 1570, which was promulgated by Pope Pius V.<sup>13</sup> The result was a conviction that 'the way the liturgy was given in the 1570 missal was as close to the pristine tradition of the church as possible...[but] which at best reflected the tradition of the Roman Curia in the thirteenth century.'<sup>14</sup>

While the Tridentine reforms achieved some good results, the practice of the private Mass came to be accepted as 'normative for the church.' After the reforms of Trent, there were attempts to develop other liturgies in the western Church, especially in France, but because these were associated with Gallicanism and Jansenism they failed.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>General Instruction to the Roman Missal, [GRIM], Introduction No 8. pg. 17.

<sup>13</sup>Apostolic Constitution *Quo primum*, 14 July 1570.

<sup>14</sup>*How Firm a Foundation: Leaders of the Liturgical Movement*, compiled and introduced by Robert L. Tuzik, (Chicago, 1990), p.1.

<sup>15</sup>*ibid.*, p.2.

There followed three centuries of liturgical stability from 1614-1903 during which the rubrical rigidity of the Tridentine reforms cast the Mass in a concrete mould. Liturgy was seen as an action of the Church which was done according to set and unchanging laws, rather than as a ritual action which expressed the belief of the gathered assembly.

In the nineteenth century the liturgical movement was assisted through the efforts of two German theologians, Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838) and Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835-1888). Both these theologians developed the concept of church as a gathering of all the baptised.<sup>16</sup> Dom Prosper Gueranger (1805-1875) was the first to use the expression liturgical movement and was the founder of the modern movement.

The modern phase of liturgical reform began in 1903 with Pope Pius X. He took the initiative and began a return to the tradition by maintaining that an active participation by the faithful in the holy mysteries was 'the primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit'.<sup>17</sup> In 1907 he published a new edition of Prefaces and prayers before the Canon, followed in 1909 with a decree on frequent communion, exhorting the people to daily communion. This together with the simplification of the rites constituted a reform which was codified in 1914.<sup>18</sup> A Belgian monk, Dom Lambert Beaudin, is almost synonymous with the European liturgical movement of the twentieth century.

Beaudin aimed to reach the general Catholic population and create a new awareness of liturgy by encouraging active participation by the laity. To achieve this he published a small missal written in both French and Latin, with which people could follow the Mass. To ensure the education of priests, Beaudin organised annual liturgy conferences and courses at Louvain University as well as publishing the journal *Les Questions liturgiques*. Under the direction of Fr. Paul Doncoeur a French Jesuit, the dialogue Mass was introduced in France after World War I. In Germany the liturgical movement was also gathering momentum under the direction of Professor Romano

---

<sup>16</sup>ibid., p.2.

<sup>17</sup> Pope Pius X, *le sollecitudini*, Vatican, 1903.

<sup>18</sup>*Additiones et variationes in rubricis Missalis*, 1914.

Guardini (1885-1968) and Don Odo Casel (1886-1948) and in Austria Pius Parsch (1884-1954) popularised the German reform movement. Later in America, people such as Virgil Michel and Godfrey Diekmann were at the forefront of the liturgical movement. The introduction of bi-lingual missals first in Latin/French, then Latin/German and lastly Latin/English enabled Catholics to follow the Mass. The dialogue Masses gave them the sense of participation, but it was only a shadow of the participation which the Vatican Council's reforms would demand.

The liturgical movement in Europe was augmented by the Catholic Social Action Movement. The 'Catholic Action' groups had rediscovered the place of the assembly in worship. They were drawing on the historical research into the liturgy and the ancient Christian traditions of Community. Their goal was to form a new consciousness in Catholic laity based on the baptismal call to evangelise the world.

Pope Pius XII, who had wanted to call a Council himself, made his contribution to the liturgical movement with the encyclical letter *Mediator Dei* (20 November 1947). Even before this publication Pius had established within the Congregation of Rites a commission especially charged with the reform of the liturgy.<sup>19</sup> In this document, referred to as the Magna Carta of the liturgical movement, Pius made liturgical reform possible. This spurred on liturgical reform, and produced a huge body of scholarship so that when the Second Vatican Council gathered in 1963 the liturgy was the first area to be discussed. Pius's other important writing was *Mystici Corpus Christi* in which he returned to the Pauline image of the church as the mystical body of Christ, an image which Vatican I had rejected. In 1951 Pius restored the Easter Vigil to Holy Saturday night and in 1953 evening Masses were approved, while eucharistic fasting was shortened to three hours. In 1955 the Congregation of Rites simplified the Presidential Prayers, the Creed, Prefaces and the last Gospel. Much of this was a direct result of war time Mass practices and the post-war European experience and again practical realities dictated the change in worship. Pius saw the world changing and knew that the Church too needed to change. He fostered a deep interest in the liturgy because he saw it as a sign of God's caring for his people and of the movement of the Holy Spirit in the Church.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>See Martimort Volume 1., pg. 75.

<sup>20</sup>Pius XII address to participants at the First International Congress on Pastoral Liturgy, Assisi, 22 May 1956, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, [AAS] 48, (1956), no. 712.

Pius' letter, *Divino Afflante Spiritu* opened up for Catholics a limited access to the scriptures. Though the best way for Catholics to have access to the scriptures was through the use of vernacular texts, Pius did not think that a sweeping change at that stage were wise. Therefore he allowed a limited use of the scriptures in Mass by having them read first in Latin by the Priest and afterwards in the vernacular by a lay-reader. The Vatican Council followed the lead given by Pius when they produced the Lectionary, in the hope that the treasures of the bible would become more accessible to Catholics. Aidan Kavanagh, OSB attributes great importance to the Pontificate of Pius XII and the effect of his letter *Mediator Dei* on the development of Pastoral Liturgy. This impetus, he writes, 'affected Catholic worship markedly in the growing use of the vernacular, the practice of the 'dialogue Mass', and most strikingly in the 1951 restoration of the Easter Vigil and the 1955 reform of Holy Week.'<sup>21</sup>

Pope John XXIII called a Council to 'open the windows of the Church', but as far as liturgical reform is concerned he did very little. The only change he made was to include the name of St. Joseph in the Canon. By comparison, the leaders of the liturgical movement in both Europe and the United States had more in mind than simply to 'move furniture and have people sing chants at Mass. They wanted to reform the way people lived as church.'<sup>22</sup>

Many influences including all the liturgical reforms of the twentieth century are responsible for *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. This document has continued to be the blueprint for Catholic worship in the years since it was published. It contains within it a vision of Christ and the Church which is expressed in Pastoral Liturgy.

---

<sup>21</sup>Aidan Kavanagh, 'Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*' in *Modern Catholicism Vatican II and After*, (ed) Adrian Hastings (London, 1991), p. 69.

<sup>22</sup>Tuzik, p3.

The sacred Council has set out to impart an ever-increasing vigour to the Christian life of the faithful; to adapt more closely to the needs of our age those institutions which are subject to change to foster whatever can promote union among all who believe in Christ; to strengthen whatever can help to call all mankind into the Church's fold. Accordingly it sees particularly cogent reasons for undertaking the reform and promotion of the liturgy.<sup>23</sup>

*Sacrosanctum Concilium* was the first Document of the Second Vatican Council writes Aidan Kavanagh, because its 'pre-conciliar preparation proved far more satisfactory than that of other comparable important texts. By coming first, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* set the atmosphere for subsequent debates and documents.'<sup>24</sup> As a document it relied 'on a massive tradition both legislative and scholarly extending back some four centuries and culminating in the movement of Pastoral Liturgy.'<sup>25</sup>

Pastoral Liturgy rejected the old rubricism and replaced it with a new understanding of worship and Christian action has having an intimate and dynamic link. Pastoral Liturgy in its composition and execution, was intended to reflect more the needs of the age and the desire of the Church to be involved in the world than previously thought necessary. It was to be marked by an ability to change, use and adapt for worship those local customs and practices which were expressive of God. Pastoral activity was to be directed towards liturgical expression as the normative means of expressing Catholic belief. Though the Council pointed out that liturgical expression did 'not exhaust the entire activity of the Church, nevertheless the greatest care must be taken about rightly linking pastoral activity with the liturgy and carrying out a pastoral liturgy not as if it were set apart and existing in isolation but as it is closely joined to other pastoral works.'<sup>26</sup>

It was the desire for Pastoral Liturgy that highlighted the need for the use of the vernacular languages in worship. In New Zealand the concept Pastoral Liturgy was relatively unknown, and accordingly there is no evidence of debate at that time.

---

<sup>23</sup>SC., no: 1.

<sup>24</sup>Kavanagh, p68, see also Martimort, and Hughes 'Overview of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy', in *The Liturgy Documents, A Parish resource*, (Chicago, 1991), p.2.

<sup>25</sup>Kavanagh, p. 68.

<sup>26</sup>Pope Paul VI. Address to a consistory on carrying out the reform of the liturgy, 23 June 1964: AAS 56 (1964) no 299 in *Documents on the Liturgy 1963-1979 Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*, (Minnesota, 1982), p.90.



*Sacrosanctum Concilium* set the Council's agenda of reforming the Church's self-understanding through the promotion of the liturgy. It presents the liturgy as the place where the work of salvation is achieved by Christ and continued in the Church. The liturgy is 'the summit towards which the activity of the Church is directed; at the same time it is the fount from which all the Church's power flows'.<sup>27</sup> Given this premise, liturgy of its very nature calls the faithful to a 'full, conscious and active participation' in its celebration, and 'the reform and promotion of the liturgy...is the aim to be considered before all else'.<sup>28</sup> *Sacrosanctum Concilium* put liturgical public worship at the forefront of the Catholic Church's contemporary agenda.

As the first document of the Council, its weakness is that it reflects the Roman penchant for compromise, evident in its interesting combinations of general principles and pastoral specifics.<sup>29</sup> It includes quite different liturgical practices side by side, often practices which mutually question each other.<sup>30</sup>

Based on *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the main revision of the liturgical books took place during the period 1963- 1973. It was a period of rapid, top-down change. It is remarkable that bishops from all over the world, most of whom were not noted for being liturgical leaders in their own areas, gave their assent to a document which would change the way they prayed.<sup>31</sup> This is certainly true of the New Zealand Episcopate, and is so clearly obvious in their approach to the implementation of pastoral liturgical reforms. McKeefry and Sneddon typify the approach of 'slowly slowly, one thing at a time, lets wait until someone does something'. They were people who followed the papal dictates and waited for the official directives to be issued. Neither of them are noted for instigating much experimentation and were to a large extent only enforcers of official liturgical practices.

---

<sup>27</sup>SC, no: 10.

<sup>28</sup>*ibid.*, no. 14.

<sup>29</sup>Liston Papers,[List.] no. 19., ACA.: Letter, McKeefry to Liston 17 June 1961, 'The puzzle to me is how all the varying opinions are to be reconciled, but I suppose the Italian ability for compromise will see to that'.

<sup>30</sup>GRIM, nos. 244-252. See for instance the Practice of Communion from the chalice, as it offers drinking, intinction, and spoons, while promoting the principle of eating and drinking communion.

<sup>31</sup>Kavanagh, p.69. and Mark Serle, Pastoral Centre Lectures, taped, 1990.

From the above outline one can see that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was not just the product of fifteen general sessions of the Council (22 October to 13 November 1962), but also an expression of much scholarship throughout the preceding one hundred years. It was passed by a vote of the bishops of 2147 to 4. Then began the work of the *Consilium ad exequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia*, a working group established by Paul VI on 29 January 1964. It was this Consilium's task was to revise the liturgical books in accordance with the norms of the Council Document; to provide education for priests and laity and to animate the renewal of Catholic worship<sup>32</sup>. It became its role to bring the document to life in the Church and in the process it met with much opposition, because in countries like New Zealand the Church was not completely prepared for such a change.

The task of directing the liturgical renewal fell to the bishops, but the task of enfleshing Pastoral Liturgy essentially fell to the priests. Among the priests were a small group, whose enthusiasm had been sparked in the preceding decade.

---

<sup>32</sup>Martimort, Vol 1 p.80.



## Chapter Two: Who is driving the reforms?.

### Was the New Zealand Church ready for such a change?

This chapter examines the perfunctory manner in which the reforms were implemented, largely due to the fact that the bishops, with two notable exceptions, were not enthusiastic for the renewal directed by *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Here, for the first time the work of the St. Paul's group at Holy Cross College during the 1950s is documented. Later, the members of this group were very influential and provided practical leadership in the development of liturgy in New Zealand during the 1960s, 70s and 80s. Generally the Catholic Church in New Zealand during the later part of the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s could be categorised as a conservative church which was not prepared for major renewal.

Given the hierarchical nature of church structure, there was very little room for movement by both clergy and laity. The volume of letters addressed to the bishops by both clergy and laity asking permission for even the most trivial requests, gives one the overriding impression that nothing was done without first getting permission from the bishop. The dominant role of the bishop is very obvious even to the casual observer.

With the advent of liturgical renewal during the 1960s not everyone was caught by surprise. There was a small group of priests from various dioceses who were prepared for it. Their preparation had begun as members of the St. Paul's group back in the 1950s at the National Seminary in Mosgiel. The St. Paul's group was begun by Basil Meeking, a seminarian from Christchurch diocese.<sup>1</sup> Msgr. Brian Arahill, another member of the St. Paul's group, remembers that in 1951 Basil Meeking was known as someone very interested in the liturgical movement, who was already receiving overseas periodicals like *La Maison Dieu*. Meeking had sought permission to begin the St. Paul's group, which met on Sunday mornings outside of class time under the chaplaincy of Father Ronald Cox, the Scripture Professor. The Rector, Fr. Bernard Courtney supported the group by allowing it to function in the Seminary.

---

<sup>1</sup>Since 1996 Emeritus Bishop of Christchurch

Originally the group's aim was not to prepare for the 1960s, but to remain informed of the trends which were moving the Church in the 1950s. Describing the seminary of that time, Basil Meeking writes 'there was...some awareness of what was happening liturgically in Europe, but it required a catalyst to get some of the students interested and discussing it in a systematic way, St Paul's group provided that.'<sup>2</sup>

The St. Paul's was a response to the movements in the Church which had occurred after the Second World War in areas as diverse as patristics, liturgy, scripture, reconstruction of society, and the cold war. 'Something of all this had communicated itself to those who took part in St. Paul's group and they wanted to talk about it together in a systematic way and to discuss what it might mean for their pastoral work as priests', writes Meeking. Essentially the group understood the liturgy as more than rubrics or ceremony and wanted to give 'practical expression to the insights of the liturgical movement in parishes in New Zealand.'<sup>3</sup> Through study of two important writings by Pius XII, *The Mystical Body of Christ* (1945) and *Divine Worship* (1947) together with other material, they came to appreciate the deeper theological meaning of liturgy. Occasionally the group also initiated practical demonstrations of what could be achieved.

When Basil Meeking was ordained and left the seminary, Msgr. John Broadbent, later Rector of the seminary himself, took over the groups' leadership. The last leader of St. Paul's group was Brian Arahill until late in 1955 when it was ended. Arahill recalls being summoned to the Rector's office and told that the group could no longer operate because the Bishop of Dunedin, Dr. John Kavanagh, decided it was not 'according to the mind of the Church and ordered the Rector to disband the group.'<sup>4</sup> Meeking writes that 'eventually a new rector, not so sure of himself theologically, and, I have been given to understand, the fears of at least one bishop, led to its demise, but it had probably served its purpose by then.'<sup>5</sup>

The St. Paul's group discussed ideas such as Mass facing the people, vernacular languages being used, communion under both kinds and in the hand, as well as the reform of the Holy Week ceremonies. According to Arahill, at that stage there was

---

<sup>2</sup>Basil Meeking, 23 July 1996, unpublished text.

<sup>3</sup>ibid.,

<sup>4</sup>Brian Arahill, interview. 14 March 1996, Auckland.

<sup>5</sup>Meeking, 23 July 1996.

no one on the staff who taught liturgy or was aware of those things and that 'Basil Meeking was the only one that was aware of these things as far as I can recall,'<sup>6</sup> and certainly there is no evidence to the contrary.

Meeking's place in the narrative of New Zealand liturgical history is central.<sup>7</sup> Rev. David Blake who was also a member of the St. Paul's group, describes Meeking's insights into the reform of the liturgy as 'magnificent'.<sup>8</sup> Meeking's involvement continued later as a member of the Christchurch Diocesan Liturgy Commission and he was noted, or notorious, for liturgical implementation in the Christchurch area. There is much anecdotal evidence of his parish church resounding to the sounds of modern music long before this practice became popular and to the sight of liturgical dance, much to the horror and bewilderment of the majority of parishioners then and the amusement of those who compare this stage to his period as Bishop of Christchurch.

The presence of the St. Paul's group is crucial in showing that a section of the New Zealand Catholic Church were interested and aware of the liturgical movement. Some members of the clergy were reading liturgical publications, but the trend was not general. Most of the material the St. Paul's group used came in particular from North American and French liturgical journals and Fr. J.D. Crichton of Birmingham Archdiocese, England, with whom Basil Meeking was in contact.

Though there had been very limited liturgical movement in New Zealand prior to 1964, the influence of the members of the St. Paul's group was crucial in the development of Pastoral Liturgy from 1963 onwards. Because the St Paul's group was a voluntary one in the seminary, the clergy were generally more comfortable with rubrical liturgical practice and not well informed about contemporary trends. Among both clergy and laity, the practical leadership offered by members of this group was so important.

---

<sup>6</sup>Arahill, 14 March 1996.

<sup>7</sup>ibid. In the interview Brian Arahill stated: 'I would say that Basil Meeking must in the future be credited with being the founder of the liturgical renewal in New Zealand. 14 March 1996.

<sup>8</sup>David Blake, interview, 14 March 1996, Auckland.

In contrast to the small and relatively un-influential St Paul's group, the New Zealand church as represented by its Episcopal leaders, was generally unprepared for the advent of Pastoral Liturgy. When changes were introduced from Rome, the bishops' method of implementation was to inform people of the forthcoming reforms, rather than form within them a sense of ownership for the changes. The implementation of Pastoral Liturgy was intended, wrote Pope Paul VI, 'to give expression to the Pascal Mystery in people's lives'.<sup>9</sup> In the same document, Paul VI insisted on the need for good formation for the people, instructing the bishops to provide the formation which would ensure the full and active participation by them in the renewed liturgy. As a group of leaders, the New Zealand bishops had only two members with the vision necessary for implementing the changes in the Church: Reginald Delargy and Brian Ashby. But Delargy was Auxiliary Bishop of Auckland and had limited authority of his own and Ashby, consecrated Bishop of Christchurch in 1964, was the new boy on the block in the Episcopal Conference.

Both as individuals and as a conference, the bishops' attitude and understanding of Pastoral Liturgy were crucial, but one could characterise the Episcopal Conference as a reactive rather than proactive group. They were paternalistic too, in their contentment to go slowly, so as not to upset the people, without admitting that often it was their own Catholic identity they did not want disturbed. Peter McKeefry, Archbishop of Wellington and James Liston, Bishop of Auckland were the key bishops during this period. Their personal relationship is important to any analysis of the period. Neither of them wanted the Church to change, yet both implemented the changes in the Church because they had to. It was their job, not their choice. This underlying attitude is obvious in their approach to the changes, both in their own dioceses and in the Episcopal Conference.

Cardinal McKeefry is reputed to have said on his return from the first session of the Vatican Council, 'English in the Mass? over my dead body!' and they did; he was buried according to the *Novus Missae* of 1969. Given McKeefry's position as principal Bishop and President of the Episcopal Conference, his attitude towards the changes is central. McKeefry's attitude to liturgical reform as noted in the Conference minutes was, 'that there was nothing to be lost in going slowly about the introduction

---

<sup>9</sup>Pope Paul VI, 'Motu Proprio on the Sacred Liturgy' *Sacram Liturgiam*, 25 January 1964 no.6., in *Vatican Council II The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, (ed) Austin Flannery, O.P., (Minnesota, 1975), p.46.

of further changes, especially in view of the possibility that the Consilium was already at work on the radically new "*Ordo Missae*".<sup>10</sup> Within the Conference too, there was a definite hierarchy which shows itself in the decisions which were made.

McKeefry was strongly influenced by James Liston for whom he had worked, before being appointed Coadjutor Archbishop of Wellington. McKeefry was born in Greymouth in 1902 and had attended the Christian Brothers school in Dunedin before going to the seminary at Holy Cross College in Mosgiel for three years. During these three years he was taught by Liston before going to Rome for four years to continue his studies at Propaganda Fide College and being ordained Priest in Rome at Easter 1926. On his return to New Zealand he was appointed curate at the Cathedral parish in Auckland and secretary to Bishop Cleary, from there he worked on the Diocesan paper 'The Month'. From December 1929 he was Liston's efficient and trusted secretary and editor-manager of *Zealandia*, retaining the editorship for twenty years.

McKeefry's affection for Liston is quite obvious from the many letters he wrote to him. It was to his mentor Liston that McKeefry once wrote, 'Your guidance, kindly directives and generous help on all occasions have made it an easy way, and the friendship of years with constant union at the Altar'.<sup>11</sup>

While much of the correspondence between McKeefry and Liston during McKeefry's absences at the Council in Rome concerns issues of Catholic education in New Zealand, the letters also reveal McKeefry's attitude towards the Council and the changes in the liturgy. Writing from Rome on October 31st 1964 McKeefry describes the session as 'wearying days -boring at times' and that it has 'been hard and constant and nothing very special to show', but 'if the committees do their job then there will [be] some hope of one or more constitution'.<sup>12</sup>

McKeefry criticised the reporting of the Council session of 1964. He considered the North American standards of reporting to 'have been extensive but poor and in some cases will have been adding to the general confusion that some of our people are experiencing.' While he felt that in the end much good would result from the reforms,

---

<sup>10</sup>Delargy Papers, [Del.], 10.2, ACA.

<sup>11</sup>List. 161, ACA: papers. Liston's role of mentor to McKeefry is also attested to by Ernest Simmons in his book *A Brief History of the Catholic Church in New Zealand*. (Auckland, 1978).

<sup>12</sup>List., 161, ACA.

it was he wrote, 'a pity that developments have to be thought of as judgements on the past or that the Church is just another human organisation subjected to whims in the past...boloney to that stuff.'<sup>13</sup>

In September of 1964 McKeefry penned a letter to Liston, '*Carissimo Padre*', in which he gave a typical description of the Council:

The weather was hot 'not a breath of wind to cool things....The only thing worse was going to the Council and having to stew while windbags shot their mouths off. We were on the Church and Collegiality. Some contributions were good, but most just unending fervour, most uninspiring and irritating. We have been making progress and should be able to cover all the agenda before ending. No word if this will be the final-most hope so but there still exists the fear that the Curia will gum up the works if too much is left for it to tidy-up.'<sup>14</sup>

He signed it, 'devotedly yours, your devoted child'. McKeefry again wrote to Liston at the end of the Council, expressing his relief that the Council was over:

The Council is over and it is slowly working its way out of my system. They have been great years to have lived through, and the future will reveal much that in the weariness of days we may not have realised. There will also be strenuous days ahead, but let's hope that with an end to journalists' wild speculations there will come full tranquillity to our people.<sup>15</sup>

Liston shared McKeefry's desire to return to peace and tranquillity once the Council had ended. They had seemed to see the reforms in the liturgy as a movement from one rigid rubrical system to another, and expected the new adaptation to form a solid unchanging ritual practice for the next four hundred years. The concept of continual adaptation and inculturation seems to have evaded them.

McKeefry certainly mourned the passing of the pre-Conciliar Catholic worship. His attitude is clear from the following instances. In March 1959 McKeefry replied to a

---

<sup>13</sup>ibid.: letter, McKeefry to Liston, 1964.

<sup>14</sup>Lis 19, ACA: letter, McKeefry to Liston, 7 September, 1964.

<sup>15</sup>ibid.: letter, McKeefry to Liston, 15 December 1965.



letter from the Catholic Doctors' Guild which supported a greater use of the vernacular in the Mass. Endeavouring to express his own thoughts concerning vernacular worship, he writes:

First, the liturgy proper is concerned solely with the Eucharistic rite which is essentially an action of sacrifice and, as an action is extremely restricted in the words associated with it. When we look at the ritualistic prayers surrounding the action we see in them not only prayers in keeping with the primary and secondary objectives of the action, but also prayers which, over the course of centuries, have been framed to express dogmatic truth. Hence there is a certain precision in the words chosen, and the meaning in those words has to be safeguarded, for in them lies a statement of essential truth. That being the case, the church has been jealous in preserving Latin in the Western Church....The English language today, through the loss of a unifying philosophy, has lost also appreciation in word and were the language of the Eucharistic rite to be put into English it is very doubtful if the purity of belief could be as well maintained.<sup>16</sup>

While this letter does not constitute the 'setting down a position of opposition to the introduction of some prayers in the vernacular', it is a clear expression of his position. Given his understanding of 'essential truth', the use of the vernacular in the Canon [Eucharistic Prayer] of the Mass is problematic, but it could be used in other sacraments and sacramentals. His concept of a theological distinction between the Eucharist and the other six sacraments at the level of the essential truth being preserved in the ritual language for one and not the others is a reflection of his theological training. Justifying the use of the vernacular in this way in 1959 must have made it difficult for McKeefry, less than ten years later, to accept the use of English in the Eucharistic Canon of the Mass.

McKeefry's attitude towards the use of the vernacular did not really change. In two letters (1964 and 1970) to Fr. Con. O'Connor SM, Novice Master of the Marist Fathers Noviciate at Highden near Palmerston North, McKeefry's attitude is quite clear. In 1964 O'Connor had written complaining about the use of the vernacular in the Mass, regretting the passing of Latin and the detrimental effect on the seminarians Latin

---

<sup>16</sup>Liturgy Papers, McKeefry, Peter, T., and Sneddon, Owen, N., Liturgy 1954 to 1985, [Lit.'54] WCA: letter, 22 March 1959.

study.<sup>17</sup> At that time McKeefry had recommended an English Mass only once a month. In 1970 O'Connor wrote to McKeefry on the same issue, McKeefry's reply reveals his true sentiments:

I sympathise fully with you in your regrets over the gradual departure from the Latin Mass. I still adhere to the Latin Mass except when I am out in Parish Churches. Then, I go along with the new form of the rite insofar as it has been at present implemented. I shall do the same after the First Sunday of Advent [1970], but privately, my Masses shall remain in Latin. I did my liturgy under Tardini, who was a purist in Latin, and like yourself I detest many of the translations that have been inflicted upon us. However, we can hope that when it comes to the final translation of the new Roman Missal some of these defects will be remedied.<sup>18</sup>

Such a comment from one who is primarily responsible for implementing a new practice of ritual worship is not comforting, because of the dichotomy it displays between official practice and private stance. It is an attitude which unquestionably had a marked influence on the process of liturgical implementation in New Zealand during this period. McKeefry implemented the new liturgical reforms out of sense of duty and loyalty to the Vatican, rather than any sense of agreement with the theology of Pastoral Liturgy. McKeefry's overall attitude towards the Vatican Council was one of studied frustration. His personal position on private Masses, while still in accord with Church directives, was not what every priest desired.<sup>19</sup> McKeefry was a man of his time and the new age would test his resolve.

A further instance is McKeefry's reply to a letter from E.P. Cahill about the negative effect of the changes in the liturgy.<sup>20</sup> McKeefry acknowledges that 'the liturgical changes that have been made have caused a lot of heartache to many people and one must sympathise with those who are disturbed'. McKeefry describes the place of vernacular in worship as a poor substitute for Latin, made necessary by lower educational standards:

---

<sup>17</sup>ibid.: letter, August 1964.

<sup>18</sup>ibid.: letter 19 November 1970.

<sup>19</sup>ibid.: letter, Allardyce to McKeefry, 30 March 1966. Allardyce asked permission to celebrate a private Mass in English, because he had two altar servers present. McKeefry denied permission because 'the general ruling has been that private Masses are to be in Latin.'

<sup>20</sup>ibid.: letter, E.P. Cahill to McKeefry, 7 September 1970.



while people today have become more literate, Latin is unfortunately no longer part of the general educational background. If it were not for this, *it would have been possible to have preserved the Latin Mass* which on account of its centuries-old use had its own special form, and so preserved that essential note of mystery that made for a profound faith. Now we are finding too many who think that "activity" must be emphasised, and there is a real danger that where freedom is allowable in certain adaptations the use of this freedom could cloud the essential nature of the Mass.<sup>21</sup> [my emphasis added]

To blame the lack of familiarity with Latin as a reason for the development of vernacular worship is ridiculous. In the days before widespread literacy most Catholic people were illiterate in both their own language and the language of worship. It was not the lack of instruction in Latin, but the rise in appreciation of one's own language as the vehicle for worship which was responsible for the development of vernacular worship. His reference, to freedom 'in certain adaptations' clouding 'the essential nature of the Mass', signals too a growing fear of loss of control over the implementation process and possibly over the future direction of the Church. McKeefry's argument reflects his general inability to understand the depth of the renewal which the Church was demanding. McKeefry followed up this letter with one to Owen Sneddon in which he suggested that the National Liturgy Committee should give some thought to the former letter, as the sentiments expressed were true for a good many people.

In these letters, we see the true McKeefry, a man who really did not want or support the vernacular Mass. Because of his training and position, he did not have the freedom to publicly oppose or question its implementation; because he too was constrained by the hierarchical system he administered. His negative influence within the Episcopal Conference and on Sneddon his assistant cannot be underestimated or ignored as contributing towards the lack of initiative by the Episcopal Conference's Liturgy Committee [later the Commission] and for the dearth of good liturgical leadership in the Archdiocese of Wellington. When Delargy replaced McKeefry, one of the difficulties he had to face was a Presbyterate formed in the McKeefry model. Since the days of McKeefry the Wellington Archdiocese has struggled in the area of

---

<sup>21</sup>ibid.: letter, McKeefry to E.P. Cahill, 14 September, 1970.

liturgical implementation and has exercised a limited liturgical influence in New Zealand.

Liston's attitude is not dissimilar to McKeefry's, except in one crucial way, Liston did not inhibit development in the same way that McKeefry did in Wellington, but rather used the initiative of Reginald Delargy whom he had chosen as his assistant Bishop in 1958 and Delargy's enormous energy for change.<sup>22</sup> Liston, though autocratic in his style of governance and not himself in total agreement with Church reforms, was an intelligent and loyal churchman. Though he never attended any of the Council sessions, he was not uninformed of the Council's progress or direction. Appointed coadjutor Bishop of Auckland to assist Bishop Cleary in 1920, Liston was an influential figure in the lives of both McKeefry and Owen Sneddon who became auxiliary Bishop of Wellington to McKeefry.

In the 1960s Liston was the senior bishop and an old man, with the personal title of Archbishop. In 1965 he was 85 years old and had already served for 45 years as a bishop in Auckland. Liston's temperament was such that while people respected him, he was not held in great affection. His violent outbursts towards his priests had resulted in a difficult relationship between priest and bishop, which Ernest Simmons, describes as being 'more like that of schoolboy to a rather tyrannical and feared headmaster, than of priest to a fellow priest or father in God.'<sup>23</sup> Even though he allowed many things to happen in the area of liturgical reform and encouraged people such as Fr. David Blake of Auckland to found and to build up the Catholic Printing Centre [CPC], all real power of decision making rested in his hands. Jocelyn Franklin, Bishop Delargy's secretary from 1959 until 1965 remembered times when Delargy's loyalty to Liston was sorely tested:

many times he [Delargy] would be making decisions and doing this or that and people would go over his head to the Archbishop or else the Archbishop would make a decision and being an auxiliary bishop it was very, very hard....<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>ACA, Liston papers: letter of Episcopabile.

<sup>23</sup>Ernest Simmons *A Brief History of the Catholic Church in New Zealand*, (Auckland. 1978), p.105.

<sup>24</sup>Jocelyn Franklin, interview, 12 June 1996, Auckland.

There is no doubt, writes Simmons, that Liston often seemed 'grossly unfair in his judgements and vindictive in his actions', but that he was nonetheless 'a leader of considerable stature, both in the eyes of his own people, of the whole Church in New Zealand and of the general public.'<sup>25</sup> Liston's gift to the Auckland Diocese was his ability to see that the changes were not fleeting and even though he did not agree with all the implications, he allowed people to develop and the future to happen. The missalettes which CPC produced from 1968 onwards were originally the idea of Liston, who knew that if the people were to participate in the Mass, they had to have material which would enable this to happen. Liston allowed Delargy the opportunity to attend all the Council sessions. His authority was such that if he had not wanted Delargy to be absent from the country, he would have forbidden him to go, and Delargy would have had no choice, given his position as Auxiliary Bishop and his natural loyalty to Church authority.

Though Liston never instituted a Diocesan Liturgy Committee, the work of Reginald Delargy and David Blake at CPC, together with people such as Laurie Sakey (who produced his own hymn book), John Mackey of the Catholic Education Office and Felix Donnelly in the area of catechetics, were undoubtedly effective in implementing the reforms in the liturgy.<sup>26</sup> Delargy was well aware of Liston's position. In a letter to Archbishop Guilford Young a personal friend, Delargy wrote:

His Grace, [Liston] the Archbishop here, is alert to the spirit of the Documents and progressive in principle, but slow to move in any radical way. Altars facing the people, etc. only now getting acceptance. On the other hand, his programme on education for the Diocese in the spirit of the Council is ahead of most places, or at least, that is my impression.<sup>27</sup>

Reginald Delargy shines through as the New Zealand bishop most at home with the Vatican Council and the changes it was bringing about. Only Brian Ashby of Christchurch displayed a similar ease. Delargy attended all of the Council sessions and spent much of this period travelling between New Zealand and Rome. Delargy also had many contacts world-wide, with people who were at the cutting edge of the

---

<sup>25</sup>Simmons, *History*, p.106.

<sup>26</sup>Delargy set up the first 'steering' Liturgical Committee in Auckland diocese in mid 1970. This arrangement was formalised in May 1982.

<sup>27</sup>Del. 5, ACA: letter, Delargy to Young, 3 September, 1966.

reforms, including Godfrey Diekmann, the American Benedictine and Liturgist and Archbishop Guilford Young of Hobart. Delargy's energy seemed infinite. Simmons described him as 'a leader of unusual quality', but one whose leadership was confusing at times for his priests.<sup>28</sup> Uncharacteristically among bishops of the day, Delargy's interest in the Council stemmed from his activity in the lay apostolate.<sup>29</sup>

For Delargy, the theology of the Church was one which naturally included the laity, their formation and their role as ministers of the Gospel. Delargy's ease and McKeefry's unease with the renewal of the Church and the apostolate of the laity could partly explain the difficult relationship between these two men. McKeefry 'seemed to lose few opportunities, public or private,' to put Delargy in his place.<sup>30</sup> In a letter to Liston from Rome in November 1964 McKeefry wrote, 'Reg is the only one that seems to be able to keep his enthusiasms -most often bubbling and always stimulating, even if I do not agree with him, but then he is used to that, and always comes back for more'.<sup>31</sup>

Delargy's vision of the Church was not an easy vision for others to follow. The priests of the Auckland diocese often felt bewildered by Delargy's leadership methods because his way of operating was so totally different from Liston's. Delargy simply assumed that the laity would be part and parcel of the Church reforms. When the bishops set up the National Liturgical Commission, it was Delargy who insisted that full use be made of the clergy, religious and laity in the commission.

An example of Delargy's position can be seen in his address to the Anglican's Men's Society in Auckland in 1966. He explained that 'if the Church is to come to grips with the modern world, it must discuss more than Liturgy, but in fact to begin this way was truly inspired'. He pointed out that the way in which people pray is a reflection of what they believe and that the present time of debate and experimentation in the Catholic Church would provide it with an 'opportunity for one and all to sort out their ideas on the nature and needs of modern man'. For Delargy this was the beginning of a new

---

<sup>28</sup>Simmons, *History*, p. 109.

<sup>29</sup>He started the Catholic Youth Movement in 1939 and attended the lay congress with Fr. John Curnow of Christchurch in 1957. Delargy was a devotee of the J.O.C. the Catholic Youth Movement [CYM] begun in Belgium by Fr. Cardijn. The Catholic Youth Movement sought to change society by studying the Gospel and putting them into practise following the principles of Catholic Action.

<sup>30</sup>Simmons, *History*, p. 110.

<sup>31</sup>Lis 161, ACA: letter, 24 November 1964.

age and the 'reconstruction of the Liturgy and its adaptation to local conditions,[was] more radical than ardent supporters had thought possible before the Council'.<sup>32</sup> Such was Delargy's enthusiasm for the reform. Delargy's own energy and his direct contact with the Council and some of its chief architects meant that he was a dynamic proponent of change.

By contrast, Owen Sneddon, who was the Episcopal deputy for Liturgy and a member of the International Committee for English in the Liturgy [ICEL],<sup>33</sup> did not have the same enthusiasm. He was much more conservative by nature and had very little contact with the Lay Apostolate movements before the Council. He was born in Auckland, studied in Rome for seven years, gaining a post-graduate degree in theology. He was famous for his wartime broadcasts on Vatican radio to New Zealand, reporting the status of allied prisoners of war which made him known outside Catholic circles. With Mons. Hugh Flanagan and others, Sneddon at personal risk helped hide allied soldiers and airmen who came through Rome on the run from Italian and German forces. For his part in this wartime effort Sneddon was awarded a MBE by the British. On his return to New Zealand, he was appointed Assistant editor of *Zealandia* in 1947 and later editor.

Sneddon was appointed to Wellington Archdiocese in 1962. Sneddon is remembered as a very shy and retiring man, who did every thing diligently. He was able and intelligent, well read and cultured, but these aspects alone could not fit him to his task as a leader in liturgy. Sneddon was not a noted liturgist before or after the Vatican Council. In fact Owen Sneddon was not a leader. His shyness, to the point of physical illness, and an apparent lack of self esteem inhibited his ability to provide definite direction for priests during the liturgical reforms.

---

<sup>32</sup>Del. 5, ACA: letter, November 1966.

<sup>33</sup>The first meeting of the International Committee for English in the Liturgy [ICEL] was held at the Venerable English College in Rome on October 17th 1963. ICEL was created by the English speaking bishops to work on the translations of the latin texts into English. The Vatican had directed that there could only be one text for the same language groups. ICEL drew its experts from North America and England and is now based in Washington DC. Cardinal Heenan had great difficulty with the concept and work of ICEL, because he of the language differences between British English and American English, which he felt, dominated the texts. he also found the translations to be simplistic and banal and on occasions quite wrong. None of this is a surprise given Heenan's 'no' vote to *Sacrosanctum concilium* in the Council.



The indecisive nature of the National Liturgy Commission reflects traits of Sneddon's own character and the dominance of McKeefry's power. Sneddon's inability to offer leadership to the Commission meant it was in constant need of some other authority to provide the insights and material for implementation. Sneddon did not have a free hand since he was McKeefry's Auxiliary, a position without authority or real influence and the effectiveness was often limited because McKeefry 'reserved certain decisions to himself'.<sup>34</sup>

In Christchurch Brian Ashby was consecrated bishop according to the pre-conciliar rite on Wednesday 15 August 1964. Coming as he did from the Catholic Enquiry Centre in Wellington to the episcopate in the middle of the Vatican Council, he appears to have had a good sense of the impending changes in the Church.

Although Ashby was more personally concerned with ecumenism than liturgy, he was the only Bishop with both a Liturgy Commission and a Music Commission. Ashby had established both Commissions in May 1965 with the brief to 'secure a uniform liturgical practice in the celebration of Holy Mass'. He later combined the two commissions and formed a single Liturgy Commission on 30 October 1967 under the chairmanship of Reverend Dr. G.W. Harrison.

Ashby was the youngest Bishop in the New Zealand conference. McKeefry's observation of him at the Council was:

---

<sup>34</sup>Lit '54, WCA: letters, Sneddon to O'Dea, Sneddon to Blake, see also Lis 57.5, ACA: letters, Snedden to Delargy over the use of the Chapman Lectionary, below: 20 July 1966 Sneddon to all bishops, about the availability of Chapman Publishers LTD. *People's Holy Week Book*, letter to Delargy re: a new Lectionary, from George Chapman. July 29 1966: Delargy to Sneddon, 'commenting on the need for some thing, but that the Chapmans' Book could be of limited value. August 8 1966: Sneddon to Delargy, 'Thank you for your comments on Chapman's letter and the various Liturgical books. I hope it will not be too long before we can get something underway as regards the Lectionary programme, but you know how things are at the moment.' 26 October 1966: Delargy to Snedden, 'Was anything decided about the Chapman Holy Week Book? Archbishop Liston is prepared to have one done by Chapman. If nothing else is coming up, I might encourage him.' 4 Nov. 1966: Sneddon to Delargy, 'The Chapman Holy Week Book is under consideration at the moment, and I hope to have a decision before too long.'

For Brian I think the session has been most invaluable. Apart from giving him a sense of status it has brought him face to face with situations, topics and people and all this will enable him to enter again into Ch.Ch. not so much as a former priest just consecrated, but as one freshly aware of obligations, duties and equally aware that the Holy Ghost is there to inspire and guide.<sup>35</sup>

John Kavanagh, the Bishop of Dunedin, was a canon lawyer by trade, and it shows in his approach to the liturgical renewals. He implemented the changes because he had to, and did what was necessary to inform the priests and people of Dunedin diocese, but he was not a leader in the area, nor even progressive. His main and important contribution was managing the production of new interim texts through the use of the *Tablet* newspaper and printing company.

The period prior to the changes of the 1960s can be characterised by the necessity of getting things right in terms of the liturgy. This is most probably a result of the training which the Clergy received in the Seminaries. Liturgy manuals such as Fortescue-O'Connell's *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*<sup>36</sup> left nothing to chance, nor to the imagination. Every movement of the bishop, priest or deacon is described in minute detail, where the overriding concerns focus on the legal [Canon Law] requirements for saying Mass and the use of approved texts. Given the change from a very rigid ritual prescription to a more Pastoral Liturgy during the mid sixties, a reaction on the part of the priests was not unexpected. Due to a real dearth of material which priests could use during this time of transition, several priests moved ahead and either translated their own material, or used material from other English speaking countries. Two priests from the Wellington Archdiocese to do this were Frs. Shaun Hurley and Barry Edwards. In Porirua Shaun Hurley had made his own translation of songs from Latin into English for use at the Sunday Mass.<sup>37</sup> In

---

<sup>35</sup>List.. ACA: letter, McKeefry to Liston.

<sup>36</sup>Fortescue-O'Connell, *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*, 11th ed, (London, 1960).

<sup>37</sup>Lit.'54. WCA: letter, Shaun Hurley to Owen Sneddon, 16 January 1968, re: permission to use an English Mass and the four hymn sandwich as a 'stop gap' measure. Hurley explained that the parish had been singing the proper in English 'using an English adaptation by myself of the Latin People's mass', which was 'satisfactory'. Hurley requested a recommended or approved sung Mass for New Zealand of good quality. Sneddon replied on 13th February 1968 that there was nothing yet and that the Liturgy Commission and Episcopal Conference would raise the issue.

Wanganui, Barry Edwards had made his own translation of the Mass from Latin into English<sup>38</sup>, but these initiatives were never fully utilised in the Wellington Archdiocese.

Implementing the new liturgy was not easy for the bishops, nor for the majority of priests, because it presumed a new theological starting point than that espoused in Fortescue-O'Connell. Because the implementation of Pastoral Liturgy involved both a changed theology and a less hierarchical structure, the bishops often appear caught between the new liturgy and the old methods of Episcopal governance. Often there is tension between what an individual bishop might want and the reluctance of Episcopal Conference to act. This was sometimes due to the desire by the bishops, especially Liston, McKeefry and Kavanagh, for New Zealand to be seen as one homogenous church.

The lack of decisive action by the Episcopal Conference and the dependence of the New Zealand Church on other countries is very evident. There is the constant refrain throughout the late sixties from Owen Sneddon that the liturgical texts were not available for distribution, because nothing had arrived from Rome, or from ICEL.<sup>39</sup> An example of this dependence is a letter to Geoffrey Chapman Publishers, where Delargy comments on the New Zealand situation,

As you well understand NZ is a very small place and we must depend on what is done elsewhere. There are no firm decisions and it is not likely that there will be for some months. However, as regards the Mass we will be depending greatly on the Layman's Missal Prayer book. We do not intend to use the vernacular all the time and will be providing simple leaflet forms for the Propers.<sup>40</sup>

Dependence on others to do the ground-breaking theological work was also symptomatic of New Zealand's small size and its lack of trained liturgists. By 1965 this situation had begun to change, in the minor areas of the liturgy.<sup>41</sup> But it was only with the creation of the Auckland Catholic Printing Centre in 1968 that New Zealand's dependence on other countries for liturgical material and expertise was lessened.

---

<sup>38</sup>ibid.,

<sup>39</sup>Bishops Conferences minutes, 1963-1971, WCA.

<sup>40</sup>Del. 63-70, ACA: letter, 15 June 1964.

<sup>41</sup>Del.10:-1, ACA.



Before the widespread availability of local texts the Episcopal Conference had produced material which was intended only to inform, not to form people in the new direction of Pastoral Liturgy. In their pastoral letter of 1966 the bishops' mirrored the suggestions of Pope Paul VI in his letter *Mirificus eventus*<sup>42</sup>, in which he suggested various means for educating the Catholic population regarding the liturgical and church changes.<sup>43</sup> The bishops themselves offered four initiatives which they hoped would educate the Catholic people. Firstly, from the third Sunday of Lent until Pentecost a period of nine weeks there should be a weekly talk given by the Parish Priest or another competent priest on the Council documents. Secondly, from Easter Sunday onwards there would be homilies on the nature of the Christian life as in the Constitution on the Church. Thirdly, the suggestion to give children ritual experiences and appropriate instruction on the role of the bishop as 'shepherd of his people'. And lastly, to invite adult parishioners to join in the children's ceremonies and make visits to churches. Even with the enticement of a Plenary Indulgence for each attendance at three meetings explaining the Council decrees the response to this initiative was not great as the bishops expected.<sup>44</sup>

In the Pastoral they exhorted the Catholic people 'to study for yourselves and make prayerful imitation on the Council documents as they become available.'<sup>45</sup> Though they felt that liturgy because its symbolism and language was not understood by the vast majority of Catholics, the bishops did not set up an effective education programme throughout the country to ensure the formation of the Catholic population. The bishops' response reflects a presumption that an implementation of change from above using tried and true methods was sufficient. The incentive of the Plenary Indulgence is a good example of an old practice which even then was becoming less and less viable in the developing new spirituality of the 1960s and 70s.

The suggestion that the parish priests run sessions on the Council is a direct reflection of the priest's classes for converts, when he instructed people in doctrine, passing on knowledge about the beliefs of the Church, while not always being concerned for developing the faith of the individual. It was also a difficult call for many priests, who were themselves as shell-shocked by the changes as the people they

---

<sup>42</sup>7 December 1965.

<sup>43</sup>*Zealandia*, 10 March 1966, p.1.

<sup>44</sup>Lit '54, WCA: letter, McKeefry to Liston, Kavanagh to McKeefry, see also National Liturgy Commission Box, CDA: letter, Ashby to Delargy.

<sup>45</sup>*ibid.*, p.1.

ministered to. In some cases they were also less well informed about the Vatican Council's aims and direction than the laity.<sup>46</sup> Assessing the effectiveness of the reforms and people's reaction to them is problematic because of the way in which the bishops handled the two surveys which were undertaken for ICEL in March 1967 and the Holy See in June.

Both ICEL and the Holy See wanted to gather opinions as to how the translations and the reforms were being received by Catholics. While the bishops published ICEL texts so the 'average mass-goer' could have their say<sup>47</sup>, the results of the questionnaire were of little practical value to ICEL, because the number of respondents was so low. The Vatican survey was supposed to be have carried out through the national and diocesan liturgy commissions to gain a more precise knowledge of the legitimate aspirations of the clergy and of the Christian people, but it was not.<sup>48</sup>

McKeefry in his covering letter acknowledged the suggestion by the Concilium to use national and diocesan commissions but he felt 'it would be better if we amalgamated the views of the Bishops with the observations of a cross-section of the Parish Priests'. In doing this McKeefry undid the effectiveness of the Commission and the Concilium. McKeefry then incorporated 'into the questionnaire' the suggestions of the bishops' and 'selected parish priests'.<sup>49</sup> Had the survey been allowed to continue it would have revealed some of the needs which the Catholic community were facing. Because this did not happen in New Zealand a valuable source of information was lost. This approach characterised the relationship between the bishops and the National Liturgy Commission and resulted in the commission's inadequate liturgical leadership.

---

<sup>46</sup>Rev. P Murry 'The priest are just as much bewildered as the laity with all the changes in the Church', in *Zealandia*, 5 May 1966.

<sup>47</sup>Lit. '54, WAC: statement, Consultation of the Laity. see also *Tablet*, 22, February 1967. 'New Zealanders get a say in Texts for Proper of the Mass: Experts want to hear from the ordinary Mass-Goers'.

<sup>48</sup>Letter to bishops 15 June 1967, in *Documents on the Liturgy*, p.140. see also Lit. '54, WCA: letter, request for information to be provided through national and diocesan liturgy commissions or 'other bodies normally used' by the bishops and to have the information in Rome by 30th November of 1967. The Concilium was interested in how the liturgical reforms were working on pastoral level and whether the number of worshippers had increased or decreased? Had use of the vernacular increased more active and intelligent participation, what reaction had there been to the reforms? There had been a previous request by the Concilium in march 1965 for written reports from presidents of Episcopal conferences on the 'first steps of liturgical reform. Also in List. 3:69.2 and List. 63.1., ACA.

<sup>49</sup>List., 3:69.2, ACA.

On 19 May Sneddon wrote to the bishops' regarding the Second Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy<sup>50</sup>, which was to come into effect on 29 June 1967. Kavanagh sent copies of the booklet containing the Instruction with comments and instructions for the bishops and clergy.<sup>51</sup> To the official comments of Bugnini, Kavanagh added some local comments and pointed out for the Bishops the issues that they had yet to decide upon. At this stage the Instructions and letter from the Vatican regarding the reforms were coming thick and fast. Between January and August 1967 there were ten letters or instructions on the liturgy.

In May 1967 McKeefry consulted the bishops regarding petitioning Rome for permission to use English in the ordination rite. With their agreement he petitioned Rome and received an affirmative answer on 9 June. The latest changes in the liturgy were printed in the two Catholic papers and copies were sent to the priests. The major change was yet to come, that of the vernacular in the Canon or Eucharistic Prayer. In *Consilium ad Exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia* on 21 June 1967 Cardinal Lecarno, President of the Concilium, wrote of the place of the vernacular in the Eucharistic Prayer, or Canon as the 'last step in the gradual extension of the vernacular'.

Pressure was brought to bear on the bishops to implement the new order of Mass as soon as possible. The Apostolic Delegate to New Zealand wrote asking 'the Episcopal Conference of New Zealand...according to instructions received by me from the Cardinal Secretary of State to His Holiness, to adopt as soon as possible the new liturgical text for the Mass as issued by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy'.<sup>52</sup> Ireland by comparison had introduced the vernacular in the Canon and new Eucharistic prayers on 1 December 1968'.<sup>53</sup>

Here one of the major blocks was the bishops' disagreement over the translation of the Our Father [Pater Noster]. They were divided over the use of the present text

---

<sup>50</sup>*Tres abhinc annos* 'Second Instruction on the carrying out of the Constitution on the Liturgy', 4 May 1967.

<sup>51</sup>Lit. '54. WCA: letter, Kavanagh to Bishops, 9 June 1967, re: *Instructio de cultu mysteriorum Eucharistici*, 25 May 1967 see also *Documents on the Liturgy*, p1410. Annibale Bugnini, CM. was Secretary of the Concilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy from 1964-1969.

<sup>52</sup>Lit. '54. WCA: letter, Sneddon to George Dwyer, Archbishop of Birmingham, 10 February, 1970.

<sup>53</sup>Allan McClelland, 'Great Britain and Ireland', in *Modern Catholicism, Vatican II and After*, (ed) Adrian Hastings, (London, 1991), p.366.

[Our Father who art in heaven] or the ICEL translation [Our Father in heaven]. Apart from this crucial issue, everything was now in place and the new order of the Mass was ready to be implemented on November 29th 1970. This was the definitive text which signalled the end of the period of implementation, as Sneddon said 'experimentation...over the last five years is now closed'.<sup>54</sup> But the reaction to the new Mass was only just beginning. In the *Zealandia* Brian Farmer, an Auckland priest who had been sent to Trier in Germany to study liturgy, wrote eight articles during October and November in preparation for the New Order of Mass. There were several important issues which had not been resolved by the Bishops like the instruction on Communion in the hand, which later in 1974 was to cause enormous upheaval in the Church.<sup>55</sup>

The presence of the St Paul's group indicated a small but effective level of interest in liturgical development in New Zealand. The groups voluntary nature also reflected the contemporary attitude that liturgical development was not a major priority for the New Zealand Church. The action of John Kavanagh, Bishop of Dunedin, indicates that there was some fear of the liturgical movement, even among the hierarchy.

The bishops were of course concerned with many issues apart from the liturgical changes. Issues such as the future development of the New Zealand Catholic school system and the new catechism took their attention. The role of Peter McKeefry in setting the overall tone of 'slowly, slowly' has shown itself to be a central factor in the implementation process. His attitude towards the National Liturgy Commission reflected both this general attitude towards change and his desire to keep control of the period. The bishops were men of their time, loyal functionaries of the hierarchy, where only Reginald Delargy and Brian Ashby stand out as men conversant with the changes.

---

<sup>54</sup>*Tablet*, 30 September 1970, p. 3.

<sup>55</sup>Bishops Conference Minutes, WCA: 14-16 July 1969, re: Instruction *memoriale Domin* issued 29 May 1969, 'led to agreement that no action should be take and no announcement made at this stage, regarding the suggestion for the reception of communion into the hand of the communicant.'

## Chapter Three: From one day to the next.

### **The Changes.**

What was it about the reforms which so confused the New Zealand Church? Here the general nature of the reforms, the changing role of the priest and the need for formation is discussed in greater detail.

The Church's preparation for change began on 5 February 1964 when the *Tablet* [p6] published the first Instruction for the implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* under the title 'Pope Paul decrees some changes in Liturgy'. The provisions of the Constitution which were to come into force on 16 February 1964, were printed in full. The bishops had decreed there would be no changes to the liturgy until after the publication of the first Instruction. Throughout 1964 liturgical news and comment was a regular feature of the *Tablet* and *Zealandia* as New Zealand prepared for the implementation of vernacular in the Mass, scheduled to begin in August.<sup>1</sup> On July 15 1964, the *Tablet* published the first of the post-Council changes in the Mass, that were to come into force on Sunday, 16 August 1964.<sup>2</sup>

At their meeting of 14 and 15 May 1964, the bishops had decided vernacular worship could be used at parish Masses with a congregation, official Religious Community Masses on feastdays and Sundays in Religious Houses and at Requiem and Nuptial Masses 'at the discretion of the parish priest...[and] the ability of the congregation to

---

<sup>1</sup>There were regular articles by Rev. Fredrick McManus Professor of Canon Law at the Catholic University of America and an official Councillar expert:

26 February 1964, 'How Much of the Mass Can We Expect to Have in English?'

11 February 1964, 'New Look for the Sacraments has Been Decreed in Reforms' looks at the other sacraments of Baptism and Anointing of the Sick.

22 April 1964, 'Two Major Changes in Mass have been Decreed by Council' is about Communion under two kinds and concelebration.

29 April 1964, 'New Liturgy Constitution is Revolutionary'

see also, *Tablet*, 27 May 1964, editorial comment, and *Tablet*, 5 August 1964, letter to the editor.

<sup>2</sup>*Tablet*, 15 July 1964, p.35.

take part.<sup>3</sup> The decree permitting the introduction of the vernacular into the Mass in New Zealand was given at Rome on 16 May 1964 and arrived here on 8 June, 1964.<sup>4</sup>

A circular letter dated 10 July 1964, which was sent to all priest and was also published in the *Tablet* and *Zealandia*, announced that 'changes are authorised in the Mass and permission has also been given for the use of English in the administration of the Sacraments of baptism, matrimony and the anointing of the sick, and in the rite of obsequies associated with requiem Masses and Burials'. For the scriptures, Epistles and Gospel parishes were directed to use the Knox translations. In the Ordinary and Proper, because there was no standardised official text or altar missal, the English texts in the Layman's Missal Prayer Book were to be used.<sup>5</sup>

The letter insisted how essential it was for the work of preparation and instruction of clergy and laity to continue. If the renewal was to be effective, both laity and clergy would need a thorough understanding of the Liturgy Constitution.

For their part the bishops had set in motion preparation of a Sunday missal, including holy days, nuptial and funeral masses. They had arranged for the *Tablet* to distribute throughout the country the approved leaflets for congregational use, with the Ordinary of the Mass. Clergy were to be provided with a revised altar chart giving the parts of the Mass in English and in Latin. The first dialogue Mass in English and Latin in New Zealand was celebrated in the Dunedin Catholic Centre on Saturday evening August 15th by Bishop Kavanagh. In this 'new' Mass, the old was very evident, as Kavanagh read the Epistle himself at an altar against the wall. On the following day, Sunday August 16th at 11am, the new Mass was broadcast by station 4YA Dunedin from Holy Cross College, Mosgiel.

A letter to the editor of the *Tablet* in July 1964 asked for the use of 'present day English' in the Mass, before going on to suggest the necessity of a new translation of the Our Father.<sup>6</sup> This letter is noteworthy, because of its contribution to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Bishops Conference minute, WCA: May 1964.

<sup>4</sup>Consilium as exsequendam Constitutionem De Sacra Liturgia, Prot. n. 602/64, Novae Zelandiae, E Civitate Vaticana, die 16 maii 1964 signed by Iacobus Cardinal Lercaro , President and A. Bugnini CM, secretary.

<sup>5</sup>see glossary.

<sup>6</sup>*Tablet*, 15 June 1964.



discussion of vernacular liturgy which had been held in the *Tablet* since October 1963. Between this date and the announcement of the changes by the bishops in July 1964, there had been seventeen articles in the *Tablet* alone about the changes in the liturgy.<sup>7</sup> There was even a picture of a specially erected Altar at the Vatican Council, where the celebrant faced 'the fathers of the Council in the body of the council hall while offering Mass'.<sup>8</sup>

Veritas, the *Tablet* columnist, wrote that 'the wider use of the vernacular in the liturgy and the reason for it is to encourage and increase the participation of the laity in the liturgy of the Church'. He went on to comment that the success or failure of the reform would depend on the local priest. In this he was partly right, though by the middle of 1964 he was indicating that the laity were themselves a stumbling block to this renewal, through their lack of interest in participating in the changes.<sup>9</sup>

In his 1963 Christmas Day editorial, *Tablet* editor Fr. Frank O'Dea commented that the changes would not be 'accomplished overnight'. He pointed out that it could take up to ten years for the changes to be standardised, but that the 'necessary educational programme must be launched immediately and pursued with vigour.' A vigour which would 'demand effort on the part of both priest and people'.<sup>10</sup> The editors' conclusion was echoed in 1964 by Archbishop Guilford Young of Hobart, a member of the Roman working group on the Liturgy. He considered it would probably take seven years to compose a new rite for the Mass, 'but that would be as nothing, for the rite produced would influence the church's worship for centuries'.<sup>11</sup>

For those members of the Church who were regular readers of the two Catholic papers the renewal should have been no surprise. Articles about the reforms increased with the introduction of the changes. On July 29th 1964 the *Tablet* published a concise summary of the changes in the Mass that would become effective from Sunday 16 August including details of both language and posture, under the title 'The Mass In English'. These articles outlined those parts of the Proper and the Ordinary of the Mass which would retain the Latin and those which

---

<sup>7</sup>ibid., 30 October 1963, see also 1963 and 1964 editions.

<sup>8</sup>ibid., 13 November 1963.

<sup>9</sup>ibid., 27 November 1963, 'Spotlight on New Zealand'.

<sup>10</sup>ibid., 25 December 1963, p.4.

<sup>11</sup>ibid., 22 April 1964, by John Kennedy from Melbourne.

would be said in English, as well as outlining a major change which would see the people and the priest praying the same prayers together.<sup>12</sup>

In the dialogue Mass which the people were used to, the responses to the priest were made in Latin, by the congregation, but the priest and people did not say the same prayers together. For instance, when the reader read the Epistle in the vernacular, the priest read it in Latin. It was a sign of disunity, highlighting the distance between the official proclamation [priest] and the unofficial reading [the lay reader]. Though they operated at the same time, they did not participate at the same level or with an equality. An example of the move towards a new unity was the directive that some prayers be said in the vernacular and recited by both priest and people in unison.<sup>13</sup>

This was indeed a major reform, not simply in ritual action, but in the theological understanding of the relationship between priest and assembly. No longer could the priest say Mass for himself, or treat it as a private possession at the which the Laity were onlookers. This challenged both the Laity and Clergy to participate at a level they had never before experienced. Even in the dialogue Mass the people's participation was severely limited. Now many began to realise that what they thought was full participation and were comfortable with, was well short of the goal which the new reforms envisaged.

By the end of 1964 the bishops too were already beginning to request more English in the liturgy and had begun on the process of simplification.<sup>14</sup> This came as a response to the consultation of priests and selected laity about the changes. For example, Fr. D'arcy Reader, SM., responding to a general invitation made by McKeefry to all priests in the Wellington Archdiocese, commented 'there are too many posture changes for parents with children and the elderly. At present there are nine changes

---

<sup>12</sup>ibid., 29 September 1964, p.33., see also, *Zealandia*.

<sup>13</sup>The introit, Collect, Epistle and Gradual or Tract, Sequence and Gospel with its introduction and conclusion, offertory, Communion and Post-communion prayer were to be spoken aloud in English. The Canon and several other prayers were to still use Latin and be said or read by the priest from the Altar.

<sup>14</sup>Lit. '54, WCA: letter, McKeefry to President of the Concilium, 19 November 1964, requesting English in the Prayers at the foot of the Altar, Orate Fratres and Suscipiat; the Preface and introductory dialogue; embolism after the Pater Noster, dialogue before the Haeo Commixtio; communion formula for the people; concluding formula at the end of Mass and the blessing by the celebrant.



of position'.<sup>15</sup> At the inaugural meeting of the National Liturgy Commission in 1966, Rev. Dr. G.W. Harrison of Christchurch's Liturgy Commission asked that the people be allowed to stand for the final blessing, but the chairman Sneddon, said it was 'contrary to current legislation and long-standing custom'.<sup>16</sup> It was not until 1967 that the National Commission as a whole requested the bishops to rule on this issue, so there could be a single national gesture.<sup>17</sup>

Even though they consulted, decisions by the bishops on issues such as these were difficult partly because of New Zealand Catholicism's dependence on European church culture and partly due to the bishops' extreme reluctance to decide, as New Zealanders, what was locally applicable and what was not.

On 26 September 1964 the Vatican issued an Instruction, distributed to the priests and published in the Catholic papers, which modified parts of the ritual and answered some of the issues raised by priests like D'arcy Reader (see Appendix 1).<sup>18</sup> It also dealt with the building of churches and the necessity of one altar, placed away from the wall and the need to limit the number of side altar, all of which was done to facilitate the celebration of Mass facing the people. On Sunday 28 February 1965 there was an announcement made in all churches regarding the changes. The Instruction's implementation on the first Sunday of Lent, 7 March 1965 was a major event. The New Zealand bishops' own instruction, also printed in *Tablet* and *Zealandia*, was very pragmatic in its outline and it was the editor's comments which served to fill in the meaning behind the reforms.<sup>19</sup> Vernacular in the Mass continued to be a central issue, particularly in the primary prayer, the Canon or Eucharistic Prayer. As late as 1967, a memo from John Kavanagh to the bishops indicates that this was still in the preparation stage. The Episcopal Conference had decided to

---

<sup>15</sup>ibid., letter, Reader to McKeefry, suggesting people remain standing for the entrance rite, sit for the readings, stand for the Creed, sit after that till the Canon, as they had been doing for two years in the Dialogue Masses

<sup>16</sup>List. 3:6.4, ACA.

<sup>17</sup>List. 3:78.1, ACA.

<sup>18</sup>*Inter Oecumenici* the 'Instruction for the Proper Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy' which was to take effect from 7 March 1965.

<sup>19</sup>This included preferably English language hymns for both the entrance and recessional, in keeping with the sacrifice of the Mass and season of the year. An offertory hymn could be used when applicable. The instruction to the priests noted that it is 'desirable that the faithful be taught and encouraged to make Latin responses after the kyrie. This was intended to strengthen the people's latin, so they would more able to parteculate in the Latin dialogue and hence achieve a fuller participation.

'request the Canon in the vernacular...without any commitment...until definitive texts...have been presented.'<sup>20</sup>

One important result of the changing of the Mass' language and of the position of the Altar, was how it began to change the role of the priest in liturgy and more generally in the life of the Church. Mr Henry O'Connor of the Christchurch Liturgy Commission described this as 'one of the most important changes.'<sup>21</sup> The positioning of the altar changed the way the congregation and priest related to each other. It challenged the way priests understood their liturgical role and how this impacted on their pastoral role outside the Mass. For many priests this understandably challenged their identity as priest and called into question their whole theology of priesthood. This 'loss of identity' by the clergy can be seen in the preoccupation by the 1972 World Synod of Bishops on the ministerial priesthood, its role and function, in a time when so many priests were leaving active ministry. It would be too simplistic to argue that the two are directly related, but there is an important co-relation between the changing of the Mass and the role of the priest within the Church and in the wider society and the decision by so many to leave both active ministry and in some cases the Church as well. The introduction of Pastoral Liturgy was a change which heralded a new concept not only of worship, but also of priesthood in the Catholic Church.

O'Connor's submission also noted that 'as far as the language changes are concerned, the more English spoken [for those he consulted] the better, and with a little less ceremony [even though] parts of the Mass which belong to the celebrant...will no doubt remain in the traditional Latin.' The role of the priest was not only different from the ordinary, but perceived as beyond the ordinary, hence the acceptance of parts of the Mass belonging only to the celebrant. However, O'Connor also recognises that 'the Church should ensure that the bulk of the Mass be said in English, thereby removing much of its mysterious aura for the masses, and bringing them more into the Sacrifice by active participation.'<sup>22</sup> The 1967 Lay Apostolate report to Rome echoed O'Connor's concern that the introduction of the vernacular in the

---

<sup>20</sup>Bishops Conference Minutes, 29 October 1967.

<sup>21</sup>National Liturgy Commission, CCA: submission, Henry O'Connor to Christchurch Liturgy Commission, 25 June 1965.

Also from those interviewed, the priest facing the people, was not remembered precisely by them. There is a vague recollection of the period, but not the circumstances or the day, or event.

<sup>22</sup>Ashby, Liturgy letter and notes, CCA: O'Connor submission.

Mass was the greatest of all the Council reforms, but that people had not fully understood the changes in the Liturgy.<sup>23</sup>

The reforms associated with the liturgical renewal during this period included the practical necessity of interior changes to Catholic churches to accommodate the new position of the altar and the layout of the sanctuary. An important aspect concerned the role of women as Lectors. Traditionally women were not allowed in the sanctuary to read the scriptures, even in Convents and at girls' schools. The National Liturgy Commission petitioned the bishops for an answer to this issue. While imposing a ban forbidding women from reading the scriptures from a lectern within the sanctuary, the bishops did allow them to read from a lectern outside the sanctuary. The ban continued until it was lifted by the Vatican in 1970, but before that time local practice moved ahead, often in conflict with the stated rule. But arguably this issue was not as significant to Catholic women as the publication of *Humanae Vitae* in July 1968.<sup>24</sup> Other issues such as concelebration by groups of priest at a single Mass and communion under both kinds had to be dealt with and prepared for, as well as English in the Mass.

By 1968 the implementation of Pastoral Liturgy was well underway, but it was a process fraught with difficulties. The necessary preparation was not easy, because it was continually hampered by the lack of material. In Correspondence between Owen Sneddon and Frank O'Dea, editor of the *Tablet* and David Blake of CPC in Auckland, it is evident how desperate the editors' were for texts, but Sneddon was unable to provide them. From this correspondence it is obvious too that all the work of producing books for people and priests was being done in Auckland and Dunedin and that Sneddon was very happy to let this continue.<sup>25</sup>

Both Blake and O'Dea were concerned with the status and availability of New Zealand music and the place of Maori music in the liturgy. When Mass on Sunday was fully sung it was to remain in Latin because choral settings in English were not available. Blake commented that before good local music could be produced, it would first be necessary to get used to 'the feeling of the liturgy in English' and produce music 'whose idiom can be appreciated by the man in the street, simple, attractive and

---

<sup>23</sup>*Tablet* 14 June 1967, p.38., see also Delargy, notes and letters, ACA.

<sup>24</sup>see chapter five.

<sup>25</sup>Lit.'54, WCA: letters, O'Dea to Sneddon, 1968-1969, see also letters, Sneddon to Blake 1968-1970.

tuneful but yet in conformity with the principles of good music writing.' In regard to Maori liturgical music Blake commented,

the offering from Maori music...while we appreciate that liturgical music of the future should ideally be characteristic of New Zealand, we're not sure whether that 'characteristic' can be developed from Maori music. We have got used to a kind of 'ersatz' Maori music which is called traditional but which in fact is not that at all. The "Now is the Hour" type of thing- a good tune but not authentic....not...that I am suggesting "high browism" by that remark, but rather that we need genuine sources to work from. After all what we are trying to do is to establish a new translation which may have to stand up for centuries.

Also a further question arises as to whether our NZ culture is in any way dependant on the Maori or influenced by it. With this in mind, if we were to develop a chant on the Maori traditional music would that quality (Maori) be apparent and recognisable in the music to the average New Zealander?<sup>26</sup>

Blake's comments reveal that it was becoming increasingly difficult to find uniquely Kiwi expressions for use in worship. Inculturation of the liturgy was difficult for New Zealand in the 1960s because the myth of uniformity among diverse peoples and cultures still existed and the concept of universal church had long been a feature of traditional Catholicism. Where the New Zealand Church should now turn for enlightenment became a major question. For a church which was so European oriented and had never before questioned its cultural conditioning, it was a disconcerting period (as discussed more widely in chapter five).

While vernacular liturgy in New Zealand also concerned Maori it was not a dominant issue for the majority of Catholics. On 4 August 1964 the Mill Hill Missionary priests and the Marist Maori Mission priests held a conference to discuss the use of Maori. The Mill Hills worked in the Auckland diocese and the Marists in Wellington and Christchurch dioceses. The Conference statement acknowledged the tradition of prayers prayed aloud in the Polynesian tradition since the 1840s and requested this to continue. This produced a cultural conflict between some priests and the people's desire to pray the prayers for the dead in the Canon. Traditionally only the priest had spoken the Eucharistic Prayer, but the strong custom of honouring dead ancestors

---

<sup>26</sup>ibid.,

among the Maori prevailed.<sup>27</sup> The Conference requested that 'such parts of the Common of the Mass, as are to be allowed in English, be also allowed in Maori, for Maori congregations.'<sup>28</sup> The Conference submitted two translations for the bishops, one in Tai-tokerau dialect for Auckland Diocese and the other in Tai-hauauru dialect for Wellington Diocese. Both of these were presented to the Concilium which had great difficulty in allowing them, primarily because no one in Rome spoke Maori and secondly because of the rule that every language group was to present only one translation for approval. McKeefry dealt with this issue and both translations were received the Concilium's approval together with the ritual for Marriage in Maori on 14 November 1964 by the Concilium's Secretary, Fr. Annibale Bugnini, CM.<sup>29</sup> During the following years Maori translations of the Mass were often dealt with by the Episcopal Conference using expert help from Catholic and Anglican Maori, but the development of Maori liturgy has generally stopped in New Zealand. There is still appears to be a decided lack of initiative and leadership in the area of Maori liturgy and a debilitating reliance on translations from either English or Latin texts. These two factors have hindered any true development of liturgy in the Catholic Maori community.

As the initial period of implementation drew to a close there was still a general resistance towards local initiatives on the part of Sneddon in particular. The lack of texts presented an opportunity for local material to be produced. For example, Fr. Barry Edwards of Wellington Archdiocese sent Sneddon a copy of his translation of the rubrics of the *Ordo Missae cum populo* in September 1969 and a copy of the Holy Week Book he had produced. Edwards offered it to Sneddon as the basis of a text for the Archdiocese, he also suggested an English publication, *Liturgy Newsletter*, as a resource for the priests of New Zealand. Sneddon in his reply encouraged Edwards to continue in his endeavours and mentioned that he had been receiving this publication for some time, but gave no explanation as to why he had not made it available to the priests.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>ibid.: letter, M. Caufield to Sneddon, 1974.

<sup>28</sup>ACA, Statement of the Conference of the Marist and Mill Hill Fathers, 4 August 1964.

<sup>29</sup>Lit. '54, WCA: see 'Novae Zelandiae, Ordinarium Missae et Ritus Matrimonii lingua "Maori"' in Liturgy.

<sup>30</sup>ibid.: letter, Edwards to Sneddon. 'I have also been instructed to enquire [by the Deanery] from your Lordship the feasibility of our preparing a presenting for the Fathers a demonstration of the new rites....A third point, which is my own idea for which I would invite you comments, would be whether it would be useful to prepare some form of handbook explaining the new rites. This is a matter dear to my heart and something I would be delighted to attempt. I believe that we should be preparing now for the coming



Sneddon himself produced very little original material. The material he produced during 1969 was written to help priests introduce the new Prefaces and Canons of the Mass. While his explanation is very full and well written it relies very heavily on other Vatican instructions and shows very little of his own thinking.<sup>31</sup>

David Blake continued his work throughout 1968 and corresponded regularly with Sneddon, sending him copies of the Mass leaflets CPC was preparing. CPC had produced the *Graduale Simplex* in leaflet form for the offertory and Communion, with the appropriate music as well.<sup>32</sup> Before the introduction of the *Missa Normativa* the bishops would have to decide on and set in place a series of introductory lectures, which Sneddon wrote to Blake 'I am reasonably sure...will not be before Lent of next year'.<sup>33</sup>

Instead of completing the introduction of the new liturgy in 1969 the year ended on a whimper with a letter from Sneddon to the bishops advising them that the implementation of *Missa Normativa* on the first Sunday of Advent 1969 would be impossible because the texts from ICEL would not be ready by then. Sneddon suggested that by first Sunday of Lent 1970 they will be ready to go and New Zealand should look to this as the date of implementation.

What was beginning to emerge from the confusion of the period was the need not only for preparation, but also the need for effective education and formation of clergy and laity. Brian Ashby made this clear when he wrote he had 'no pastoral difficulty in the order of the Mass, beyond the constant change which seems to be inevitable'.<sup>34</sup>

---

changes, even if they will not be in effect until next year, And, I believe, we should be preparing our people these changes also'.

letter, Sneddon to Edwards, 3 October 1969, 'My thanks for your letter of 18 September, and congratulations on your initiative in translating the rubrics of the new Ordo Missae. At the meeting I attended recently in London, we were promised a full version of the instruction concerning the new Mass, and I shall be happy to send you a copy as soon as this arrives. Until then, it may be wise to defer any preparation of a handbook explaining the new rites. This, together with a demonstration of what is to come, may well be made easier for you when this material arrives. It is somewhat difficult to put on paper the many points involved, but I shall be happy to talk it over with you at the earliest opportunity'

<sup>31</sup> Ashby Papers; Diocesan Circulars, 1969, CCA:.

<sup>32</sup> Lit. '54, WCA: letter, Blake to Sneddon, 13 October 1969.

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.*: letter, Sneddon to Blake, 16 October 1969.

<sup>34</sup> Ashby Papers; National Liturgy Commission, CCA: letters, Ashby to Sneddon, 21 May 1967 and 21 May 1968.

Ashby was very aware of the clergy and laity's need for preparation. In an earlier letter to the priests of the diocese Ashby's wrote,

it is essential that every liturgical change be adequately understood before it is introduced. Some basic instruction will be needed before each of the canons are used. Then as the canons become familiar further instructions should be given to deepen the people's understanding and appreciation of the doctrines they enshrine.<sup>35</sup>

In a confidential letter to John Cuneen the secretary of the Diocesan Liturgy Commission, Ashby admitted that liturgical renewal was not going as well as one would hope. He was concerned that so few of the priests have 'yet become convinced that their role is that of liturgical leader of the worshipping community...[and that] their conviction regarding the primacy of the liturgical community is emerging slowly.'<sup>36</sup> This observation supports O'Connor's view that the priest was now 'forced to celebrate the Mass for the people and not for himself'.<sup>37</sup>

Ashby continues, that in his opinion 'the liturgical reform has not yet "caught fire" in the diocese as a whole, due to a lack of personal conviction regarding the essential meaning of the reform' on the part of the priests. While acknowledging that 'many are struggling towards this conviction, are preaching the reform, and are adapting the liturgical structure of parish worship to accommodate it', the reform was piecemeal and continually hindered by lack of clerical understanding of the aim of the reform.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Ashby Papers; Liturgy letters and notes, CCA.

<sup>36</sup>ibid.: letter, Ashby to Cuneen, 2 May 1968. The letter came as Ashby's considered opinion as, 'the best field officer the Commission had'.

<sup>37</sup>ibid.: submission, O'Connor to Christchurch Diocesan Liturgy Commission.

<sup>38</sup>ibid.: letter, Ashby to Cuneen 2nd May 1968.

As part of the preparation demanded by the Vatican to ensure the success of the renewal, each Episcopal Conference and each diocese was to establish its own liturgical Commission or committee for the education of clergy and laity. In New Zealand the National Liturgy Commission was formed by the Episcopal Conference in 1967.<sup>39</sup> The bishops decided that the Commission would be a small national body composed of chosen members who would use other expert advisors where necessary. At their first meeting, Commission members were invited to draw up their terms of reference and terms of appointment, which they were then to submit to the bishops for approval.<sup>40</sup>

The National Liturgy Commission was not constituted to lead. Their function was to comment on the bishops' decisions and then to implement the Episcopal Conference's decisions after the most minimal of adjustments. The Commission's role was to keep the clergy and laity informed of liturgical changes, to co-ordinate contributions to liturgical development between commission members and other contributors; to encourage initiative and 'controlled experimentation in the area of liturgy'. Bishop Sneddon was the Chairman and Rev. John Cuneen of Christchurch, the secretary. All the members were appointed by the Bishops' Conference and there were no lay members.<sup>41</sup>

The National Commission was a toothless lion in the area of liturgy. The difficulty lay in the Commission not meeting regularly, and the bishops' choice to keep all the decision making authority to themselves. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* gave the Episcopal Conference the authority to make many decisions regarding the liturgy in their local area, and the Papal Letter to Episcopal Conferences of June 1967 spelt out this task. The effectiveness of the New Zealand Commission can be better judged when compared to other churches and their process of implementation, for example in Ireland.

---

<sup>39</sup>List. 3:6.4, ACA: Minute of the Inaugural meeting of the National Liturgy Commission, 1967.

<sup>40</sup>Del. 10.2, ACA: inclusion of the Cook Islands in the New Zealand Conference.

<sup>41</sup>Other members were: Mons. Adrian Curran and Br. Theophane of Auckland, Rev. B. Tottman of Wellington, Rev. G.W. Harrison Christchurch, Rev. L. B. Manes CM of Holy Cross Seminary and Rev. J. Weaver SM of the Marist Seminary, Taradale.



According to V. Allen McClelland in Ireland 'the Irish bishops, under the dynamic leadership of the new primate William Conway, moved swiftly in response to *Sacrosanctum Concilium*'. McClelland recounts that the Irish Episcopal Commission for Liturgy was formed in the 'same month' of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* publication. This Commission was 'assisted by five advisory committees for music, sacred art and architecture, pastoral liturgy, catechetics and translations.' The following year the Irish Commission for Liturgy, was established under the leadership of Joseph Cunnane, future Archbishop of Tuam.<sup>42</sup>

In England, Wales and Scotland the response was at times 'rather more cautious and this caution was reinforced by a somewhat legalistic application of liturgical norms' Cardinal Heenan of Westminster was not a proponent of change, having been one of the four who voted 'non placet' at the Council. During the 1960s, Heenan's main concern was to stop a major division in the English Catholic Church over the changes.<sup>43</sup> In Ireland, according to McClelland there was never the division, due most probably to the nature of Irish society. Even today while in the United Kingdom there are groups opposed to liturgical change, 'such groups are almost unknown in Ireland'.<sup>44</sup>

In New Zealand McKeefry's insistence on the bishops' absolute right to decide on liturgical innovation meant that the Commission could never really get off the ground. An example of his position was when he took a visiting Jesuit priest, Leslie Barber, to task over his presuming to change the liturgy beyond what the bishops had allowed. In a letter to the bishops explaining the incident McKeefry writes that they 'alone

---

<sup>42</sup>McClelland, p.366.

<sup>43</sup> *Tablet*, 22 September 1970. Address given by Fr. Michael Smith SM MA in Wellington, referring to Cardinal Heenan's pastoral letter in 1969 introducing the New Order of the Mass Heenan said 'that now after many years of frequent changes, the Church had a Mass rite that would stay the same for hundreds of years.' Smith continues 'His sentiments were obvious; the distress and dislocation of the previous frequent and fragmentary changes, not to mention the multiplication of texts has obscured for many people the real values of the changes in the Church's liturgy set in motion by Vatican II....Whether his statement will prove to be true, however is very much open to doubt....For one thing is very clear about the new rites for the celebration of the Sacraments, especially the Mass - flexibility and adaptation are to be the keynotes'. in the

<sup>44</sup>McClelland, p.366-367, quoting 'Joint Report October 1984 on Liturgical Renewal in the British Isles (including Ireland)', Delivered in Rome 1984.

authorised to carry out approved experiments and that they had an obligation to restrain private initiative and to adopt safeguards against abuses.'<sup>45</sup>

Given McKeefry's dominance it is difficult to distinguish Sneddon's own opinion from that of McKeefry's.<sup>46</sup> What is painfully obvious in Sneddon's inability to provide original material and his continual refrain that nothing is yet available from overseas sources. Overall Sneddon took no responsibility for the implementation of the Liturgy and simply acted a distribution agent for ICEL material.

In spite of the Vatican request for each diocese to have a diocesan liturgy commission, the Christchurch Liturgy Commission was the one operating in New Zealand. Its purpose was to,

offer liturgical material for discussion at the June and September clerical conferences' in the diocese. Secondly, to resolve or formulate queries arising from the bishops Low week conference and three, to study towards the best uniform liturgical practice in the celebration of Holy Mass, taking into account the difference sanctuaries and churches in which it is celebrated. <sup>47</sup>

In keeping with the age and the directive of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* Ashby pointed out that 'the body is consultative and all their resolutions need the final approval of the ordinary'. In a letter to Snedden, Ashby notes that 'the faithful and clergy have received with great joy these new changes',<sup>48</sup> possibly because of the Christchurch dioceses' commitment to the education of the clergy and laity through the work of the Liturgy Commission.

The Christchurch Commission formed a literary sub-committee, whose task was to publish the *Liturgical Newsletter* for the priests of the diocese. The members of this sub-committee were Revs. B.M. O'Brien, SJ., B. Meeking, K. Clark and J. Cuneen. The publication was unpretentious in presentation, but very thorough in the material it presented. Some of the topics in 1967 for example were, 'Sunday according to

---

<sup>45</sup>Lit. '54. WCA: letter, McKeefry to Bishops, 31 January 1968. McKeefry wrote warning them that Barber was a disreputable 'weasel, if ever there was one, but no doubt typical of so many who are abroad today reforming the Church'.

<sup>46</sup>ibid.: letter, from Cuneen to Sneddon.

<sup>47</sup>Ashby, Liturgy, letters and notes, CCA: 7 May 1965.

<sup>48</sup>Ashby, National Liturgy Commission, CCA.

Vatican II', in *Lent 1969* 'Music in the Modern Church' and in *Winter 1969*, 'Masses for special gatherings'.

In Christchurch Ashby's consciousness of the enormity of the change led him to conclude that because 'people are being led to enormous changes in life-long habits [and] modes of participation' all experimental situations would have to be outlined and advertised before any action took place.<sup>49</sup> His criteria for experimentation included the necessity of the priest being personally prepared and conversant with the principles of the reform. Commenting on his own diocese he wrote, 'few priests and parishes in the diocese are yet capable of advanced liturgical experiment'. He therefore continually urged the diocesan commission to continue with a programme of education 'especially by popularising and bringing within the grasp of priests and people the main principles of the Liturgical reform.'<sup>50</sup>

Elsewhere the need for study groups to facilitate Catholics' understanding of the Mass and the new catholic identity became apparent, but the formation of groups in parishes appears to have been very haphazard. The thirst for on-going education, or for initial education was clear and the impact of lay groups like the CYM are an example of that. Professor John Reid of Auckland University, writing about the place of the CYM in the implementation of the Vatican decrees, typifies this position. 'There is a tremendous need for up-to-date knowledge by young people. It is hard to dislodge inherited ideas that are now obsolescent. Study groups will become far more important that they have been.'<sup>51</sup>

Reid's comments highlighted the gap which was beginning to grow between those who welcomed the changes and those who did not. At this stage it would be premature to talk about conservative and liberal, or reactionary and progressive, because the reaction to the Mass did not occur until after 1970. Rather it highlights the accuracy of McKeefry's fear that everything pre-Council would be viewed as bad and everything post-council as necessarily good. Dislodging the ideas of the pre-

---

<sup>49</sup> Ashby, Liturgy letter and notes, CCA: letter Ashby to Cuneen 2nd May 1968.

<sup>50</sup> Ashby, National Liturgy Commission, CCA: Ashby's requirements of a priest: Orderliness, a sense of neatness in the preparation and execution of the rubrics. Rapport: a sense of unity with the people and a consciousness of being the leader of the Congregation outside the Mass setting so as to be able to lead it within. Community: an awareness of the people and their needs and possible reactions especially their ability to take the change.

<sup>51</sup> *Zealandia*, 21 April 1966, p.8.

conciliar age would prove to be very long process, which forty years later is not a complete.

In the Auckland Diocese Bishop Delargy and Fr. John Mackay<sup>52</sup>, together with Professor John Reid and four other speakers began a series of talks for priests on the Vatican Council. This same series was also held in Hamilton and Whakatane. The talks emphasised the whole gambit of changes, not just liturgy, but also the changes of belief and the structure of belief.

Henry O' Connor's submission to the Christchurch Diocesan Liturgy Commission<sup>53</sup> had pointed out that 'education of the people for their role in the Mass is the top priority'.<sup>54</sup> While he pointed out that attention, had to be given to preaching on the various aspects of the Mass, Barry Edwards' experience in Wanganui was that sermons were ineffective as a means of education and formation.<sup>55</sup> What was called for was an effective adult education programme.

By the end of 1966 reaction to the changes was beginning to grow. Letters to the editors of both *Zealandia* and *Tablet*, show the divergence of opinion on the success of the changes. For example from Christchurch, 'In spite of dungeon, fire and vernacular' agrees with an earlier letter from 'Vexata' and writes,

the changed order of Mass leaves me with a sense of loss. To illiterate worshippers the value of the vernacular is unquestionable. Literate Catholics who could not be bothered to follow the Mass as it was by the simple expedient of using a missal are unlikely to change, and presumably will now follow a form of worship consisting of disjointed and fragmentary series of rejoinders. Under these circumstances, the value of the vernacular as a stimulus to worship becomes doubtful. With much dignified movement of the Mass removed, the reformed enactment of the Holy Sacrifice becomes correspondingly bereft of solemnity.<sup>56</sup>

By contrast 'Decet' from Dunedin responds writes that,

---

<sup>52</sup>Later Bishop of Auckland.

<sup>53</sup>See earlier this chapter.

<sup>54</sup>Ashby Papers; Liturgy letters and notes, CCA, 2 May 1968.

<sup>55</sup>Lit.'54, WCA: survey by Barry Edwards' in Wanganui, October 1969.

<sup>56</sup>*Tablet*, 17 March 1965, p. 38.

The new liturgy has an advocate in the person of myself, but...with one complaint -the changes do not go far enough. I consider that even in the most radical changes we are still thinking in the grooves of the old Latin liturgy, when what is needed is a basic overhaul; e.g. hymn singing, so much advocated by Pope Paul, has no official standing at Low Mass. There are no built-in places where the priest can lead his people in song and while we have now an excellent choice of Low Mass hymns, these are still extra-liturgical. In fact, it seems to me to be in the worst traditions of "duplication" to have, e.g. a congregation singing an Offertory hymn while the priest says the prayers. Let us swallow our pride and model the "Liturgy of the Word" on the non-Catholic service.<sup>57</sup>

The lack of common ground between hierarchy and the rest of the Church was becoming increasingly obvious. This supported the call for an effective adult education programme. The bishop's too appeared to be losing control of the process. McKeefry wrote an angry letter to his priests pointing out that no permission had been given to remove altar rails, or to admit lay people into the sanctuary, nor to give people communion in the hand. The altar rails were there he wrote to form a 'barrier between the congregation and the altar'.<sup>58</sup> Given the divergence of opinion among the Laity and the bishops' own lack of a firm model of implementation, it can be asked who was driving the changes?

As the demand for effective education of laity and clergy grew, New Zealand's efforts were being compared to those of other English speaking churches. For example, Dr. Vernon Griffiths, Professor Emeritus of Music at Canterbury University reflecting on a recent sabbatical in England commented there 'was more of a national effort' in England than there was in New Zealand.<sup>59</sup> In making this comment Griffiths was not knocking New Zealand's efforts, which he thought were generally going well, but his opinion is borne out by the bishops themselves when they acknowledged that the reform had not moved at a uniform pace in every parish, but 'a desirable degree of uniformity has been maintained'.<sup>60</sup> Given the divergence between one parish and another, between laity and clergy and the hierarchy and the rest of the Church one can seriously question the effectiveness of the National Liturgy Commission's role in

---

<sup>57</sup>*ibid.*, 31 March 1965.

<sup>58</sup>Lit.'54, WCA: letter, McKeefry to priests, 20 December 1966.

<sup>59</sup>*Tablet*, 18 January 1967, Dr. Vernon Griffiths, in 'New Zealand Leads Britain in Liturgy Field'. Spearheading the renewal in England was the English Liturgical and Music Commission, a sub-committee of the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales.

<sup>60</sup>Bishops Conference Minutes, WCA: statement, 30 July 1968.

formation of the clergy and laity and also see the pressing need for an effective formation programme for the hierarchy, laity and clergy. Christian Life Week in Auckland was an initiative to prepare the Church, both clergy and lay, for the changes.

## CHRISTIAN LIFE WEEK, JANUARY 1967.

In Auckland the need for education of the laity and clergy brought about the gathering known as Christian Life Week and the visit of Fr, Godfrey Diekmann OSB, a noted liturgist. This was a major event in the chronology of New Zealand liturgical history and for the Auckland diocese, which was held from the 22 to the 29 of January 1967.<sup>61</sup> Diekmann had been an expert advisor at the Vatican Council and he had considerable influence on the preparation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Bishop Delargy, together with Fr. David Blake of Auckland and others, among them Fr Felix Donnelly set up this important conference based at the Auckland YMCA and Sacred Heart College.

Christian Life Week's intention, recalls David Blake, was to help people 'understand what the liturgy document was about', to help them see that there had not only been a reform of liturgy, but also a movement in theology; 'to let them see liturgy was really saying something...that liturgy was theology, rather than just a rubric.'<sup>62</sup>

Delargy's international contacts and his time in Rome at the Council had enabled him to persuade Geoffrey Diekmann to visit New Zealand, before he carried on to Australia. Delargy had also invited Archbishop Gilford Young of Tasmania, but he was unable to attend. After Auckland Diekmann travelled to Wellington and Christchurch. Delargy described the event as the major starting point for further implementation of the Vatican Council recommendations and described it as an event for everyone, 'not an event for specialists.'<sup>63</sup>

Delargy appointed David Blake to organise what was a major undertaking 'in the days when big Catholic demonstrations were still quite popular amongst the

---

<sup>61</sup>*Tablet*, 1 February, 1967, p.5. attended by some 600 priests and religious and the main session drew between 1000 and 1200.

<sup>62</sup>Blake. 14 March 1996.

<sup>63</sup>Del. 5-1/13, ACA: pulpit announcements, 19 December 1967.



faithful...still hanging on to the...aftermath of the Christ the King procession at Remuera and things like that there, nevertheless there was still that kind of Catholic demonstration thing in people's minds'.<sup>64</sup> There were many people present from all over New Zealand.

The programme consisted mainly of addresses by Diekmann supported by other presenters. These addresses covered all aspects of liturgy then under discussion, and concepts which had been elucidated by the Council.<sup>65</sup> There were sessions for priests, religious and laity and also for teachers from catholic schools. These were complemented by sessions on music, the new Anglican liturgy, art and education schools. Sessions on the roles of the people and the priest in the Mass, the homily, church architecture, the altar and lectern, use of ecumenical scripture services, were also included.

The preparatory committee's aim was to prepare people before Diekmann arrived by studying the liturgy constitution. The convention committee had four aims:

- # to create a fuller sense of community worship through involvement.

- # to have a public demonstration of faith.

- # to gain a fuller knowledge of the present situation in the diocese concerning community worship.

- # to prepare practical recommendations prepare for fuller community worship in diocesan churches.

Each day there was a general assembly with liturgical functions, followed each evening with a talk for a general audience. Christian Life Week explored the reality of the people and priests having to learn by doing. It was difficult to get a balanced

---

<sup>64</sup>Blake, 14 March 1996.

<sup>65</sup>Fount and summit of Christian Life/ The Bishop, Christ's Leader in the Worship of the Community/ Light to the Worshipping Community Witness to the Word in Daily Life/ The Eucharist and Church Unity/ Principles of Liturgical Participation/Designing a Church suitable for the New Liturgy Conversion of existing sanctuaries/ Involvement of parishioners in the Liturgy/ Baptism and Confirmation ceremony/The Eucharist, centre of Christian life.



picture of the new liturgy, because every thing was new, even to the experts. Because everything was so new the experts themselves needed the opportunity 'to **experience** the new approaches to liturgy in order to understand and evaluate them' for themselves.<sup>66</sup>

Though the local clergy supported Christian Life Week, there was still an ambivalence among them towards the concept of liturgy, which was a suspect concept for those who had been trained in rubricism. By far the majority of those who attended were Religious Women, who came in droves. Their presence reflects the comment that religious were very well informed and often consulted by the laity regarding what was happening and why.

Out of the Christian Life Week came the Catholic Publications Centre, which was to be a major force in the implementation of the liturgical reforms in the Auckland diocese and to a lesser extent in other dioceses. The story of the Catholic Publications Centre in Auckland is best understood as a practical response to the document *Sacrosanctum concilium*. Initially there was 'much apprehension and hesitation' as to how they should move.<sup>67</sup> Whether to print or not to print was the question because so many international publishers were producing interim texts and commentaries. Many of the publishers, especially Chapmans of London, were in the process of producing new missals but the needs of various countries were changing all the time. The biggest question CPC had to face was "where to start?" Catechesis about the reform was necessary, but it soon became evident that the reform of the liturgy and of the theology on which it was based was so great that a little catechesis would have to go a long way. As the demand for material and instruction constantly grew in inverse proportion to the available expertise, it revealed New Zealand's lack of the necessary experts and the almost total reliance on other English speaking churches.

---

<sup>66</sup>David Blake, *C.P.C. 25 Years Later*, p.2.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, p1

Throughout 1967 there was still an obvious need for information and communication at both Diocesan and parochial levels throughout New Zealand. Some parishes and dioceses were more needy than others, but as an overall trend, the bishops had not been effective, by today's standards of communication, in clearly setting forth the agenda of change. The methods of change implementation lacked the overall insight into the pressing need for renewal, and were therefore less effective than they might have been.

Generally Catholics were still uninformed about the changes that were occurring in front of them each Sunday. They lacked sufficient formation in the spirit of renewal that was driving the renewal of the Church. Absent too from the overall picture was an effective adult education for the laity and clergy, though not all the educational opportunities provided for the laity were used by them. In 1965 Veritas noted his disgust when 'hardly a hundred people out of a parish' attended a parish meeting to listen to their bishop explain the 'most important event in the Church during their lives'.<sup>68</sup> Though the main responsibility for implementation and formation fell on the local priest it was often a difficult task when he himself was not well versed in the vision behind the reforms.

Emerging from this is the general impression that good experiences of liturgical renewal were essential for the laity in their movement towards change. In many cases the success of liturgical renewal depended on which parish or lay apostolate group one belonged to, if any. Another impression is that the laity as a whole did not always choose to play a part themselves in the renewal of the Church. While the major task of implementing the liturgy rested with the bishops and priests, the task of informing oneself must rest with the individual, and the laity seemed unable or unwilling to accept this task. Two reasons seem to suggest themselves. Firstly there was the lack of an effective adult education and formation process and that much of the material produced was felt by people to be too erudite for them. Secondly the dominant catholic mentality was not to question, but to accept the direction and wisdom of the hierarchy, in short a culture of doing what one was told. The changes in ritual language also signalled the return of 'a less clerical and more egalitarian view

---

<sup>68</sup>*Tablet*, 21 April 1965, 'Spotlight on New Zealand'.

of the Church as the baptised people of God', which the laity were singularly unprepared for.<sup>69</sup>

*Sacrosanctum Concilium* was not simply a document about the mechanics of Catholic worship, it was a document which elucidated how the Catholic Church would henceforth think about itself. It is above all an eccleiological statement. The reaction to the changes highlights the nature of the process of implementation which was available to the Church at this time and how its theology was out of step with the theology of Pastoral Liturgy.

---

<sup>69</sup>Kavanagh, p. 72.

## Chapter Four: Confusion, Response and Reaction.

In her book, *A Changing Order* Sr. Pauline O'Regan recalls the changes in the Church's liturgy for which people were unprepared. She writes of one change in the liturgy which occurred at Villa Maria College Convent.

I remember well, for example a morning Mass in the Villa Maria chapel in the early 1960's, being celebrated by the late Father Bernard O'Brien, a Jesuit priest. Just before he began, he turned to his unsuspecting, early morning congregation and said, 'We are now free to say the Pater Noster in the Mass in English, so I shall do this this morning!' And he did. In one moment, without any preparation, a centuries-old tradition was overthrown. Here in one stroke was the vernacular!<sup>1</sup>

This is not atypical of the situation which most New Zealand Catholics faced. It is also arguably true that the majority of Religious were better informed and better prepared than the average layperson. If such changes then came as a shock to Religious, the shock was even greater for the laity, especially for those who had not chosen to read and learn about the Vatican Council and its new direction. This is an example of the change process which was employed, a change from the top which took no account of the anthropological dimensions of ritual worship.

Priests too were affected by the changes in the Church. Many were confused by the enormity of the options available to them. Coming as they did out of a closed culture of rubricism (where it was vital to hold one's hands eight inches apart facing each other at shoulder height) they were not used to variety. They were being asked to implement a pastoral liturgy which 'respects and fosters the genius and talents of the various races and peoples'<sup>2</sup>, without being given the formation necessary to make the transition to this new world of theology. Such things as the pluralism of presiding styles and styles of worship were completely new. The specific needs of young people at Youth Mass, of Charismatic Catholics at their Masses, and the ordinary parishioner wanting more at Sunday Mass were concepts of worship which had never been considered before, now they became paramount in preparing for and celebrating a Mass.

---

<sup>1</sup>Pauline O'Regan, *A Changing Order*, (Wellington. 1986), p. 89.

<sup>2</sup>SC. Nos. 33-36 and 37.

In 1964 Veritas had noted the 'state of liturgical flux' which was to become part of the Catholic experience during the years following the Council. While this experience impressed on Veritas 'that the liturgy is being changed to ensure greater participation' criticism about the lack of uniformity in worship continued to grow.<sup>3</sup> Traditionally Catholic's had prided themselves on being members of a single international church with a universal liturgy. The reality of the Church's liturgical life, like the New Zealand society was somewhat different. There was a much greater diversity and difference than most people cared to consider. By 1960 the dialogue Mass had already changed the face of Catholic worship.

Fundamentally the confusion in the minds of all Catholic people was not due to changes of furniture or language, but the result of being people who had given their best efforts to mastering the theology of an earlier age and now were totally bewildered by the new theology, the new liturgy and the new authority structure it demanded. Pauline O'Regan describes this as an 'eerie experience of feeling the secure foundations on which, for a lifetime, we had built all our belief, our liturgy, our theology and our spirituality, rocking beneath us.'<sup>4</sup>

Reaction to the changes in the liturgy was not a uniquely New Zealand phenomenon. The reaction spawned various groups who felt the Church moved too far or did not move fast enough towards radical renewal. Judging from sources like the letters to the editors of the *Tablet* and the *Zealandia* the major reaction in New Zealand against the new Mass did not begin until after 1970. From this date onwards the reaction to the new Mass took on a noticeably negative and vindictive nature than had not been previously present.

The time between 1964 and 1969 was not a time of experimentation in New Zealand, but rather one of simple implementation, of finding out which bit went where. After 1970, having to some extent caught their breath after the initial implementation, priests, religious and laity who looked for more began to experiment with the liturgy, modifying it in various and numerous ways. Whereas before 1964 each priest had to apply for permission to celebrate Mass outside of a church, now they were able to celebrate Mass almost anywhere. With women permitted into the sanctuary as

---

<sup>3</sup>*Tablet*, 27 May 1964, 'Spotlight on New Zealand', p.11.

<sup>4</sup>Pauline O'Regan, *The is Hope for a Tree*, (Auckland, 1995), p.23.

Readers from 1970 onwards, calls for women as eucharistic ministers began to be made.

Not all Catholics enjoyed the changes brought about by *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Churchmen such as Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who made his public rejection of the Vatican Council in January 1975, and writers such as Geoffrey Hull and Michael Davies typify the international reaction. People like Frs. George Duggan and Kevin Bonisch of the Marist Order and John Kennedy, late editor of the *Tablet* typify the New Zealand reactionary.

Hull's book *The Banished Heart. Origins of Heteropraxis in the Catholic Church* is written as a critique which 'does not set out to counterbalance the systematic indictment it makes'<sup>5</sup> As such it is typical of material of this kind but, untypical in one regard: though written from the traditionalist point of view, it is a one of accommodation.<sup>6</sup> It is a movement by a person of the conservative right towards the middle ground.

Hull's critique of the present ritual as being outside the 'authentic tradition' is more a political critique than a theological one. Reactionary conservatives like Hull do not accept the general use of vernacular languages in worship because of their conception that worship stands outside work-a-day world and its language. Such a concept of religion relies on two separate realities or worlds which are essentially in conflict with each other. In short their concept of usual life and religious living is based on an unhealthy dualism.

Hull rejects the right of the Church hierarchy to change the worship rituals by decree, from the top down. It is a point which he makes well, but it loses credibility in light of the of the singular Latin ritual which developed in the Roman Church from the end of the eighth century until the Second Vatican Council. His conclusion that the changes

---

<sup>5</sup>Geoffrey Hull, *The Banished Heart. Origins of Hetropraxis in the Catholic Church*, preface, p.xiii.

<sup>6</sup>ibid., p. viii. In his Foreword to the book, Warwick Orr describes Hull's intention of moving the arguments out from the corners and into the middle of the ring. It is 'both a timely and an untimely book...in that it brings the case for traditional liturgy in the Catholic church a necessary breath of perspective...which leaves no room for the supposition that all was well in the Church prior to the Second Vatican council; and untimely, in that it thereby seeks no accommodation to the entrenched positions of traditionalists...nor to those of the present 'official' Church. nor, far less, to the philosophy and practice of those who, after the Council, sought to inculturate Catholicism with the antagonistic culture of modern secular society'.



in the liturgy were manufactured by a small minority of people, mostly French, without any reference to the wider Catholic population is an unsubstantiated denial of the evidence of scholarship on the part of many people. Because Hull deals with this material in a negative way, it escapes him that he could be dealing with a ground-up process in progress (its roots in the nineteenth century), even if it was implemented in a top-down fashion.

Many conservatives blame the Second Vatican Council and its reforms of the liturgy for the breakdown of traditional authority structures within the Church throughout the world. In regard to New Zealand, such claims seem to lack solid sociological, anthropological and theological reasoning. In the Archdiocese of Wellington, for example, the Mass attendance figures give another perspective (Appendix 2).<sup>7</sup> In 1956 the Government Census showed 111,002 Catholics in the Archdiocese, of which 85,033 were included on parish rolls, a difference of 25,969. Of the 85,033 known to the parishes only 51,913 attended Mass on an average Sunday during the year, a difference of 33,120 people. In 1963 the total number of infant baptisms peaked at 4831 and of the 116,492 Catholics registered on parish rolls 66,553 attended Mass on an average Sunday, a difference of 49,939. By 1966 Mass attendance figures peaked at 68,385 while the Church roll stood at 125,878. While the effect of the liturgical changes cannot be discounted as a contributing factor to the post-1966 figures, it is important to note that in 1956 more than one third of Catholics registered with parishes in the Archdiocese did not attend Mass and there was a steady increase in this figure which reached fifty percent by 1968. The Mass attendance figures between 1960 and 1974 were all within the sixty to sixty-nine thousand bracket and it is not until 1975 that Mass attendance fell below sixty thousand.

These figures indicate that while there was no major loss of people in the Archdiocese during the period 1963-1970, there was nonetheless a continuing pattern of nominalism. This raises the question of what other influences, apart from the liturgical changes, were affecting New Zealand Catholicism. Given the pattern of nominalism already present in New Zealand Catholicism, it is plausible that the liturgical reforms, in refocusing the Church to a communitarian faith, directly challenged the culture of nominalism.

---

<sup>7</sup>The Archdiocese at this time was from Waitara in the West, Ohakune in the centre and Warier in the east, south to Kaikoura on the South Island's east coast to Westport on the South Island's West Coast.



There were weaknesses in the reforms and difficulties in their initial implementation, both here and overseas. As Adrian Kavanagh has noted, possibly the greatest weakness was,

the almost total absence of any anthropological dimension in the approach to revision of so massive and long-standing a ritual system. For ritual patterns, which have much to do with sustaining identity and the social bond, are for these reasons essentially conservative and normally need to change slowly.<sup>8</sup>

The liturgical reforms changed not only Catholic public prayer, but also the way Catholics perceived themselves as believing worshipping Christians. The reforms of the liturgy have 'changed the way in which the Church thinks of itself and is perceived by others.'<sup>9</sup> Both the late Liturgical Theologian Mark Serle, and Aidan Kavanagh have written on the intimate and crucial connection between how one prays and what one understands oneself to be as a believer. The fall away from the Church by people after the changes in the liturgy are indicative of this point. Any full sociological analysis which is impossible here, would have to include the changes in the Church's attitude to other religions, the impact of documents like *Humane Vitae*, the nature of New Zealand society and the culture of nominalism which was present in the Church, prior to 1963.

Without doubt the changes of the rituals could have been better handled by 1990 standards, but in the context of the 1960s Church they were implemented in the usual manner. The changes were clumsy, too quick in some areas, and without sufficient long-term preparation from the late 1950's, but the real need, thirty years on, is to 'assess what has been accomplished, as well as what may still need to be done'.<sup>10</sup> Rather than blaming the changes in the liturgy for the drop off in church attendance numbers, it is more important to discover whether such a change was the cause of, or the excuse for such a result.

To answer this one must try to discover the extent to which laypeople were informed or formed in, involved or excluded from the changes. Of course measuring the effectiveness of the laity's preparation for the liturgical reforms is problematic,

---

<sup>8</sup>Kavanagh, p.71.

<sup>9</sup>ibid., p.71.

<sup>10</sup>Adrien Nocent, *A Rereading of the renewed liturgy*, Minnesota, 1994, Introduction.

because there is so little material available. For instance a survey in the Wellington Archdiocese in 1968 regarding Youth Masses was sent to the twenty-six Catholic Colleges of which fifteen replied. In 1969 in Wanganui City a survey was undertaken by Fr. Barry Edwards. The questionnaire examined how four groups: Adult laity [1]; religious women [2], sixth form girls [3] and sixth form boys [4] from local Catholic schools were responding to the liturgical changes. The respondents answered seven questions pertaining to the reforms in the liturgy (see Appendix 3). The response from group one though was 'so disappointing...the total number was...well below that of the other three groups'.<sup>11</sup>

From the information gathered one gains the impression that while the adult community relied on the sermon to instruct them, they did not appear to read material on the changes as the Religious did. The sixth formers seem to be well informed and liked the use of discussion groups. The adult group, which was the smallest group, appeared to be very pragmatic in their desire for instruction. While they wanted more and better sermons, they did not appear to listen to them.

The local convent appears to have been a place of learning and reading. This could be accounted for in several ways. Firstly the Religious had themselves been sent back to their original founding sources to recover the original vision of their common life and were therefore more used to this than the laity. Secondly they were teachers and so had the responsibility of being *up with the play* for their students and were probably better resources and motivated than the majority of laypeople. And thirdly because they were a smaller group they would have been more easily gathered together and educated by a single person. This tends to support the comment that Religious were very important in the changes in the liturgy and could also account for their prominence at educational events on liturgy, like the Christian Life Week in 1967. While the Religious had more written material, the general run of available material may have been beyond the ordinary Catholic's literary and theological ability to comprehend it.

---

<sup>11</sup>Lit.'54, WCA: Report on Liturgy Questionnaire, October 1969, by Rev. Barry Edwards. The original idea was to carry out the survey in Wanganui East parish, but it was expanded to cover Wanganui more generally. Also, Barry Edwards, interview, 2 May 1996.

Elsewhere, Barry Edwards comments that he did not have much success getting house-meetings going in his parish in Wanganui to discuss the changes in the liturgy, because 'no-one seems to be very keen in taking it [the changes] up.'<sup>12</sup>

Another reaction to the reforms came from a group of teachers at a Teacher Training Course on the South Island's West Coast in 1967, during which the teachers had experimented with the Mass. They had used folk hymns sung to guitar accompaniment, had the lesson read by a lector, composed and read their own Prayers of the Faithful and had had an offertory procession. During the consecration members of the group stood around the altar and then received holy communion standing. At the conclusion of the course the participants were asked to give their opinion. The question participants were asked to respond to was: 'What are your impressions, or reactions, to the celebrations of the Mass in which we participated during the Course?' The forty-eight responses from teachers from Greymouth to Hasst included:

The feeling of sharing in a closer way in the Holy Sacrifice. The hymns though different - a new way of giving honour to God.

A great feeling of involvement

I'm very much in favour of more active participation of laity and feel women should be able to take more active part - scripture reading etc. at Mass. I don't think we do fully understand or appreciate the Mass. It should be the very centre of our lives around which the whole of our every day life evolves. Truly wonderful participation.

Undecided but could get to like it as its more informal than Sunday Mass.

This created a deep impression. One really felt part of the Mass. Being so close to the Altar at the Consecration was wonderful. I would indeed like to attend more.

---

<sup>12</sup>ibid.: letter, Edwards to Sneddon, 3 March 1970.

Couldn't get properly geared to it. Has great possibilities when we get used to it; take time; gives a greater sense of belonging to each other. Simple hymns were effective<sup>13</sup>

Ninety-eight percent of the participants were in favour of the experience, none vehemently against it. The sample group are interesting because they were all teachers in Catholic schools who would have had more resources at their disposal than others and would probably have been more aware of contemporary trends. Yet some of the responses seem to indicate that this was the first time they had thought about what participation in the Mass was, or the first time they had experienced it. By 1968 there had been volumes of material published and distributed on the meaning of the liturgical renewal and its reforms, but the spirit of the reforms and effective formation in Pastoral Liturgy still had generally not been successful.

Judging from this information the effectiveness of the laity's preparation was at best patchy. As seen in chapter three, there was a solid attempt by both the Catholic papers to stimulate discussion among Catholic laity on the implementation of the renewed liturgy. All of this appeared to falter because of an unnamed, evasive factor which seemed to inhibit effective formation of the Laity. A possible answer, given the Irishness of the New Zealand Catholicism, may be found in the work of Maura Hyland, an Irish teacher and catechist.

Writing recently on the nature of the Catholic Church in Ireland some twenty years after Vatican II, Hyland accounted for the apparent success of the liturgical changes brought about by the Council by referring to the 'rampant clericalism' of the time. She identified,

Two factors seem to be involved. Firstly we have a laity who for years have been trained to do as they were told, without expecting to be consulted, and without any sense of responsibility for the decisions that were taken by others. ....Secondly, we have a clergy who are trained to see themselves as authority figures, running one-man shows, and are slow to face the risk of dialogue, or showing responsibility, or even of taking seriously the advice and experience of the laity.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Ashby. Liturgy notes and letter, CCA: letter, Hanrahan to Ashby, 13 December 1968.

<sup>14</sup>McClelland, p.369.

Though McClelland critiques this understanding as a 'rationalisation [which] does less than justice to the efforts of the Irish hierarchy'<sup>15</sup>, in terms of New Zealand, Hyland's description is not without validity. Certainly is it true that the laity were well trained in the art of receiving the direction of the hierarchy, rather than of participating in Church decision-making. Both opponents of the change such as Hull and proponents such as Fr. Barry Edwards attest to this. In Edwards words the role of the laity was 'stand, sit or kneel, and shut up!, because otherwise he'll [the priest] turn around and tell you to be quiet.'<sup>16</sup>

During this period, the laity were characterised by the attitude of going to church on Sunday, going home, going back next week. Their place in the Church was functional, not foundational. Generally the response by the laity to initial reforms was marked by confusion and a slavish following of directives rather than discussing or questioning directives, which is unsurprising considering the nature of the Church's leadership. Towards the end of the 1960s there was a marked development in the understanding of the laity generally. By the mid to late 1970s this understanding developed to such an extent, that the laity were becoming frustrated by the slow pace of continued reform.

Fr. David Blake, who travelled extensively throughout the Auckland Diocese comments that over the period 1964 to 1970 there was plenty of instruction given to laity but they 'weren't capable of cottoning on to it' [the liturgy], and that priests who were working for the introduction of the renewal had often to wait until the people caught up.<sup>17</sup> Blake's experience supports Hyland's analysis, that the laity were not involved in the changes at the level of co-participant, but only at the level of respondent. It was essentially a process based on clericalism. This was evident in the methods of the Episcopal Conference. I would suspect that, at least initially, the Irish Bishops acted in much the same way as the New Zealand bishops, simply because no other change model was known.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>ibid., p.369.

<sup>16</sup>Edwards, 20 May 1996.

<sup>17</sup>Blake, 14 March 1996.

<sup>18</sup>J.B. O'Connell, 'The Liturgical Movement in Great Britain and Ireland', in *Liturgical Renewal In Retrospect and Prospect*, (London, 1965), p.43., describes the understanding of the Liturgical Movement in Ireland as 'poorly understood and little advanced'.

The system which produced this state of affairs was not at this time under scrutiny. That came later. To have proceeded in any other way would have been considered at best unusual. Hyland's analysis is important because it begins to explain why the laity appeared to lack any real interest in the changes and why there is still a lingering memory of their never having been informed of them. In a certain sense, the laity could never have been formed in the theology of Pastoral Liturgy, because they had no framework of experience (nor were provided with one) on which to hang the new garment of Catholic identity being developed around them.

A paradigm shift was developing in the way priests and people related to each other, but it was occurring against the backdrop of old imperial methods of implementation. It was the distance between the new theology, as seen in the liturgy, and the old structures of governance that created enormous confusion in the minds of both the clergy and laity, revealing the two forces to be totally at odds with each other.

Under attack too was the general attitude of the laity towards the priest and worship. This attitude could be characterised as *get up there, do your thing quickly, so we can get home* and is revealed in expressions like *hear Father say Mass*, or *say his Mass*. Mass was something to be attended, not participated in. Barry Edwards recalled an incident when he once prayed the Canon of the Mass, which was usually said silently, out loud in Latin. A parishioner later complained to him because it ruined his recollection.<sup>19</sup> In terms of liturgical practice the traditional attitude was one went to Mass to be alone with God, to say private prayers, not to be with others.<sup>20</sup>

Another important aspect which either inhibited or aided lay liturgical formation, was the experience of liturgical renewal at the parish level. Generally one can say that if the local priest was following the developments, then the parish grew and the people grew to understand the nature and the necessity for the reforms, but if not, the people experienced confusion and became resentful.

Hence the attitude among priests became very important. While most were enthusiastic for reform others were not at all enthusiastic and only very slowly changed their churches and their theology. Many, including those generally in favour

---

<sup>19</sup>Edwards, 20 May 1996.

<sup>20</sup> Br. Julian Watson FSC, interview, 6 June 1996.



of the renewal, were frustrated and confused by the rapidity of change.<sup>21</sup> The lack of effective leadership from the Episcopal conference added to this problem. For Religious, the changes involved not just the Mass, but their whole way of life, customs and apostolate. A major difference between the Religious Orders and the Diocesan Priests was the intensive education and formation they received throughout this period.<sup>22</sup> There were frequent conferences given to Women Religious in their convents by visiting and local experts. Pauline O'Regan recalled the frequent requests made by the laity to the sisters to explain the changes.

In the Catholic press' coverage of the liturgical reforms between 1963 and 1970, both *Tablet* and *Zealandia* were extremely consistent in placing before the reading Catholic public a full range of material.<sup>23</sup> One such example was an article entitled: 'Vernacular to be introduced into parts of the Mass' deals with the issues of concelebration and communion under two kinds as well as which parts of the Mass could be said in the vernacular [English]. It also deals with the introduction of the homily as an integral part of each Sunday Mass.<sup>24</sup> It clearly outlined the precise nature of the process of the Vatican Council's adoption of the liturgy schema and articles such as this were often augmented with photo spreads of the Council.<sup>25</sup>

But the effectiveness of this form of communication appears to have been limited. While the *Zealandia* included more local material, the *Tablet* displayed a very marked European bias with few New Zealand feature articles.<sup>26</sup> Two important regular sources of comment regarding the New Zealand situation were the *Tablet's* Editorial Comment and Veritas' 'Spotlight on New Zealand'.

---

<sup>21</sup>O'Regan, *There is Hope*, p.25.

<sup>22</sup>This was commented on by most of those interviewed.

<sup>23</sup>In *Tablet*, between January 1963 and December 1964 there are 37 articles, editorial comments, columnist comments on the changes in the Church and liturgy. From January 1965 to June 1967 there are 33 articles, comments and editorials specifically on liturgical renewal and its impact. This figure does not include the letters to the Editor on the same subject. In *Zealandia* during November and December 1966 there were seven articles [1 per week] on the Vatican Council's meaning and significance by Reginald Delargy. Delargy continued these articles in June 1967 and wrote a series of ten until December 1967.

<sup>24</sup>*Tablet*, 30 October 1963.

<sup>25</sup>*Tablet*, 13 November 1963.

<sup>26</sup>Fr. Frank O'Dea was editor, until his retirement in May 1967 (when John Kennedy took the position) and used the Rev. W. Purdy's *Rome Newsletter* with its weekly commentaries during the years of the Council. He augmented this with articles from the *London Tablet*, the *London Catholic Herald* and the *Catholic Reporter* from the United States of America. In the *Tablet* 19 February 1964 Dr. Patricia Burns' article is the only one which appears in the *Tablet*, written by a New Zealander, during 1963 and 1964 in which she asks how New Zealand Catholics will react to the Council reforms.



Coverage of the Council and its decisions was not limited to just *Zealandia* and *Tablet*, local and national papers covered the event as well. The general standard of coverage showed an improvement after the criticisms of the coverage during the first session. Generally there was still a lack of material which caught the interest of people who were unable or unprepared to read difficult material. More space probably could have been devoted to those human interest stories in an attempt to reach a wider population.

People's reactions to the reforms reveal a singularly important aspect of liturgy and worship which the process of reform never considered, the anthropological dimension. The reforms were enacted over a short period of time and often people did not experience the fullness of the reform. The 'minimalism that afflicted the liturgy' writes Adrian Kavanagh, was a result of lack of understanding of various groups and people before the Council. Kavanagh sounded a cautionary tone that the new celebration of Mass 'may become a celebration of middle-class values, creating a narrow new elitism which tends to exclude the lower classes and alien ethnic groups'.<sup>27</sup> Given the fullness of hindsight, it is without doubt that the changes could have been done better through a more productive change model.

Probably the only change model which would have had any hope of succeeding in the New Zealand Catholic church of the 1960s was the top-down model. There are generally two change models which can be employed: change from the bottom up or from the top down. The Catholic Church, because of its hierarchical authority structure brought about the changes in the sixties from the top down. The question of 'change process' being applied to this period is the agenda of the 1990s rather than the 1960s. The bishops, priests and people of this era could not have conceived of any other model. To a certain extent the discussion of process is an example of the present reinterpreting the past, because of the difficulties of the 1970s, 80s and 90s which have forced changes in the area of consultation, and shared decision-making on a scale that the Church has not seen for nearly two millennia.

It would never have occurred to people like Archbishops Liston and McKeefry to consider the need for consultation with laypeople in regard to the implementation of liturgical reforms. Being men of their times, following what the higher authority

---

<sup>27</sup>Kavanagh, p.72.

proposed, they would not have considered consultation of today's kind necessary. This, writes Pauline O'Regan, 'meant that the church, while promulgating new decrees that spoke of the dignity and equality of its members, still fell back on its usual authoritarian means of communication.'<sup>28</sup>

The process of change was to secure the official texts, distribute them to priests, publish the date of their use and let the change occur. With the possible exception of Delargy and Ashby, the Episcopal Conference appeared to have had no other concept of change implementation. Delargy's background gave him a very different theological starting point to most of the other bishops, but because he was not the Bishop of Auckland, he had very little say in how New Zealand went about the process.

Of the four dioceses, Auckland and Christchurch were the best served in different ways. In Auckland, because of the encouragement of Delargy, David Blake through the Catholic Printing Centre put material into priests' and laity's hands. The misalettes, Orders of Mass and later publications enabled people to keep up with the changes at a practical, Sunday morning Mass level. In Christchurch the Liturgy Commission and Music Commission set-up by Brian Ashby served the priests of the diocese with informed comment on the changes and material for parish meetings. In Wellington Archdiocese there was a notable lack of leadership from either of the bishops. There the changes in the liturgy relied on the initiative of individual priests, which were then sometimes made public throughout the Archdiocese.<sup>29</sup>

Hull's assessment of the role of the Vatican in implementing fundamental change in Catholic worship, is important here, concluding as he does that Catholics were able to give up their familiar ritual practice because:

---

<sup>28</sup>O'Regan, *A Changing Order*, p.89.

<sup>29</sup>Work of Rev. Barry Edwards and Shaun Hurley

the psychological conditioning of the faithful by post-Tridentine authoritarianism guaranteed popular acceptance of the liturgical revolution. Apart from the unlikeliness that people trained for generations to obey without question every directive of the hierarchy and clergy would rise to defend a time-hallowed orthopraxis that their leaders now scorned, there was also a cultural gap between them and their own inheritance.<sup>30</sup>

His is a valid critique of the process by which the change was implemented. In New Zealand for example, clergy and laity generally accepted and implemented the renewal without any real thought on their part, while the bishops led the reforms because that was expected of them. Certainly the reforms were implemented from above, but that is not to say that the whole enterprise was an exercise in absolute authoritarianism, nor that it lacked a popular basis. Because the bishops failed in their role of ensuring that clergy and laity were well formed in the spirit of the renewal, the divisions which were caused became a greater source anxiety than Hull's critique of the central authority's right to implement liturgical renewal from above. By the mid 1970s, however, the 'psychological conditioning' Hull refers to has begun to breakdown. It is part of the irony of life that the very process which Hull scorns spawned the freedom which gives him the opportunity to criticise the Church, while still remaining a part of it.

The top-down change of the liturgy was the only option that would have worked, but it was not chosen for this reason. It occurred this way because it was the way all things occurred in the church. It was the most natural, unquestioned way for the Bishops to act. It was intended by the hierarchy, that the reforms between 1964 and 1970 would stabilise and settle into a permanent pattern after the implementation of *Missale Romanum* [1969] in 1970. The reality was quite different. The negative reaction was about to take on a strength not seen in the initial implementation.

---

<sup>30</sup>Hull, p.238.

A historical overview of liturgical development in this century shows a definite development towards Pastoral liturgy and the necessary use of vernacular languages. That this development took people in the pews by surprise, could be accounted for by the academic nature of the debates. At least that would be an easy answer. Other possible explanations for the New Zealand lay Catholic's lack of awareness could be their uninterest in the Church, except as a Sunday obligation. Possibly the answer lies in the lack of a broad and influential intelligentsia who were able to raised the level of awareness of the issues involved in the renewal. Ordinary Catholics who were not in touch with international trends were nevertheless part of the development of the dialogue Mass, the changes in fasting laws, the introduction of evening Masses and the reintroduction of the Easter Vigil. Changes such as this should have left more of a memory of change and reform than the common memory tends to suggest.

Is it too easy therefore to assume that ordinary Catholics would have heard about and read the encyclical letters of Pius XII, or to have heard about the *aggiornamento* of Pope John XXIII and the Council completed by Pope Paul VI ? One cannot conclude that all these events simply passed by unnoticed by the vast majority of the Catholic population, yet still there is a common perception that they did not know about the changes.

So what was the inhibiting factor which lay between the laypeople hearing about the reforms and their becoming involved in the changes at any real depth? The answer is not simple. It is found rather in the combination of a dominant structure of church authority which belonged to a previous age, the local culture of nominalism and a clerical mentality among the laity, all of which were being confronted by the new theology of communitarian worship and Catholic identity, and the new style of leadership which it demanded.

Communitarian worship demanded shared implementation, but this was extremely difficult because the authority structures of the Church and its leaders mitigated against the direction of the change. The bishops and clergy simply did not know how to go about the reform, so they used tried and true methods which only alienated people. Also, the culture of nominalism among the Catholic laity was confronted by a

demand to become part of the community, to share with others and to approach God from a shared, rather than individualised position.

That the Catholic people were offered information about the reforms is beyond question, that they were well formed in the meaning and theology of the changes is highly debatable.

## Chapter Five: A change in conflict with culture?

Michael King in *Being Pakeha* describes two common Catholic responses to the 1960s. First a coming to awareness of diversity and difference within the Catholic culture and society when before 'we saw only people like ourselves' and a sadness at the loss of the 'sense of awe', which had been replaced with 'that of the commonplace'.<sup>1</sup> King writes as if the ordinary stood in contradistinction to the holy. Behind this too lies the loss of certainty, in which Catholics prior to 1963 had been raised.<sup>2</sup>

Michael King's growing awareness of pluralism in New Zealand society and in the Catholic Church, is mirrored in the feelings of loss and confusion of many other people. For some the impact of the Vatican Council was unnerving, but it was also a sign of the times. World-society was in a state of evolution, not that it had ever stood stock-still, from what had been perceived as a stable, ordered way of life to a dynamic, evolving, changing one with a never-ending struggle of adaptation. The Church too was being changed.

It had been a culture of safety, providing all the means to salvation and the answers to all questions, demanding only that its external observances be followed, often leaving the interior conscience unfettered. With the end of the culture of safety, the true nature of New Zealand Catholicism became obvious. The secularist, or perhaps individualistic nature of Catholic practice had reflected a sharp distinction between sacred and secular, which the theology of secularisation inherent in the theology of Pastoral Liturgy confronted.

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael King, *Being Pakeha*, (Auckland, 1985), p.61., Also cited by Elizabeth Isichei in 'Australia and New Zealand', in *Modern Catholicism*, p.335., and in 'Christianity: Catholics since the 1960s' in *Religions of New Zealanders*, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Tablet*, 3 March 1965, p. 39. Letter to the editor signed "Vexata quaestio" Christchurch. 'For a lifetime we older parishioners were taught, understood, and held that the Mass in its then form was the ultimate in our worship -changeless and unchanging- yet today, on countless occasions throughout the country, I have encountered comments from our people which indicate that the new form is not liked, and that general disappointment is felt that the form of the Mass we grew up with and loved has gone. I would suggest, sir, that the Hierarchy could well have sounded out opinion before introducing the changes. The picture gained might have proved vastly different from that which is fondly believed. After all, sir, without the parishioners....'

In New Zealand society generally the period 1963 to 1969 was one of great change. Graeme Dunstall writes of the period:

From the late 1950s there were signs of rebellion among adolescents; by the early 1960s it was politicised as counter culture. The late 1960s brought recession and participation in the Vietnam war; new forms of urban protest sprang up, the most enduring of which in 1970's were a Maori cultural resurgence and a new feminist movement.<sup>3</sup>

According to Dunstall, optimists saw the growing diversity of this period as a sign of its possibility. The breakdown of homogeneity was evident in the Catholic Church, as its members struggled to understand how worship influenced and reflected the people who offered it. Pastoral Liturgy was a completely new concept in a Church which previously had done everything the same for everyone. The new diversity which it allowed threatened the security of the leaders. For many Catholics the utopia of the past was being shattered by the growing pattern of uncertainty and questioning in the world around them.

New Zealand Catholics did not stand in isolation from the general dynamic of social change. As New Zealanders were becoming wealthier, and the 'demands of materialism...insatiable'<sup>4</sup>, new attitudes questioning traditional institutions, such as marriage, race and personal freedoms, began to be expressed in the Church.

Divergent opinions within the Church were openly discussed, sometimes drawing the ire of the hierarchy, for example the conflict between the editor of *Zealandia* and the Bishop of Auckland. By the end of the 1960s the issue of New Zealanders fighting in the Vietnam war had divided the Church as much as it had the nation. Subsequently issues such as nuclear weapons and sporting contacts with South Africa, divided New Zealanders. Bishop Ashby was to become involved in the issue of sporting contacts with South Africa, eventually resigning as patron of the Canterbury Marist Rugby Club at the time of the 1981 Springbok tour. The protest movements of the 1960s began to focused on issues of racial inequality here and overseas, international relations, abortion and nuclear disarmament, all of which found their way into Catholic debate.

---

<sup>3</sup>Graeme Dunstall, 'The Social Pattern' in *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (ed) Geoffrey W. Rice, (Auckland, 1992), p. 451.

<sup>4</sup>ibid., p. 452.



As New Zealand changed and became more self-aware, so too did the Catholic Church.

Robert Chapman describes the 1960s political scene as a golden age. His description is also most applicable to the Catholic Church since its underlying changes were also,

social rather than political, technological rather than legislative, individual rather than public. If they took a mass form they did so as protest movements...working along side the party structures. The tertiary education boom, television, and the contraceptive pill were transforming family and personal relationships as well as the method by which politics were perceived.<sup>5</sup>

Catholics were emerging from a very defined structure, where political and legislative power was concentrated in the hands of the hierarchy, with a worship system which reflected this. The change to a new pastoral system of worship ultimately came into conflict with the authority structures, because it questioned their theological base. Educating people about the changes in the liturgy was difficult, because not only was the language of liturgy new and the concept of consulting Catholic laity about the Church's official prayer previously unheard of, but this new theology had no basis in the contemporary experience of the Church. Reforming the liturgy forced a change in the way priests and people related to each other. It made both groups leave the dominant mindset of individualism and enter into a new communitarian model. In the words of Br. Julian Watson, FSC, Principal of Francis Douglas Memorial College in New Plymouth, 'it was shock!, then a shock, then another shock...when is this going to stop',<sup>6</sup> became the common response.

This change was crystallised in July 1968 with the publication of *Humanae Vitae*.<sup>7</sup> This document provided 'a vivid focus for the tensions of the immediate post-conciliar period'.<sup>8</sup> The majority report, which was more liberal, had been leaked to the press through the London *Tablet*, was different to the minority report of four conservative theologians, which Pope Paul VI appeared to follow. In spite of the teaching not being

---

<sup>5</sup>Robert Chapman. 'From Labour to National', in *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, (ed) Geoffrey W. Rice, (Auckland, 1992), pp. 381-382.

<sup>6</sup>Br. Julian Watson, 6 June 1996.

<sup>7</sup>Pope Paul VI, *Humane vitae*, Vatican City, 1968.

<sup>8</sup>F.J. Laishley, Birth Control in *Modern Catholicism*, p.230.

infallible, it precipitated a crisis in the Church much larger than that of the liturgical renewal and far beyond the significance of the letter itself. It was the 'lack of consultation in the production of the encyclical, as well as the content' which lead to its rejection.<sup>9</sup>

The way in which the majority decision was apparently overturned by the Pope, angered many people. The issues were often obscured by the new consciousness of the laity and their willingness to question the authority and the wisdom of the hierarchy. *Humanae Vitae* signalled the end of the laity's (especially laywomen) blind acceptance of papal, Episcopal or priestly directives.

Over the years, worship had been so privatised within the religious system that the reaction of people, who had developed a 'practice of contemplative prayer against the background of the traditional Mass's silences, and found enforced participation disagreeable',<sup>10</sup> was to reject the new theology rather than question the old. The antagonistic thinking of sacred and secular worlds as mutually exclusive realities in the lives of believers had led to the individualisation of Catholic worship. The renewal of the Church brought about by the Second Vatican Council, attacked this development from within. Externally this was seen in the reforms of the liturgy.

The effect of television on the changes in the liturgy was noted by Fr. Barry Edwards in an interview. He remembered that one could not schedule a meeting for Tuesday or Thursday evenings and expect people to attend. Tuesday night was 'The Avengers' and no one would come out. The advent of television meant that meetings which were necessary to form people in the renewal of the Church had to be scheduled around the evening programming. People's fascination with television,

mitigated against meetings of any sort. Because it was a popular medium at that stage and it only came on at 6 o'clock in the evening and finished at 11, or 10, and you watched the commercials, to the bitter end...people could be distracted much more easily.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>ibid., p. 231.

<sup>10</sup>Isichei, *Modern Catholicism*, p. 340.

<sup>11</sup>Edwards, 20 May 1996.

Elsewhere the reaction of the progressives was stronger than in New Zealand. The call for Women Priests was especially strong among Religious Women in the United States. The place of women in South East Asian and African Churches meant that initially the need for basic equality, housing and food was a more pressing need than liturgical leadership. Progressives, in calling for liturgy which was an expression of local diversity and belief, threatened what the conservatives perceived as the already weakened universal nature of Western Catholicism. Inculturation, as it came to be known, exposed the painful reality that the European Church, which had been synonymous with Catholicism, was no longer automatically viewed as leading the Catholic world. Many of the issues which divided New Zealanders also divided or at least influenced the Catholic community, as they had always done. In the culture of the 1960s the attempts at hiding the divisions became much harder and ultimately useless. Given the culture and world view of the 1960s with aspects as diverse as the culture of the Beatles, flower-power, and challenges to institutional authority and the reaction to *Humanae Vitae*, the wonder is that the Catholic Church came through the changes it initiated.

Applying Robert Chapman's analysis to the Church enables one to see how the increasing individualisation of Catholic New Zealanders' attitudes moved into direct conflict with the desire of the Church to rediscover its communitarian base. His analysis, finds a reflection in the culture of the New Zealand Church. This suggests that the reforms in the liturgy and church were counter-cultural and for the New Zealand Church, perhaps too much counter-cultural.

Is New Zealand a Christian country which is becoming secular, or has it always been a secular nation which is now no longer interested in using the trappings of cultural Christianity which it formerly used? This appears to be an important question for those interested in the New Zealand religious experience, which unfortunately is often soaked in polemical rhetoric by either the secularists, or the religiously driven. In order to pursue such a question to any depth definitions are need to guide the discussion. What is meant by secular society?<sup>12</sup> Is the popularist meaning also

---

<sup>12</sup>Secular-profanus- unholy, common, impious, concerns with the affairs of the world, outside religious authority/direction. From the Oxford Concise Dictionary.

theological and reconcilable with sociological and anthropological presumptions? What is Christian society and how can one define, characterise, or assess it?

A debate about secularism involves issues like sectarianism, personal freedom, theological pluralism and political responsibility, and the decline of Church influence in the political life of a country. It can become a complex conversation. In the *Secular City*, Harvey Cox described secularisation as 'a historical process, almost certainly irreversible, in which society and culture are delivered from tutelage to religious control and closed metaphysical world views.' If one accepts this sort of definition, the problem that arises is the lack of any common ground for discussion. It would appear as if society and culture are two distinct realities that exist in contradistinction to religion and metaphysical worldviews. This is of course a particular world view, which all Christians would not share, nor one to which all people who believe in a deity could adhere. In his thesis, John Evans adds another dimension to the secularisation debate, that of the development of the Welfare State and the economic prosperity of the 1950 and 60s. This development was important in 'the restructuring of the institutional relationship between church and state.'<sup>13</sup> The development led to an intertwining of the values of church and state, which gave the impression that being a good nation equalled being a good christian nation. With the collapse of the Welfare State the restructuring of the relationship between church and state and Christianity and humanism is again on the political agenda.

When some Christians speak of secularisation they imply that it is a negative force equal and opposite to Christianity, driving a wedge between ordinary life and religious belief. Hence secularism is viewed as a force which lies outside the ambit of the Christian theology's ability to influence it. It would appear that dialogue between secularisation and Christianity is impossible and that head-on conflict is inevitable. This could be a result of the dualistic thinking inherent in some theologies which describe and promote the existence of two worlds of good and evil, of natural and supernatural. It could also be the result of Christianity's scriptural opposition to trends such as power-mongering, materialism, violence, and the abuse of other humans, by humans. This is often confused with secularism.

---

<sup>13</sup>John A. Evans, 'Church State Relations in New Zealand 1940-1990 with Particular Reference to the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches'. D. Phil. thesis in Theology (University of Otago, 1992), p. 32.

Secularism is a philosophy of life which denies the sacred realm of the human person, or the world. Such a philosophy could be described by Christians as an example of anti-Christian secularism. Secularism, writes Cox 'is the name for an ideology, a new closed world-view which functions very much like a new religion'.<sup>14</sup> Like any ideology, whether it posits the existence of a deity or not, secularism is ultimately closed minded and becomes as absolute as the absolutist religions it attempts to negate.

When secularists speak of human reality they understand it as a reality complete within itself, needing no external deity to explain or understand itself. For the secularist, Christianity falsifies the human experience by relying on an external arbiter to judge the process of the world, thereby giving a false impression of what is of essential value. When these two world views meet they tend to collide and take up positions which seem irreconcilable. My goal here is not to discuss the intricacies of the conflict, but rather to try to understand what people mean when they say New Zealand is a secular country.

Definitions are problematic because the total experience of religion in New Zealand is so broad and can it never be satisfactorily dealt with. After reading the latest material, one is left with the impression that religion in New Zealand doesn't matter and it has always maintained a low social profile. One difficulty is that researchers either look at the Protestant/Anglican religions and generalise about the Catholic experience, or vice-versa. In general New Zealanders appear to be a very pragmatic people and perhaps the advent of secularisation here is more a question of diminishing utility rather than a directly anti-sacral secularism. It could be the case here that religious values are no longer used because religious practice is no longer a priority, and that usefulness is a key factor which determines the priority that is given to religious practice. Rather than forming a definition which will fail to some extent because it chooses to include certain features and to exclude others, I shall explore the question from the point of view of utility.

Writers such as Jackson and Harre for instance describe religion as having

---

<sup>14</sup>Harvey Cox, *The Secular City* (London, 1965), pp. 20-21.

two particularly important functions -to express in a ritual and symbolic way the identity of the community it serves and to validate and perpetuate a system of morality. In neither of these activities is the Christian Church in New Zealand very effective.<sup>15</sup>

If this is all religion is then it is a good thing that it has been ineffective. But I hasten to add that religion is more than ritual expression and codified morality. Jackson and Harre forget that to a certain extent there is no 'Christian church', but rather Christian Churches, which do not share a common world view or understanding of the relationship between humanity and God.

Colless and Donovan describe our brand of religiosity as 'unspectacular enough to be taken for granted'.<sup>16</sup> Does this mean that it is so much a part of the social fabric that it is like the air one breathes or rather so meaningless that no one looks to religion for meaning? Was there ever a golden age of religion in New Zealand, or have we always been as we are now? Andre Siegfried in the last decade of the nineteenth century wrote that 'no tradition has remained so strong in New Zealand as the religious one'<sup>17</sup>, but Sir Robert Stout disagreed saying 'as a nation we have nothing to do with religion.'<sup>18</sup>

One thing is certain about New Zealanders, they talk little about religious affiliation and seek various ways of understating it. Prior to the changes of the 1960s, Elizabeth Isichei comments, that Catholic New Zealanders' attitudes 'generally mirrored divisions in society as a whole'.<sup>19</sup> But Isichei does not apply this criteria to the drop in church numbers after the Vatican Council. In suggesting that it is a direct reaction to the reforms of the Second Vatican Council, she fails to consider that the present shape of New Zealand Catholicism is a result of Catholics mirroring the divisions and attitudes of New Zealand society in general.

---

<sup>15</sup>Jackson and Harre, *New Zealand*, (London, 1969) pp. 131-132.

<sup>16</sup>Colless and Donovan see Michael Hill and Wiebe Zwaga, 'Religion' in *New Zealand Society*, Paul Spoonley, David Pearson, Ian Shirley, (Palmerston North, 1990), p. 279.

<sup>17</sup>*ibid.*, in 'Religion, McLeod, 1968, p160 and Mol, 1972, p.365

<sup>18</sup>Presidential Address to the Otago Education Institute, 1879, quoted by D.V. McDonald, 'The New Zealand Bibles in Schools League', MA thesis, University of Victoria, Wellington, 1964, in Evans, 'Church State Relations', p.3.

<sup>19</sup>Isichei, *Modern Catholicism*, p.335.



The secularist debate is raised by Elizabeth Isichei when she describes the effect of contemporary New Zealand society on post 1970s Catholicism:

secularization has deeply affected the attitudes and lifestyles of those who are still practising Catholics. But in some way this secularization is more apparent than real. Many are alienated from the churches, but engaged in various forms of inward quest that may lead them, for instance, to Eastern-style meditation or Gestalt-psychology workshops. This has influenced Catholicism in two ways -some are alienated from it, and others pursue a more individualistic spirituality within it.<sup>20</sup>

Isichei makes simple, but important mistakes and her statement is more misleading than it is insightful. Her treatment of secularisation and its place in the Catholic experience appears less than adequate. Firstly it is unclear whether Isichei is referring here to anti-Christian secularism, or secularity, (the respect of the secular world with its tasks and values) as expressed in the theology of Secularization. The two are distinctly different, though often in the common imagination, they are confused or seen as a single reality.

Simply stated 'the theology of Secularization is an attempt to give a positive assessment of modern secular society by interpreting that society as the legitimate outcome of the Christian faith itself.'<sup>21</sup> It does not appear that Isichei is trying to deal with the theology of Secularization in *Gaudium et Spes* and its demand for the Catholic Christian to comprehend that the needs and aspirations of the world, when she writes of secularization. Though if she had of been, then perhaps she would have seen that the theology of Secularisation, inherent in the Council changes, would have been such a threat to the Catholic experience and societal thinking of 1960s New Zealand, that the existing thin veneer of cultural Catholicism could not have withstood its critique.

---

<sup>20</sup>ibid., p. 334.

<sup>21</sup>Charles Davis, *Religion and the making of Society, essays in Social Theology*, (Cambridge 1994), p. 4. The theology of secularization relies on a healthy distinction between the world and faith, and an acknowledgement of the autonomy of the world, in which the document 'Gaudium et Spes' from the Second Vatican Council is central in the Catholic response. Such a theology sees the social order as having a source outside itself which is essentially sacred, but that this does not mitigate against the understanding that society is a human construct. The theology of secularism does not identify society as being naturally hostile to the church, nor church to the world.

If on the other hand Isichei is referring to anti-Christian secularism, as she probably is, and its part in New Zealand society then either such a secularism has affected Catholic lifestyle and attitudes or it has not! Things which are apparent, may also be real. What people do is often intimately linked to what they believe, feel, or think.

Secondly what does alienation mean? Does it mean disaffection with, or exclusion from, or reflect a choice to leave? Isichei seems to use the word 'alienation' as an umbrella word for all those who are in the Church and dislike it and outside the Church and dislike it, without any regard to its meaning. What she describes is not necessarily alienation. It may be the result of alienation, but could also reflect more personal choices to move beyond shared faith experiences into private belief, or a rejection of the theology of Secularisation as outlined above.

The problem lies in conceiving too narrowly of religious belief and practice and its interrelationship with human experience. What can develop is an assumption that there is a distinctively religious sphere. 'Religious faith and practice is a dimension of human experience in all its forms. To think otherwise...fails to acknowledge that religion is found only when human experience is transcended.'<sup>22</sup> Such a difficulty occurs when the respective influences of human agency and religion on the shaping of society, are seen as mutually distinct. This is important in regard to the use of the word church.

By setting 'churches' in the plural Isichei confuses the reader as to whether she is still speaking of the Catholic Church, or has moved to speak of the Christian Churches in their plurality of expressions. It is an important theological point, which through lack of clarity, adds confusion. The theology of Secularization allows for pluralism as a necessary component of human society. If people in a secular society are alienated by pluralism, then one can be sure that the secularisation is not built on a theology of Secularization, but on anti-sacral secularism. Based on this analysis I conclude that Isichei is referring to anti-Christian secularism and its place in New Zealand society.

The effect of anti-Christian secularism on the New Zealand Catholic population can be seen in the increasing trend towards nominalism. This is in part the result of living in a society with a wide variety of values which naturally have their influence on the

---

<sup>22</sup>Davis, p. 5.

Church at all levels. Also the tradition of religion, which is evident in other countries, is not as evident in New Zealand. A believing community does not exist as an isolated unit separated from the wider sphere of society. In fact any such separation is not a Gospel value. The changes in New Zealand generally during the 1960s show a momentum of change bigger than any one organisation, which effected people in varying way and to varying degrees. I would describe the general secularism of New Zealand as an individualist ethic which is strongly influenced by pragmatism, rather than as directly anti-Christian.

The changes in the liturgy were not an isolated force within Catholicism. As New Zealand society changed, tending as they did towards individualisation, it came into conflict with a counter-cultural movement within the Catholic Church, which had its parallel movements in other parts of society. The liturgical reforms of the Mass by changing the way Catholics prayed, forced them to reassess the cultural nature of their common and personal beliefs and the ways in which they expressed them. This process of rediscovery directly challenged many previously unquestioned socio-religious practices and attitudes.

Catholic ritual worship is not simply a sociological phenomenon, but also an expression of fundamental personal meaning, expressing a person's understanding of the nature of life, death, social interaction and their place in the dynamic of the cosmos. To change these ritual expressions, which are invested with supernatural reality and meaning, is to change the means by which a believer believes and understands themselves to be a believer.

The result of this process appears to be that some Catholics found they did not believe the Catholic faith and so they left. Others, not being able to accept the counter-cultural challenge to move away from individualism to communitarian belief and worship, retreated into the 'old mass' movements. However, it is equally true that many more people found the practice of common verbal prayer and common participation most agreeable and have continued to do so. As Mark Serle says: 'when

we change a person's symbol we change their belief, when we change the environment in which a person prays we change the way they pray and way they believe'.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>Mark Serle, Conference tapes. Liturgical Theology, Pastoral Centre, 1990.

## Conclusion.

Reforming anything is not an easy project and analysing a reform is equally problematic because one is dealing with a complex interrelationship of influences. This thesis has looked at some of those influences and how they impacted on each other. Moving the Catholic Church's worship from a rubrical system to a pastoral expression, as outlined in the document *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was not an easy process.

Liturgical reform was a gradual development which found expression in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, but it is the reforms which resulted from that document that have been the focus of attention here, rather than the document itself. It was a change implemented from above, often by churchmen who were struggling themselves to understand the necessity of the renewal and the consequent movement in theology.

Having traced the movement of those changes as they occurred in the New Zealand Catholic Church between 1963 and 1970, one is very aware of the complex web of interrelationships which makes a simple cause and effect analysis very difficult. Complicating any local analysis is the practicality of assessing the changes in the New Zealand Church against the impact of changes which were occurring in other parts of the world, as part of a larger international movement. One can only guess as to what might have happened if the change had been a totally local phenomenon. Therefore this case-study is unique in those elements which are particular to this country's Catholicism and culture, while other aspects are more applicable to Catholicism in general.

A major point of discussion throughout the thesis has been the question of process which was employed by the hierarchy during this period. This discussion was important to avoid imposing onto the 1960s Church a 1990s mentality. With the virtue of hindsight, and the relatively short period from 1970 to 1996, we have the advantage of having many people who lived through this period. Indeed, because to some extent the Church is still living out of the 1960s changes, one must be careful not to read back into the period the agenda of the present, though of course this is not always possible. The process of change has shown up the differences in

expectations by the laity of their Church leaders during the 1960s and now. Methods and attitudes which are expected now within the Church, even if only given lip-service to, were not demanded or expected in the 1960s. Contemporary expectations of the Church hierarchy are much more a result of the changes of the 1960s, than of a demand prior to them. What this thesis shows is that tried and true methods of hierarchical administration were employed by the bishops, but that those methods did not suit the theology of Pastoral Liturgy which underpinned the reforms.

Since the 1970s a major generational division between Catholics has occurred. That difference is the experience of change over stability, of rubricism over Pastoral Liturgy. Older generations who lived through the tail end of one of the Church's most static periods, grew up within a culture of safety with its accompanying expectations and its hidden nominalism. Those born after this time have never experienced, or perhaps even looked for, a culture of safety, and have viewed Church attendance as a personal choice to be part of the Church community, rather than as a response to a theology of damnation. Their experience of the Church has been an experience of change, as it struggles to formulate Christian answers in a post-Christendom world.

Accepting that any faith community does not exist as an isolated unit outside the wider sphere of society, it has been important to look at 1960s New Zealand society in general, using authors such as Chapman and others. Their analysis shows an obvious social pattern which was exerting an influence upon people, irrespective of religious persuasion.

While Catholic ritual worship is influenced by cultural expressions of religion which are not always in harmony with the foundational concept, it is not simply a sociological phenomena, but also an expression of the relationship between God and humankind, expressing as it does a person's fundamental self-meaning. To change the ritual expression invested with supernatural reality and meaning, is to change the means by which believers express belief. It thereby changes the *sitzenleben*, or the point from which they view living in the world, the nature of life, death and social interaction. It also points to the societal forces which have shaped the Church's liturgy. When society moves in one direction and the Church in another, reaction and conflict result.



Therefore, the changes in the liturgy while experienced only by Catholics, were not isolated forces within the New Zealand experience of that time. The changing nature of New Zealand society, as embodied in Catholics, tending as it did towards individualism and pragmatism, came into conflict with the counter-cultural communitarian movement within the Church. The liturgical reforms of the Mass, by changing the way Catholics prayed, forced them to reassess the nature of their common and personal beliefs and the ways in which they expressed them. This process of rediscovery directly challenged many previously unquestioned socio-religious practices and attitudes.

As a result of this process it became evident that some Catholics found the Church held no meaning for them and so they left. Others, not able to accept the counter-cultural challenges of communitarian belief and worship, sought refuge in the safety of the 'old Mass' movements. This reaction to the renewal occurred after the period of initial implementation (1964-69) rather than before it. The experience of change in the 1960s enabled the critical consciousness of the Catholic laity and clergy, about their role and place in the Church, to develop.

The question throughout this thesis has been whether the Church in New Zealand was prepared for such a change and how did they prepare for and implement the new reforms. Issues such as the method of change have been discussed as well as the common memory of Catholic laity not having been informed, consulted or taught about the changes. Several important factors have shown themselves to be crucial to this discussion.

The first characteristic is that of haphazard change. All those interviewed agreed that it depended where one was and the interest of the local priest as to what one experienced in liturgical worship. It is clear that not all priests were comfortable with the liturgical changes, nor understood them. It is also clear, that in those places where the dialogue Mass was used and used well, the transition from latin to the vernacular and to fuller participation by the laity went more smoothly than in those places where the dialogue Mass had not been used.

Secondly, most of the priests who were instrumental in giving direction to the liturgical changes had begun their interest while at Holy Cross College, either as members of

the St. Paul's group, or as a direct result of its influence on other priests. The initial implementation of the changes relied on the work of a small and dedicated group of priests, aided by some lay people and Religious, especially those in schools, who were instrumental in forming Catholic school children in the new liturgy. The reform was on the whole a priest-driven renewal that relied less on the bishops than it did on the initiative and enthusiasm of priests. While the effect of the Lay Apostolate can clearly been seen in this period, it was not a driving force behind the implementation of the reforms.

Thirdly the rapidity of the changes (1964-69) was probably too fast for the majority of Catholics. In a Church which moves slowly in so many other areas, the speed of the reforms was simply stupendous. The disorientation which resulted showed itself most fully after the initial implementation had been achieved.

Fourthly, the common memory of the changes remembers the reforms as all occurring at once, when they actually occurred in a steady progression, which could account for the memory of being in constant change. These were of course not the only changes which occurred between 1950 and 1970. Catholics had experienced changes in the liturgy before the implementation of the *Novus Missae*. What the difference would have been, had the entire Mass changed completely at once, as distinct from the gradual change, is anyone's guess.

The fifth aspect is to accept that the first and major change people remember was from Latin to English, which was accomplished to a large extent by 1968. The Canon of the Mass was the last prayer to use the vernacular. The second change was from the priest facing the altar, but away from the people, to the priest facing the altar and the people. It was interesting, though, that of those interviewed, no one could remember the actual day or occasion with any clarity, on which they as the priest faced the people, or as a member of the congregation had the priest face them. With the change from Latin to English or Maori went a change in the understanding of Church music, and with it a sense of loss of the old ways.

The sixth element is the development of Maori vernacular liturgy which was a very small part of the story of change. The use of Maori in the Mass continued, but the development of Maori liturgical rites did not. By the early 1970s the practice of the

congregation joining in the prayers for the dead in the Eucharist Prayer had developed. While this practice found much support among Maori Catholic, some leading Maori Mission priests were against it.

Lastly, at this time, there was no concept of questioning the hierarchy's motives or decisions. The concept of process was not a question for the Catholics of the 1960s, but has become a question as a result of that period. The implementation was a top-down event, with elements of paternalism on the part of the Episcopal Conference. Not all the bishops had the same reaction to the changes, but the dominant attitude was one of imposing changes by decree rather than by formation. Generally the bishops and priests did not always have a personal commitment to the Pastoral Liturgy, or any personal investment in the success of the reforms. This attitude must account for the variance of success among parishes and dioceses. This happened because the laity and clergy had been trained to believe in a top-down process and to receive direction without question. As Maura Hyland has shown, the laity could not develop a sense of responsibility for the decisions that were taken by others. The clergy too, because they were trained in this model, often accepted the directions of higher authority figures and implemented reforms at the local level using the same top-down model. The process of implementation directly impacted on the theology and practice of priesthood. The new direction which Pastoral Liturgy gave, called into question the methods and cultural perceptions of Catholic priesthood.

One must also conclude that while the laity and clergy were given information about the new direction of the Church, they were unable to benefit from it, because the material was intended only to inform them, not form them in a new theology and practice of worship. The material which was produced and published through the *Tablet* and *Zealandia* was good and generally readable, but still did not reach the entire Catholic population. This could be due to the increasing appeal of television and the general decline in the use of the printed media by people.

The Catholic Church of the 1960s in New Zealand could not have implemented the liturgical changes in any other way, other than by using the top-down model. Left only to the New Zealand Church the changes which did occur would not have occurred, because the majority were generally content. The bishops, while faithful to their task of informing clergy and laity, failed to provide real formation for them in the spirit,

vision and theology of Pastoral Liturgy. The concept of Pastoral Liturgy as outlined in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* was never effectively communicated to the clergy and laity.

Pope Paul VI had been insistent that Catholic people had to be formed in the new theology of worship. This new worship, called Pastoral Liturgy, was intended to be intimately linked to the pastoral work of the Church and to give a ritual expression to faith of the Catholic people. To do this it presumed, firstly, a new understanding of the nature of the Church and secondly, a new authority structure within the Church. Problems arose when the Church instituted this change from the back to the front. The liturgy was changed, but the other two necessary elements were not and so the confusion grew.

The process of implementing the Pastoral Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council is still continuing. One major difficulty is that the natural fallback position of people formed in the pre-conciliar Church is to the actions and mentality of that era. Therefore, it is doubtful that much more will change until the leadership of the Church comprises those who have been formed only in the post-conciliar Church. Then issues such as consultative leadership and inclusion of Church members in decision-making, as well as inculturated liturgy will be able to be addressed.

The memory of no instruction is an instance of the present reinterpreting the past. The difficulties which the Catholic Church faces today in the areas of nominalism did not begin with the 1960s, but the questions of consultation and inclusion of laity in decision-making may have been influenced by the experience of that period.

The changes in the Church directly challenged the comfortable religion which had grown up in New Zealand during the 1950s and early 60s. The Church's movement in liturgy away from privatised worship to a conciliar and communitarian dynamic was a counter-cultural movement which challenged the Church to celebrate the liturgy as the prayer of the people who pray it, a very different concept to that which had preceded it.

The women who sat at the Pastoral Centre and said 'we were never told' about the changes, are remembering their reaction to the 1970s, 80s and 90s, more than the period of implementation. The information was there, but the formation was not and

the process of change has mitigated against Pastoral Liturgy since then. It was in short a time of trying to breath new life into old churchskins.

## Appendix 1

### Ritual action after August 1964

For the prayers at the foot of the altar [the Confiteor etc.], said by the priest

For the Introit, Kyrie, Gloria and Collect.

To listen to the Epistle, gradual, Tract and Sequence.

For the Gospel, Creed, and offertory verse.

From the conclusion of the offertory prayer until the beginning of the Preface.

From the beginning of the Preface until the end of the Sanctus-Benedictus.

From the end of the Sanctus-Benedictus until Communion.

At Communion.

During the ablutions and the post-communion verse.

At the 'Dominus vobiscum of the Post-Communion prayer.

For the Celebrants blessing

#### Deletions:

The priest's preparatory prayers before the Altar at the beginning of Mass.

The Last Gospel.

Leoine Prayers

### Ritual Action after August 1964.

Kneel.

Stand.

Sit.

Stand.

Sit.

Stand.

Kneel.

Kneel.

Sit.

Kneel.

Stand.

#### Inclusions:

Epistle and Gospel to be read facing the people.

Prayers of the Faithful.

'The Secret' prayers and the Doxology at the end of the Canon to be said out loud.



**DIRECTIVES TO PRIESTS**  
*concerning the*  
**LITURGICAL INSTRUCTION**  
*of*  
**SEPTEMBER 26, 1964**

By direction of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (September 26, 1964), the Instruction for the Proper Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy comes into effect on the First Sunday of Lent (March 7, 1965).

## Changes At Low Mass:

The changes detailed in the Instruction, as they affect all Low Masses celebrated in New Zealand, are as follows.

(1) In the prayers to be said at the foot of the altar at the beginning of Mass, Psalm 42 is omitted (as in Masses of Requiem and during Passiontide). Whenever another liturgical service immediately precedes the Mass, all the prayers at the foot of the altar are omitted (Instruction 48/c).

(2) The Secret prayer, or "prayer over the offerings," is recited in a loud voice (48/e).

(3) The doxology at the end of the Canon, from the words **Per ipsum** up to **Per omnia saecula saeculorum. R. Amen** inclusively, is recited in a loud voice. Throughout the entire doxology the celebrant lifts up the Chalice and the Host for the Little Elevation, omitting the Signs of the Cross, and at the end genuflects only after the response **Amen** is given by the people (48/f).

(4) The embolism after the Lord's Prayer is recited in a loud voice (48/h) by the celebrant only.

(5) In distributing Holy Communion, the formula **Corpus Christi** is used. As he says these words, the celebrant lifts up the Host a little above the ciborium to show It to the communicant, who responds **Amen** and then is communicated by the celebrant. The Sign of the Cross with the Host is omitted (48/i).

(6) The Last Gospel is omitted; the Leonine prayers are suppressed (48 j).

## Readings At Low Mass:

The Instruction gives directions regarding **Lessons**, and **chants between the Lessons**, which are said facing the people, and include the **Lessons, Epistle and Gospel** (49) and the **intervening chants** (50). The Lessons occur only rarely during the year, and it is customary in New Zealand to speak of the Epistle, Gradual and Alleluia verses (or Tract, Sequence), and

Gospel. Within these terms of reference, two situations are envisaged: that of the priest-celebrant alone, and that of the priest-celebrant with assistant(s). The following directions concern those Masses at which the use of the vernacular is permitted, according to the Directions issued under the authority of the Archbishops and Bishops of New Zealand on August 16, 1964:

(1) If the Epistle, Gradual and Alleluia verses (or Tract, Sequence), and Gospel, are read by the celebrant, he stands either at the altar, or at the ambo (or lectern), or at the edge of the sanctuary area—whichever may be more convenient (49/b).

(2) If the celebrant does all the reading himself at the ambo (or lectern), or at the edge of the sanctuary area, he recites the Gradual and Alleluia verses (or Tract, Sequence) aloud, and remaining there, turns towards the altar and bowing deeply says the **Munda cor meum**. If, however, he reads everything at the altar, he recites the **Munda cor meum** in the centre as usual (49/c, d).

(3) The Epistle, and Gradual and Alleluia verses (or Tract, Sequence), may be read by a qualified lector or server (50), while the celebrant sits and listens. The Gospel may be read by a deacon or another priest (50). In these cases the celebrant sits (for the Epistle, etc.) or stands (for the Gospel) in a place clearly visible to and facing the congregation. It is suggested that, where possible, this be at the foot of the predella at the Epistle side of the altar; otherwise the existing sedilia may be used.

(4) If the Epistle, and the Gradual and Alleluia verses (or tract, Sequence), are read by an assistant (qualified lector or server, deacon or another priest), this is done from the ambo (or lectern), or at the edge of the sanctuary area (49/b). A woman acting as lector (e.g. in a convent chapel) remains outside the sanctuary.

(5) If a deacon or another priest is to read the Gospel, he says the **Munda cor meum** at the lowest step of the altar, bowing deeply. Kneeling, he seeks the blessing from the celebrant, who rises to bless him. After reading the Gospel he presents the book to the celebrant to kiss (50, 52/a, 52/b).

(6) If, after a lector or server has read the Epistle, the celebrant himself is to read the Gospel, he rises during the Alleluia verse (or Tract, Sequence), goes to the lowest step of the predella and, bowing deeply, says the **Munda cor meum** (52/c).

**N.B.** Please note that the above changes do not involve any extension of the use of the vernacular at present.

## Sung Masses:

Until new melodies are approved for parts of the Mass which eventually may be sung in English by the celebrant, ministers or people, all sung Masses will remain in Latin. The provisions of the Instruction as they affect sung Masses are as follows:

(1) The parts of the Proper which are sung or recited by the schola or the people are not said privately by the celebrant (48/a).

(2) The celebrant may sing or recite the parts of the Ordinary together with the people or the schola (48/b).

(3) In the prayers to be said at the foot of the altar at the beginning of Mass, Psalm 42 is omitted (as in Masses of Requiem and during Passiontide). Whenever another liturgical service immediately precedes the Mass, all the prayers at the foot of the altar are omitted (48/c).

(4) In solemn Masses the paten is not held by the subdeacon, but is left upon the altar (48/d).

(5) The Secret prayer, or "prayer over the offerings," is chanted in sung Masses (48/e).

(6) The doxology at the end of the Canon, from the words *Per ipsum* up to *Per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen* inclusively, is chanted. Throughout the entire doxology the celebrant lifts up the Chalice and Host for the Little Elevation, omitting the Signs of the Cross, and at the end genuflects only after the response *Amen* has been given by the schola and/or people (48/f).

(7) The Lord's Prayer may be chanted by the people together with the celebrant in the Latin language (48/g).

(8) The embolism after the Lord's Prayer is chanted (48/h) by the celebrant only.

(9) In the distribution of Holy Communion, the same formula as at Low Mass is to be used (48/i).

(10) The Last Gospel is omitted; the Leonine prayers are suppressed (48 j).

(11) It is lawful to celebrate sung Mass with a deacon only (48/k).

(12) In sung Masses, the Lessons, Epistle and Gospel, if they are proclaimed in the vernacular, may be recited without chant (51).

(13) The rubric of kissing the hand and objects other than the Gospel book which are being presented or received is suppressed (36/d).

(14) The Secret prayer will be chanted (without **Oremus**) in the Collect tone. Until new melodies are approved, the doxology and embolism will be chanted in *tono recto*.

## **Sacraments And Sacramentals:**

In accordance with Decrees of the Council for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, dated November 14 and 24, 1964, the Archbishops and Bishops of New Zealand approve the use of English in the administration of the Sacraments and Sacramentals according to the following versions.

(1) All the rites contained in The Small Ritual, published by Burns & Oates, London, 1964.

(2) All the rites (except the formula for the Sacrament of Penance) contained in the *Collectio Rituum*, approved for use in the United States of America in 1964, and published by various publishing houses Benzinger, Bruce, etc.).

## **Sacrament Of Baptism:**

In the rite for supplying omissions in the case of a baptised infant, which is given in the Roman Ritual, tit. II, cap. 5, those exorcisms shall be omitted which are found under n. 6 (**Exi ab eo**), 10 (**Exorcizo te, immunde spiritus—Ergo maledicte diabole**), and 15 (**Exorcize te, omnis spiritus**) (62).

In the rite for supplying omissions in the case of a baptised adult, which is given in the Roman Ritual, tit. II, cap. 6, those exorcisms shall be omitted which are found under n. 5 **Exi ab eo**, 15 (**Ergo, maledicte diabole**), 17 (**Audi maledicte satana**), 19 (**Exorcizo te, Ergo, maledicte diabole**), 21 (**Ergo, maledicte diabole**), 23 (**Ergo, maledicte diabole**), 25 (**Exorcizo te—Ergo maledicte diabole**), 31 (**Nec te lateat**), and 35 (**Exi, immunde spiritus**) (63).

## **Holy Communion:**

The faithful who communicate in the Mass of the Easter Vigil or in the midnight Mass of Christmas may also receive Communion again in the second Mass of Easter or in one of the Masses celebrated on Christmas in the daytime (60).

## Sacrament Of Penance:

The formula to be followed in the administration of the Sacrament of Penance is as follows:

(1) The penitent will say the **I confess . . . before** entering the confessional. After confessing his sins and hearing his sacramental penance, he will say the short form of the Act of Contrition: "O my God, I am very sorry that I have sinned against Thee, because Thou art so good; and I will not sin again."

(2) Then the priest will say: "May almighty God have mercy on you, forgive you your sins, and bring you to life everlasting. Amen."

(3) With his right hand raised, and turned towards the penitent, the priest will continue:

"May the almighty and merciful Lord grant you pardon, absolution and remission of your sins. Amen."

"May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve you: and I with his authority do absolve you from every bond of excommunication (suspension), and interdict, as far as I am able and you have need of it. And now I absolve you from your sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

(In the absolution of the laity the word suspension is omitted).

"May the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the Saints, whatever good you do, whatever evil you suffer, gain for you a remission of your sins, an increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life. Amen."

(For any good reason the priest may commence at the words "May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve you. . . .")

Reference to excommunication, suspension and interdict may be omitted when there is no serious likelihood of their having been incurred. This is especially important in the Confessions of children, whose minds can only be confused by the mention of these censures.



## The New "Ordo Missae":

Since the above directives were compiled from the Instruction, the announcement has been made in Rome that the revised "Ordo Missae" is about to be published. This provides for a clearer distinction between the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist, with the former being led by the celebrant from the sedilia or ambo (or lectern), facing the people for the Introit, Kyrie, Gloria and Collect as well as for the Epistle, etc.

Other points to be noted are :

1. The genuflection during the Credo is to be omitted, except at Christmas and the Annunciation; in other Masses it will be replaced by a profound bow towards the altar.
2. The Missal will remain at the celebrant's left from the Offertory to the end of Mass; the Communion verse and Post-communion prayer will be read at the centre of the altar, as are the concluding prayers of the Good Friday liturgy.
3. During the saying of the Libera, the celebrant will no longer sign himself with the paten nor kiss it.

# ANNOUNCEMENT TO THE PEOPLE REGARDING CHANGES IN THE CELEBRATION OF THE MASS

To be read in all churches on Sunday, February 28, 1965.

The changes at Holy Mass introduced throughout the world on March 7 will be best understood in the light of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy passed at the Second Session of the Vatican Council. Article 50 of this historic document states:

"The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, may be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful may be more easily achieved. For this purpose the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance; elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded; other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the vigour which they had in the days of the holy Fathers, as may seem useful or necessary."

The revision ordered by the Constitution now provides for the omission of Psalm 42 (Iudica me, Deus) from the prayers at the foot of the altar. This was originally part of the priest's private preparation for Mass, and was not part of the Liturgy of the Word. Similarly, the Last Gospel will be omitted, as this was part of the priest's thanksgiving after Mass and did not belong to the Liturgy of the Eucharist itself. Within the Mass, the prayer over the offerings (formerly called the Secret prayer) will now be said aloud, as will the formula of praise (doxology) immediately preceding the Lord's Prayer.

## The New "Ordo Missae":

Since the above directives were compiled from the Instruction, the announcement has been made in Rome that the revised "Ordo Missa" is about to be published. This provides for a clearer distinction between the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist, with the former being led by the celebrant from the sedilia or ambo (or lectern), facing the people for the Introit, Kyrie, Gloria and Collect as well as for the Epistle, etc.

Other points to be noted are:

1. The genuflection during the Credo is to be omitted, except at Christmas and the Annunciation; in other Masses it will be replaced by a profound bow towards the altar.
2. The Missal will remain at the celebrant's left from the Offertory to the end of Mass; the Communion verse and Postcommunion prayer will be read at the centre of the altar, as are the concluding prayers of the Good Friday liturgy.
3. During the saying of the Libera, the celebrant will no longer sign himself with the paten nor kiss it.

Yours devotedly in Christ,

✠ Peter McKeefry, Archbishop of Wellington.

✠ James M. Liston, Bishop of Auckland.

✠ Brian Ashby, Bishop of Christchurch.

✠ John P. Kavanagh, Bishop of Dunedin.

✠ Reginald J. Delargey, Auxiliary Bishop of Auckland.

✠ Owen N. Sneddon, Auxiliary Bishop of Wellington.

## Appendix 2

### Archdiocese of Wellington Statistics, 1956-1979

Year	Parish census	Mass attendance	registered non attendance
1956	85033	51913	33102
1957	88217	52633	35584
1958	93925	55708	38217
1959	95370	56900	38470
1960	99637	60510	39127
1961	104388	62200	42188
1962	111658	64437	47221
1963	116492	66553	49939
1964	119423	67040	52383
1965	123885	65941	57944
1966	125878	68385	57493
1967	129747	67564	62183
1968	132450	65752	66698
1969	133008	66119	66889
1970	136385	64855	71530
1971	136282	63563	72719
1972	138903	63537	75366
1973	146519	62233	84286
1974	139309	61631	77678
1975	141585	59393	82192
1976	140615	59835	80780
1977	141523	58431	83092
1978	142670	56622	86048
1979	140615	56225	84390

## Appendix 3.

### Edwards Wanganui Survey

The questions were:

1 Do you think that the reasons for the changes in the Liturgy are sufficiently well known by the majority of people?

2 Do you think that the people were sufficiently prepared to accept and understand the initial changes in the Mass as well as those that have since followed?

3 Has any one thing helped you to accept and appreciate the changes in the Mass? If so what?

4 What changes in the Mass do you think are improvements on the old?

5 Do you think that there are any unsatisfactory changes in the Mass?

6 Have you any suggestion by which we can best prepare the People of God for the introduction of the new Ordo Missae by Easter, 1970?

7 Do you think that there should be a follow-up (i.e., continued explanation) on the changes once they have been introduced?

A sample of the responses is given below. The responses are to questions one, three and seven.

**Do you think that the reasons for the changes in the Liturgy are sufficiently well known by the majority of people?**

Reply: 69.8% said the reasons for the changes were not sufficiently well explained and blamed poor explanations by the clergy 27.1%, disinterest of laity 23.0% and scarcity of good material 8.3% as the three main reasons. Groups 1 and 2 were more concerned with this lack of information than

the sixth former, possibility because of the better catechesis which was happening in the schools.

**Has any one thing helped you to accept and appreciate the changes in the Mass? If so what?**

Reply: groups 1 and 2 show that sermons at 28.6% and 25.0% respectively were important in helping them appreciate the changes. In reply to the same question member of group 1 failed to indicate the importance of discussion groups and found magazine articles of minimal value (7.1%).

**Have you any suggestion by which we can best prepare the People of God for the introduction of the new Ordo Missae by Easter, 1970?**

Reply: the main answer was sermons: group 1, 57.2%; group 2, 50.0%; group 3, 64.1% and group 4, 35.1%.



## **Bibliography:**

### **Primary Resources**

#### **Unpublished**

Delargy, R.J., Papers. 10.2;11.1;63-70, ACA.

Liston, M.J.,Papers, 3:6.10/ 3:6.4/ 3:61.1/ 3:63.1/ 3:65.1/ 3:69.2/ 3:76.1/  
3:78.1/ 3:79.2/ 3:613.3/ 3:711.2/ 3:713.2/ 20:5/ 57:5.1,5.2,5.3,5.5, ACA.

McKeefry, Peter, T., and Sneddon, Owen, N.,Liturgy Papers, Liturgy 1954-1985, WCA.

Meeking, Basil, 23 July 1996, unpublished text.

Bishops Conference minutes, 1960-1970, WCA.

Ashby, B., Papers, Diocesan Circulars, 1969, CDA.

Ashby, B., Liturgy letters and notes, CDA

Ashby, B., National Liturgy Commission Box, 1964-69, CDA.

#### **Interviews:**

Rev. Brian Arahill, 14 March 1996, Auckland.

Rev. David Blake, 14 March 1996, Auckland.

Miss Jocelyn Franklin, 12 June 1996, Auckland.

Rev. Barry Edwards, 2 May 1996, Wellington.

Sr. Pauline O'Regan, 4 June 1996, Christchurch.

Br. Julian Watson, FMS, 6 June 1996, Melbourne.

### **Official published**

'The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy', *Sacrosanctum concilium*, in *Vatican Council II The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, (ed) Austin Flannery, O.P., (Minnesota, 1975).

Paul VI, 'Motu Proprio on the Sacred Liturgy', *Sacram Liturgiam*, in *Vatican Council II The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, (ed Austin Flannery, O.P., (Minnesota, 1975).

*General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, Liturgy Documentary Series 2, (Washington, 1982).

Apostolic Constitution 'Veterum Sapientia' in *Latin The language of the Church*, (London, 1962).

### **Newspapers**

*Tablet*, 1962 - 1973.

*Zealandia* 1962 - 1971.

### **Books**

Fortescue, Adrian, O'Connell, J.B., *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*, (London, 1960).

Jungmann, Josef, SJ, *Liturgical Renewal In Retrospect and Prospect*, (London, 1965).

Jungmann, Josef, SJ *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, (New York, 1959).

Sloyan, Gerard, S, *Worship in a New Key: What the Council Teaches on the Liturgy*, (New York, 1965).

### **Secondary Resources:**

#### **Books**

Blake, David. *C.P.C 25 years Later: The story of Catholic Publications Centre Auckland, New Zealand*, (Auckland, 1995).

Bühlmann, Walbert, *The coming of the third church*, (Slough, 1976).

Cox, H., *The Secular City*, (London, 1965).

Davis, Charles, *Religion and the making of Society, Essays in Social Theology*, (Cambridge, 1994).

Davidson, A.K. & Lineham, P.J., *Transplanted Christianity*, (Palmerston North, 1989).

*Documents on the Liturgy, 1963-1979 Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts*, (Minnesota, 1982).

Fleming, Austin, *Preparing for Liturgy: A Theology and Spirituality*, (Washington, 1985).

Hebblethwaite, Peter, *Paul VI The First Modern Pope*, (London, 1993).

Holmes, J., Derek, and Bickers, Bernard, W., *A Short History of the Catholic Church*, (Tunbridge Wells, 1984).

*How Firm a Foundation: Leaders of the Liturgical Movement* (ed) Robert Tuzik (Chicago, 1990).

Hull, Geoffrey, *The Banished Heart. Origins of Heteropraxis in the Catholic Church* (Sydney, 1995).

James, Colin, *The Quiet Revolution. Turbulence and Transition in Contemporary New Zealand*, (Wellington, 1986).

Jackson, K, & Harre, J, *New Zealand*, (London, 1967).

King, Michael, *Being Pakeha*, (Auckland, 1985).

*Modern Catholicism, Vatican II and After* (ed) Adrian Hastings. (London 1991.)

*New Vision New Zealand*, (ed) Bruce Patrick, (Auckland, 1993).

Nocent, Adrien, *A Rereading of the Renewed Liturgy*(Minnesota, 1994).

O'Meegan, Michael, SM, *Held Firm by Faith, A History of the Catholic Diocese of Christchurch 1887-1987*,(Christchurch, 1988).

O'Regan, Pauline, *There is Hope for a Tree*, (Auckland, 1995).

O'Regan, Pauline, *A Changing Order*, (Wellington, 1986).

*Religion in New Zealand Society*, (eds.), B. Colless, & P. Donovan, (Palmerston North, 1985).

Simmons, Ernest, R., *A Brief History of the Catholic Church in New Zealand*, (Auckland, 1978).

Simmons, Ernest, R., *In Cruce Salus*, (Auckland, 1982).

Spoonley, Paul, Pearson, David, Shirley, Ian, *New Zealand Society*, (Palmerston North, 1990).

*The Church at Prayer Principles of the Liturgy*, Vol.1 (ed) A.G. Martimort, (Minnesota, 1987).

*The Church at Prayer The Eucharist*, Vol. 2 (ed) A.G. Martimort, (Minnesota, 1986).

*The New Liturgy: A Comprehensive Introduction*. (ed) Lancelot Sheppard, (London, 1970).

*The Liturgy Documents: A Parish Resource*, (Chicago, 1991).

*Towards Vatican III, The work that needs to be done*, (ed) David Tracy, (New York, 1978).

White, James, F., *Introduction to Christian worship*, (Nashville, 1990).

## Articles:

Chapman, Robert, 'From Labour to National' in *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (ed) Geoffrey W. Rice, (Auckland, 1995).

Dunstall, Graeme, 'The Social Pattern' in *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (ed) Geoffrey W. Rice, (Auckland, 1995).

Hans Mol 'Canada, Australia and New Zealand' in *World Catholicism in Transition*, (ed) Thomas M. Gannon, SJ (New York, 1988).

Hill, Michael, and Zwaga, Wiebe, 'Religion', in *New Zealand Society*, Paul Spoonley, David Pearson, Ian Shirley, (Palmerston North, 1990).

Isichei, Elizabeth, 'Christianity: Catholics Since the 1960s' in *Religions of New Zealanders*, (ed) Peter Donovan, (Palmerston North, 1990).

## Theses/Essay.

Evans, John, Adsett., 'Church State Relations in New Zealand 1940-1990 with Particular Reference to the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches', D.Phil. thesis in Theology (University of Otago, 1992).

Roydhouse, P, M., 'Religious Trends in New Zealand. Apostasy or Regenerative Secularism?', essay in History (University of Massey, 1994).

Van der Krogt, C.J., 'More a part Than Apart the Catholic Community in New Zealand Society 1918-1940', Ph.D thesis in History (Massey University, 1994).