

Pluscarden Benedictines

No. 201 News and Notes for our Friends Spring 2023

Contents

Fr Abbot's Letter	2
The Piety of Pope Benedict	5
Reminiscences of Ratzinger	13
Joseph Ratzinger and the Liturgy	18
The Monk of Bavaria	23
Coat of Arms of Pope Benedict XVI	29

Cover: Bishop Hugh Gilbert meeting Pope Benedict XVI

Back: Papal Arms of Pope Benedict XVI by Br Cyprian OSB

ABBOT'S LETTER

Dear Friends,

Fr Matthew Tylor, of our community, died peacefully in the monastery on 9th February. He breathed his last as the prayer of commendation for his soul was being said, and the bells were ringing for Mass.

Fr Matthew was a monk for over sixty years, a priest for fifty years. Before he was a monk, he was a soldier, being of the generation that did military service, and he fought in the jungle in Malaysia. He was a tall, strong man, whose long and interesting life was mostly behind him when he arrived at Pluscarden nearly twenty years ago.

We knew him as an old man, still strong though. An enduring memory will be Fr Matthew in these last few years when his memory had begun to fail. He was in the final stages of life, but he remained vigorous. He walked, hour after hour, tirelessly. He didn't wander. He went purposefully from his cell into the cloister, then along the cloister and round back along the cloister to his cell again; a pause, then off again. A beaming smile for whoever he met, a wave of his hand to indicate he couldn't stop, he had to press on.

Constant movement, but always within the confines of the cloister. Where was he going? In any reading of Fr Matthew's life, it resonates the message that St Benedict wants us to hear from every word of Scripture: that we might travel by a straight road to our Creator. Fr Matthew went by a long straight road to his Creator.

We can explain Fr Matthew's rectitude, the straightness of the path he walked in life, by the circumstances of his upbringing and early life: the Catholicism of his mother; the legal profession of his father; the generation and class into which he was born; his education at Ampleforth; his service in the army; his study of law at Southampton University. All this seems designed to produce a pious man, a dutiful and just man, a man faithful to his

commitments. Insert into this a nature that is sociable and loving, consider the impact on such a nature of the loss very early in his life of his mother, and you can understand much about Fr Matthew. All this is true and important, but superficial, and we know Fr Matthew was not superficial. He was a man of depth. What appeared was always true, but there was always more than appeared.

Consider his smile, his unfailing cheerfulness. Was he always as happy as he appeared? Was that possible? But it was not false. The truth (I think) was that his smile reflected not what was in him but what he saw in you: the happiness that he wished and hoped for in you. And because he was not a superficial person, this was something that went deep: he always hoped to find a loving and responsive heart. This is why his smiles and gestures had the quality of blessing.

He was always searching for love, not desperately but hopefully, confidently. In his search he met obstacles: his own emotional vulnerability, in later life his profound deafness, such a barrier to communication. He courageously overcome all the obstacles.

I remember once having a conversation with Fr Matthew. In the middle of it, unconnected with anything I was saying, he stiffened, looked resolute, and said "Yes, Father, I will do it!" And he marched off. To do what, I had no idea. Complete confusion, yet an essential communication had happened: a monk believed his abbot was asking something. With the swift step of obedience, he did it, whatever it was.

It was the love of God that he was seeking. He knew by faith he had God's love. He struggled to find within himself the child-like confident love towards God our Father that his faith assured him belonged there. This sense of some lack within himself, explainable by his experience of the limitations of human relationship, might have caused bitterness and self-pity, but not at all. It made him a seeker, turned towards God and neighbour, ready to go deep within himself. He needed others to assure him that this quest for love was love.

The great love of his life, under God, was Quarr Abbey: the place, the community living there, the form of life lived there. He entered the Abbey when he was a young man; he would be there still if circumstances beyond his control had not prevented it. From his first visit it exerted an overwhelming attraction for him. This is not the only way a monastic vocation takes shape, but for many, as for him, it is a total engagement of heart and imagination in what he found at the Abbey. Not so usual is that this strong attraction seems never to have left him. In this as in so many ways, in the best sense, he was child-like. If he wanted a place where he might experience love and know he was a child of God, he had found it.

All the harder that he had to leave Quarr. He was then 67, an age when it is hard to be taken from home, and not to be expected that one can really be at home in a new place. He was like Abraham, seventy-five when the Lord told him “Go from your country and your kindred and your father’s house to the land that I will show you” (Gen. 12:1), or like Moses, eighty when he stood before Pharaoh ready to make the journey out of Egypt.

Abraham never possessed the land God promised him, Moses never entered it. They were holders of a promise that for Abraham was fulfilled in his children, for Moses in his people. The promise was fulfilled in their fruitfulness. Did Fr Matthew find the promised land here at Pluscarden? He found essentially the same form of monastic life that he had chosen in his youth, and he was grateful for that. He bore spiritual fruit in this monastic life. In our cloister he walked on resolutely towards home, on the straight path to his Creator, smiling at us all as he went. It was our privilege to cheer him on. Now we pray that the angels of God will take over from us and accompany him the rest of the way.

Yours devotedly in Christ,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Fr Anselm". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style. The "F" is large and prominent, followed by "r" and "Anselm".

THE PIETY OF POPE BENEDICT AND HIS DEFENCE OF TRUTH¹

Of all the judgements passed on Joseph Ratzinger over the course of his long life (1927–2022), the one that most appeals to me is that of Joachim Cardinal Meisner. He said that Ratzinger had “the intelligence of 12 professors” and was “as pious as a child on the day of his First Communion.”

Anyone privileged to hear him deliver a homily or a lecture can attest to his erudition and lucidity, his knowledge of the scriptures, facility with biblical languages, and his awareness of historical contexts and philosophical movements. Even his detractors are not so stupid as to call his intelligence and education into question.

The usual form of attack is to construct psychological explanations for why he preferred to take sacred scripture and ecclesial tradition as his moorings, rather than experiment with contemporary social theories as partners for theology. It was said that he found the student protests of 1968 traumatic. In one of his interviews, he said that what he found most traumatic about 1968 was not the behaviour of the students themselves but the fact that Catholic priests handed out Communion to Marxists on picket lines.

Since he was born in 1927, he belonged to the World War II generation, not to the generation of 1968. The heroes of his youth were men like Romano Guardini and Theodor Haecker who had intellectually opposed the Nazi regime. These types stood for truth against ideology.

A generation later, the Frankfurt School of social theory cast a hermeneutic of suspicion around all truth claims and linked truth claims to social status and an alleged “authoritarian personality”. The generation of 1968 desperately needed some explanation for what happened in Germany during the thirteen years of Nazi brutality. The narrative it adopted was that reason itself is

¹ First published on the ABC Religion and Ethics website

dangerous. Ratzinger thus ended up spending much of his life defending concepts like reason, truth, and rationality. He coined the expression “the dictatorship of relativism” and complained of the narrowing of the scope of reason. He believed that faith and reason need to work together to mutually purify each other and that cultures become pathological when these two critical couplets are not allowed to play in concert.

Ratzinger also had a strong aversion to mob judgements (Pöbelglaube). He thought calls for the democratisation of the governance of the Church would simply lead to more bureaucracy. A luxuriant growth in committees and quangos would create a new class of professional lay bureaucrats who make it their business to manage, and often oppress, the faithful praying in the pews.

On many occasions he declared that what the Church needed was less management, fewer introspective talk-fests, and more holiness. He understood that democracy does not equate to greater freedom. On the contrary, it means greater uniformity, less freedom for diversity, and trends toward a general levelling down of cultural standards. Committees generate lowest common denominator documents and policies. He never forgot that the strongest opponents of the Nazi regime were strong-minded individuals, including heroic bishops like Clemens August von Galen, who were not afraid to be different and really did not care about majority opinion.

Ratzinger was the product of the highest educational standards anywhere in the world. The German humanistic gymnasia and the German universities were the bearers of the high culture of classical Greece, Rome, and Christendom, as well as the philosophy of German Idealism and its critics. These institutions produced a man whose academic work was honoured outside the Catholic world by his appointment to the French Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, a cardinal chosen to address the Sorbonne to mark the turn of the millennium, and a member of the College of Cardinals with the ability to go head-to-head with Jürgen Habermas.

Quite simply, Ratzinger's knowledge of the Western intellectual tradition – from its tributaries in ancient Israel, Athens, and Rome to its current crisis of faith in itself – was both broad and deep. He was a scholar's scholar, but he also had the ability to convey his wisdom to others much less learned than himself. There is a saying in Rome that crowds would come to see St John Paul II, but crowds came to hear Benedict. His Wednesday audience addresses were like fireside chat tutorials for undergraduates. Anyone with a basic arts degree and familiarity with the Nicene Creed can read his publications and understand them.

Those theologians who opposed his theological vision would often remark that he never created his own system. He never had some big idea that changed the whole discipline of theology. What he did do, however, was to write numerous books, articles and homilies on contemporary theological crises. When these are all pieced together, what one has is a masterclass on fundamental theology.

One can, for example, go to his publications to find out what he thought about the merits and limits of the historical-critical method; what he thought about the nature of revelation and its relationship to tradition; why he thought that logos must always precede praxis and what goes wrong when this relationship is flipped; what he thought Plato got right and wrong; what was his understanding of the human conscience and its role in moral theology; and dozens of other issues. When the dust finally settles on the current era and a new generation of leaders emerge who care more about the truth and the *memoria ecclesiae* than about opinion polls and Catholic Inc., the masterclass in fundamental theology is likely to be Ratzinger's most enduring legacy.

A further and almost as important legacy will be his contributions to the documents of the Second Vatican Council – especially to *Dei Verbum*, the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation. He attended the Council as a theological advisor to Cardinal Frings of Cologne at the tender age of 35. With his death we have the end of the Conciliar generation. There are no more

living legends who can recall what happened in the committee rooms and the cafés.

As Pope Benedict XVI, he was quite sympathetic to the grievances of those who were distressed by the decisions of the Council, especially those who found folk liturgies intolerable – though such liturgies were not actually mandated by the Council itself, but by bureaucracies put into position by the Council. In *God and the World*, he acknowledged that such people had been “treated like lepers” and he thought that this was unfair. On 7 July 2007, he famously offered them the olive branch of a rehabilitation of what he called “the extraordinary form” of the Roman Liturgy. He hoped that the two Roman Rites – the new Missal of 1969 and the Tridentine liturgy with a few accretions – would have a mutually beneficial effect on each other.

Benedict liked the idea of the scriptures being read in the vernacular, but he acknowledged that in many parts of the world the Missal of 1969 had given rise to what he called “parish tea party” liturgies. These were self-centric forms of worship focused on the celebration of the local community, not worship of the Holy Trinity. He compared them to the Hebrews’ worship of the golden calf and he could completely understand why people ran away from those kinds of liturgies. He also opposed rock music, comparing it to the music of Dionysian cults of ancient Greece. His criticisms of the rock music industry were quite similar to arguments made by the English philosopher Roger Scruton. Both men saw the industry as an attempt to provide young people with an experience of self-transcendence that can only be had in Christian worship.

Another ecclesial group for which he worked hard during his pontificate was the international network of Anglicans who wanted to return to full communion with the Catholic Church while bringing some of the Anglican patrimony, especially the liturgical patrimony, with them.

The end result was the creation of “Ordinariates” in the United Kingdom and other countries of the British Commonwealth, including Australia, so that such Anglicans could be in full

communion with the Catholic Church but continue to enjoy their solemn liturgical traditions. They could join the Catholic Church in parish groups rather than one by one. No doubt his personal appreciation of the scholarship of St John Henry Newman (whom he beatified) was part of the backstory to his enthusiasm for efforts on this front.

He also worked to improve relations with the churches of Eastern Orthodoxy. In his homilies and other public statements, he was acutely sensitive to their theological positions and historical grievances.

On a personal note, when I was awarded the Ratzinger Prize for Theology, I sent Pope Benedict a “thank you” note inside a Christmas card. For the card itself, I decided against an image of the nativity. I thought he had probably seen them all. Instead, I chose a card that featured a cat sitting on a windowsill looking out onto a snowy meadow, at the end of which was a village church with a light glowing inside. I knew that he loved cats and this particular cat looked as if he could possibly be thinking about the meaning of Christmas.

I sent the card and wrote my letter in German, apologising for any mistakes in the grammar. I explained that I had learned German from a nun who had learned it from Papua New Guineans who in turn had picked it up from German missionaries. I received a response saying that even more than the beautiful picture of the village church and the “pensive cat” (his description), he enjoyed the story about how I came to learn German.

My late colleague, Professor Nicholas Tonti-Filippini, could tell stories of meetings with Ratzinger during the days when Ratzinger was the Prefect of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF). According to Nicholas, Ratzinger would serve him coffee and Bavarian cake while the two talked about bio-ethical issues. It always seemed to me interesting that Nicholas would mention the coffee and cake, as if it were some kind of special treat. But one Spanish archbishop later remarked to me that for him the most distinctive thing about Ratzinger was his “exquisite manners”. He apparently behaved with each visitor as if

he had all the time in the world to chat with them, and conveyed the idea that attending to their comfort and concerns was his joy and his duty.

For his own relaxation he played the piano, and during his lunch hour in his CDF days he often went for a walk around the precinct of St Peter's Basilica. Roman seminarians would talk about how on these walks Cardinal Ratzinger would bend down to pet the stray cats who live on the streets of Rome and as a result they often followed him on his walk. Such was his fame as a cat lover that the Benedictine monks at Pluscarden Abbey (on the edge of the North Sea) sent a letter to him during his pontificate allegedly written by their own famous cat Baxter and Baxter got a formal letter of reply from Pope Benedict.

I mention these stories and impressions because they too are part of the composite picture of the man, though they speak more to his affective than intellectual side. Since he argued that "love and truth are the twin pillars of all reality" any account of his life that left out the affective side, and only mentioned his defence of truth, would be lop-sided.

So why did Benedict suffer from so much negative publicity? Why did some journalists refer to him as "Der Panzer Kardinal"? My own impression is simply that he loved the truth and would not allow nonsense to be fed to his sheep on his watch.

Someone once described a particular bishop to me as a man who had no interest in theology and did not care what his seminarians were taught in theology classes. This was because he was taught rubbish when he was a seminarian, but he said his prayers and took the sacraments seriously and all the rubbish simply washed over him. He came out of the experience thinking that what really mattered was a person's prayer life – not what a person was taught in class.

Ratzinger, however, was not the kind of person who could tolerate intellectual nonsense – and there was plenty of this about in the Church in Germany. He once used his episcopal authority to thwart an academic appointment of Johann-Baptist Metz, a scholar who had been traumatised by the events of World War II and who

fell under the influence of the philosophy of Ernest Bloch, a Marxist philosopher. Ratzinger had no time for Marxism of any sub-species and in his many statements against it his strongest criticism was not, primarily at least, that it was atheistic or materialistic, but that it had the wrong attitude toward truth. It gave priority to praxis, and in Ratzinger's judgement, "mere praxis gives no light".

A particular version of the "priority of praxis" project takes the form of distilling the "values" of Christ's kingdom from Christ himself. Here Ratzinger charted the moves from ecclesiocentricity (the Church does matter), to Christocentricity (we can have Christ without the Church), to theocentricity (we can have some generic supreme being rather than Christ), and then, finally, we can set aside deism altogether and just forge a social consensus around "the values of the kingdom": what Ratzinger called regnocentricity. This distillation process – marketed under the banner of the "Weltethos Projekt" by Hans Küng – was regarded by Ratzinger as a recipe for the Church's self-secularisation. The end result (regnocentricity) means that neither the Church nor Christ are necessary. They can be "filtered out". From the 1970s onwards, Ratzinger resisted this slippery slide into the religion of mere philanthropy.

Thus, while there are some Catholics who want to hook up elements of Christian teaching with contemporary social theories – including, in some cases, social theories with Marxist pedigrees – Ratzinger took a lot of flak for not only opposing this, but in many ways making it his life's work to be a bulwark against it. Positively, however, he would simply say that he was defending and preserving the memory of the Church for future generations, protecting it from corruption. This is, after all, one of the responsibilities of bishops and the primary responsibility of the Prefect for the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith. This responsibility, then, increases in such magnitude with the papacy that he described the burden of the Petrine Office as "martyriological".

If in the future Benedict XVI is canonised and declared a Doctor of the Church, he may be remembered as one of the greatest scholars ever to occupy the Chair of Peter, a master of fundamental theology – but, nonetheless, a man who never lost the piety of his Bavarian childhood and a man for whom the responsibilities that went with holding the keys of St Peter were truly martyriological.

Professor Tracey Rowland

Professor Tracey Rowland holds the St John Paul II Chair of Theology at the University of Notre Dame (Australia). She is the author of Ratzinger's Faith: The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI and Benedict XVI: A Guide for the Perplexed. She is due to deliver the 2025 Pluscarden Pentecost Lectures.

“Man knows that, by himself, he cannot respond to his own fundamental need to understand. However much he is deluded and still deludes himself that he is self-sufficient, he experiences his own insufficiency. He needs to open himself to something more, to something or to someone that can give him what he lacks, he must come out of himself towards the One who is able to fill the breadth and depth of his desire.

“Man bears within him a thirst for the infinite, a longing for eternity, a quest for beauty, a desire for love, a need for light and for truth which impel him towards the Absolute; man bears within him the desire for God. And man knows, in a certain way, that he can turn to God, he knows he can pray to him.”

Benedict XVI, General Audience, Man in Prayer, 11 May 2011

REMINISCENCES OF RATZINGER²

It was mid-January 1971 that I first met Joseph Ratzinger. I arrived in Regensburg's main station around 7.30 am after an overnight train journey from Münster (Westphalia) for an interview with him in his home in the parish of Pentling. Previously, I had spent most of the Winter Semester 1970–71 on the University of Münster sitting at the feet of Karl Rahner with the intention of doing my doctorate under his supervision. Rahner was a disappointment. He had become an oracle and incapable of dialogue. What prompted me to seek out Ratzinger instead, was the memory of a chance meeting with Kevin McNamara, my former Professor of Fundamental Theology in Maynooth before I left for Germany in September 1970.

Ordained in January of that year as a “late vocation” at 29 years of age, I was not sent on the missions like my younger classmates but was given permission to do postgraduate studies. I chose Germany to study under Walter Kasper in Münster, since my own congregation ran a university hostel there. That summer, I heard that Kasper had moved to Tübingen. When I told McNamara that I intended going to Tübingen, he advised against it. The situation in the Faculty there was such that a young theologian, who had impressed him at the 1969 Maynooth Summer School, told him that it was impossible to do serious academic work there. He had opted instead to accept a chair on the new University of Regensburg. That theologian was Joseph Ratzinger. Since I had already made arrangements to go to Münster, I decided to go there and study under Rahner, even though I had serious reservations about his theology: his theory of anonymous Christianity had dealt a death-blow to the missionary aim of the Church. After a few months it became clear to me that I could not study under him. Then I remembered the name of the theologian in Regensburg and decided to apply to him.

² This article originally appeared in *The Tablet*

What immediately impressed me about Ratzinger, apart from the simplicity of his house, was the undivided attention he gave to me during that interview. He said little; he listened. And after a short exchange of opinions on various theological subjects that interested me, he accepted me as a doctorand. That self-effacing attitude of listening reflects his life-long search for truth. It was evident in his openness to the great thinkers of the world, which made his wide-ranging lectures so simulating. He was attentive to whatever scintilla of truth the thinkers of yesterday and today were articulating, be they sympathetic or hostile to Christianity. As he once wrote: “Faith needs a listening intellect to be understood and lived.” His self-effacing attitude of listening was evident above all in his seminars, doctoral colloquium, and personal conversations: it had the effect of creating an atmosphere of openness, frankness, and dialogue that was unique. Also unique is the attention he gives to whomsoever he meets. He never forgot a face or a name. His memory was phenomenal. His sister, Maria, once told me: “Joseph never reads a book twice.”

The opening lectures each semester attracted listeners from all disciplines in the university, since he introduced his chosen theme – be it Christology, creation, sacraments, or ecclesiology, etc. – by situating the topic within a *tour d’horizon* of contemporary cultural currents as reflected in literature, philosophy, or science. Once he had outlined the dominant understanding of the topic and highlighted the intellectual problems it posed, he delved into his own presentation. Scripture was his starting point before exploring the riches of the tradition. Finally, he would develop his own critique to suggest a new synthesis that was as clear as it was profound.

As a doctoral supervisor, he gave us complete freedom. He never tried to influence the direction that our research was taking. This was based on his own pedagogical principle that the teacher should not impose his knowledge on the learner but allow the pupil to discover the truth for himself or herself.

By the time I joined his doctoral colloquium, it numbered some twenty-five members. They were literally from every

continent and represented almost every shade of theological opinion. We met on a Saturday morning every two weeks, when a doctoral or postdoctoral student would report on the present state of his or her research. The range of topics ranged from the Fathers of the Church, through the Reformation down to a raft of modern philosophers and theologians, not to mention non-Christian religions – so that each session was both informative and stimulating. The colloquium also included a number of guests – professors on sabbatical or postdoctoral students from other universities.

Each session of the doctoral colloquium opened with Mass in the chapel of the diocesan seminary in what was originally the early twelfth century Schottenkloster (Irish Abbey) of St James. Either Ratzinger or one of the priest-members of the colloquium preached. At the end of each academic year, a weekend colloquium was held at some location in the Bavarian Woods. Guest speakers, such as Wolfhart Pannenberg, Karl Rahner, and Stylianos Harkianakis, were invited to discuss their latest research project with us. The weekend combined worship, walks in the woods, and recreation in the evening. In such a relaxed atmosphere Ratzinger was at his best: alert, incisive in his comments, and always humorous. He greatly enjoyed the evening get-together over a glass of wine or beer we much as we did; he loved a humorous story.

His election to the See of Munich and Freising (March 25th, 1977) came as a shock to us his students. The day after the public announcement, I happened to visit him in his house in Pentling. Though I congratulated him, I had to express my own disappointment that he was about to depart from academia. He looked at me pensively, and, pointing to a letter on the desk, said that he could not turn down a personal request from the Pope. I was a member of his entourage a month after his episcopal ordination, when Paul VI elevated him to the cardinalate.

Later that year, his current and past doctoral and post-doctoral students celebrated his election as Cardinal Archbishop with a banquet in the Schottenkloster. It fell to me to make a presentation

to him of a 15th century statue of a bishop, carved in Regensburg. Among other things. I thanked him for the respect he showed “to the opinions of others, be they distinguished scholars who disagreed with him, or academic neophytes, who sometimes, in innocent arrogance, dared to express views they had picked up from the last book they read.” I also thanked him for the free space he created for us to pursue our own research. He replied spontaneously with his own *retractationes* that were both humorous and profound.

The Schülerkreis established in 1980, grew organically out of the doctoral colloquium, now expanded by former doctoral and post-doctoral students. Each meeting was devoted to a theological or philosophical topic. Eminent scholars (not all theologians, or Catholic, or even believers) were invited to address the topic. Members of the *Schülerkreis* were also invited to read papers on related theme. (I read four such papers.) One of the highlights of the annual meeting was Ratzinger’s own off-the-cuff account of the main controversies of the previous year in which he was engaged as Prefect of the CDF.

The annual meeting of the Schülerkreis took place in Germany (mostly Bavaria). Once the meeting was held in the Orthodox Centre of Chambésy, Switzerland, and twice in Rome – for his 65th and 75th birthdays respectively. In September 1997, we met for a week at a house near Lake Como to celebrate his expected retirement as Prefect of the CDF.

The first meeting of the *Schülerkreis* after his election to the See of Peter (2005) took place the following September in Castel Gandolfo. It included a celebratory lunch *al fresco* in the shadow of the remains of the Emperor Domitian’s private theatre. The topic, which had been decided the previous year, was Islam and Christianity. Two Islamic scholars, Samir Khalil Samir (Beirut) and Christian W. Troll, SJ (Ankara/Berlin), were invited to read papers. Two weeks later, Pope Benedict would deliver his lecture to the University of Regensburg, in which he quoted a 14th century Byzantine Emperor’s comment on Islam that caused a furore in the Islamic world, while the main topic was ignored,

namely the indispensable role of theology on the university to ensure that the academic/scientific mentality did not self-destruct with fatal consequences to humanity.

One of the highpoints of that first meeting was his homily at our concelebrated Mass. It touched the attempt by some theologians during the revision of the Code of Canon Law to remove entirely the penal section on the basis of a false opposition between justice and mercy – with fatal consequences for the Church’s response to clerical abuse.

Among those invited to speak to the *Schülerkreis* at its annual meeting in Castel Gandolfo were Martin Hengel and Peter Stuhmacher (Tübingen), Rémi Brague (Paris), Cardinal Christoph Schönborn, Peter Schuster, Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz, and Otto Neubauer (all from Vienna), Cardinal Kurt Koch (Rome), Tomáš Halík (Prague), Joseph H.H. Weiler (New York), Klaus Berger (Heidelberg), and Karl-Heinz Menke (Bonn). In 2009, a new *Schülerkreis* was formed made up of young scholars who, unlike his original students, had studied Ratzinger’s theology. They also changed the form of the meeting by including public symposium.

After he retired in 2013, he no longer attended the *Schülerkreis* but concelebrated Mass with us in the Campo Santo Teutonico up to 2015, when his health prevented him. My last private meetings with him in his *Monasterio* was last September, when I presented my new book on the Liturgy to him. Though his voice was reduced to a whisper, we engaged in a short but stimulating dialogue. Frail in body, his mind was crystal clear. He was, as usual, the same, quintessentially humble Joseph Ratzinger, whom I was privileged to know as *Doktorvater*, Archbishop, Cardinal Prefect – and Pope Benedict XVI.

D. Vincent Twomey S.V.D.

Fr Vincent delivered the 2013 Pentecost Lectures on Revelation and Reason: The Thought of Joseph Ratzinger/Benedict XVI.

JOSEPH RATZINGER AND THE LITURGY

Joseph Ratzinger was a man who loved God; a Christian who wanted to bear witness to Jesus Christ with his whole life; a humble disciple who was also a Pastor; a man particularly gifted as thinker, scholar, and teacher. All that is obvious: but it puts in context the central place that liturgy always held for him. “The liturgy,” he wrote, “is the animating centre of the Church, the very centre of the Christian life”. We could say that Pope Benedict loved the liturgy with a Benedictine heart. He loved its holiness, its order, its beauty, its antiquity. He loved it as a primary means and expression of prayer; as God’s gift to us, and as our way to God. As a theme, liturgy crops up countless times in his writings. Typically, he would strive to place his profound scholarship within reach of the non-specialist reader. He would also deploy his brilliant intellect to cut through nonsense, though always with characteristic modesty and restraint. Often, he would speak of liturgy in tones of lyrical beauty; not infrequently also, with a certain anguish of heart.

At the beginning of Cardinal Ratzinger’s 1999 book *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, we read how, through the ministry of Moses, God delivered the people of Israel from their Egyptian captivity. But the purpose of this was not liberation for its own sake; not even primarily in view of the Land that was Promised. Four times in Exodus God commands Pharaoh: “Let my people go, so that they might serve me in the wilderness.” Israel was set free from slavery in order to learn how to worship God, according to his holy will. Ratzinger concludes from this: “Man was created for worship. Worship alone sets us free. Worship alone gives us the criteria for our action. Precisely in a world in which guiding criteria are absent, and the threat exists that each person will be a law unto himself, it is fundamentally necessary to stress worship.”

The Covenant subsequently sealed on Sinai, he explains, had three aspects: worship in the first place, but then also law and ethics. Each of these is essential for any right human living. So: “cult goes beyond the action of liturgy. Ultimately it embraces the

ordering of the whole of human life.” Essential for this proper ordering, though, is the authenticity of the cult. A worship that springs merely from human imagination or creativity would remain just a cry in the dark, or mere self-affirmation, or a dance around a Golden Calf of our own making. Therefore, for worship to be truly an encounter with the living God, it has to be itself God’s gift, received in loving and grateful obedience. For us who live in the light of Christ, this divine gift is no longer symbolically expressed by the sacrifice of animals in the Temple. The focus and centre of our liturgy is the Holy Eucharist. For us, liturgy is now “the prayer of the Church; a prayer moved and guided by the Holy Spirit himself; a prayer in which Christ unceasingly becomes contemporary with us, and enters into our lives.”

From the beginning of his Priesthood, Joseph Ratzinger took up with enthusiasm the cause of the liturgical movement. With so many others, among whom should be mentioned especially Romano Guardini, he longed for all the faithful truly to enter the liturgy, live the liturgy, nourish their prayer and their life from the liturgy. In this way they would feed on the most authentic and wholesome sources of the Christian life, and truly live the life of the Church. At Vatican II the young *peritus* early identified himself with the Progressives urging liturgical reform. He entirely approved of the Council’s strong insistence on *participatio actuosa*. And he never subsequently retracted this position. Yet clearly, he regarded the implementation of the Conciliar reform as far from perfect. In some important aspects, it proved simply disastrous. So he spoke often of the importance of a “hermeneutic of continuity”, as opposed to a “hermeneutic of rupture”. Vatican II was no Year Zero. The liturgical rites that sprang from it can only be understood in the light of what went before. Ratzinger therefore spoke also of a need for a “reform of the reform”.

Regarding “active participation”, he would boldly assert that this has to be above all in the Eucharistic prayer itself: the Canon of the Mass spoken or sung by the Priest alone. “Each of us has to be personally conformed to the mystery being celebrated, offering our life to God in unity with the sacrifice of Christ for the salvation

of the whole world.” “In the Eucharistic liturgy, God himself is acting, and we are drawn into that action. Everything else is secondary.” Finding things to do for as many people as possible, then, is mere distraction. As for the liturgical Rite itself: this is always “something we receive, rather than produce ourselves. Unspontaneity is of its essence”.

A review such as this should mention the dominating influence of St Augustine on Ratzinger’s thought. One subject where Augustinian overtones are particularly manifest is liturgical music. “To sing is one of the most commonly words used in the Bible... Church music is a charism of the Holy Spirit, surpassing the merely spoken word. When man comes into contact with God, mere speech is not enough. After the Exodus, the people sing to the Lord. According to the Apocalypse, in heaven the conquerors sing the song of Moses, which is now the song of the Lamb... Especially through the Psalms we sing through Christ in the Spirit to the Father. We sing as those who have been redeemed, but also as those who participate in Christ’s passion, and await the completion of his victory.”

In February 2007, in the second year of his Pontificate, Pope Benedict wrote a quite lengthy post-Synodal Exhortation on the Holy Eucharist: *Sacramentum Caritatis*. There is nothing controversial or out of the mainstream to be found here. Instead, Benedict repeatedly insists that the post-Conciliar liturgy be well studied, well explained, well understood, well prepared, well carried out. Typically, here we find his insistence on the importance of beauty. He suggests incidentally that silent adoration should be promoted as a necessary consequence of liturgical worship. He also touches briefly on the abiding importance of the Latin language, and of Gregorian Chant.

In more informal, non-Magisterial writing, Ratzinger did not hesitate to urge a restored Eastward position of the Altar. Turning the Altars around, he thought, was simply a mistake, neither mandated nor even mentioned by the Council itself. What followed was “an unprecedented clericalisation of the liturgy. The Priest as Presider, or Animator, becomes the central point of focus.

Less and less is God even in the picture. The turning of the Priest towards the people has turned the community into a self-enclosed circle. It no longer opens outward to what lies ahead, and above, but is closed in on itself.” Whereas: “what matters is looking together towards the Lord. Here we find the dimension of the future, of hope in the Lord who is to come again.” When in accordance with tradition Priest and people together face East, the direction of the rising sun, they express both the cosmic and the historical aspect of liturgy. They face Christ, Lord of creation; Christ who died on the Cross, and Christ who is to come again at the end of time.

As for the re-ordering of Churches: “the destruction of images, frequently regarded as virtually mandated by Vatican II, eliminated a lot of kitsch and unworthy art; but ultimately it left behind a void, the wretchedness of which we are now experiencing in a truly acute way.” Yet as Pope, Benedict could not bear to promote yet more disruption, more controversy, more ecclesial civil war. Many of a traditional frame of mind wanted him to be more radical in countering or reversing the *de facto* sense of rupture; what was perceived as a secularisation or de-sacralisation of the liturgy. But he remained habitually cautious, and careful; loyal to his predecessors; confining himself mainly to exhortation and example.

Nevertheless, on 7 July 2007 Pope Benedict issued the *Motu proprio Summorum Pontificum*, whereby former restrictions on celebrating the pre-Conciliar liturgy were almost entirely removed. For some, this was an embarrassing and regrettable lapse of judgement; an unwitting encouragement of division and party spirit; even a betrayal of Vatican II. For others, it was the most significant act of his Pontificate, and the greatest contribution to the liturgy of his life. Benedict himself spoke of a new “Pax liturgica”. He hoped to pour soothing oil on to troubled waters. Some felt that a better image might be petrol on flames. Across the world, anyway, a whole new generation of youthful Catholics ardently committed to the Traditional Latin Mass was created. Doubtless some of these would express impatience with what they

normally found in their parishes, which many found to be boring, flat and lifeless. By contrast, many of those anxious to see the Church advance ever more radically in an entirely opposite direction felt deeply threatened. For them it seemed as if all their aspirations for the post-Conciliar Church were being placed in jeopardy.

Yet, as Benedict serenely explained at the time: “What earlier generations held as sacred, remains sacred and great for us too. It cannot be all of a sudden entirely forbidden or even considered harmful. It behoves all of us to preserve the riches which have developed in the Church’s life and prayer, and to give them their proper place.”

DBH

“Death is part of life, and not only at its end but, upon a closer look, at every moment. Jesus revolutionised the meaning of death. He did so with his teaching, but especially by facing death himself. ‘By dying he destroyed our death’, the Liturgy of the Easter Season says.

“The Son of God thus desired to share our human condition to the very end, to reopen it to hope. After all, he was born to be able to die and thereby free us from the slavery of death. The Letter to the Hebrews says: ‘so that he might taste death for everyone’ (Heb 2: 9). Since then, death has not been the same: it was deprived, so to speak, of its ‘venom’. Indeed, God’s love working in Jesus gave new meaning to the whole of human existence, and thus transformed death as well. If, in Christ, human life is a ‘[departure] from this world to the Father’ (Jn 13: 1), the hour of death is the moment when it is concretely brought about once and for all...

“Faith reminds us that there is no need to be afraid of the death of the body because, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord’s. And with St Paul, we know that even if we are separated from our bodies we are with Christ, whose Risen Body, which we receive in the Eucharist, is our eternal and indestructible dwelling place” (Benedict XVI, Angelus November 5, 2006).

THE MONK OF BAVARIA: BENEDICT XVI WAS A TRUE SON OF ST BENEDICT³

Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI has been referred to as the “Monk of Bavaria.” Yes, he was from Bavaria – a southern German state – and a proud Bavarian.

Because of the large number of monks, especially Irish monks, who either passed through Bavaria en route to Rome or to the Holy Land, or who settled for good in the area, Bavaria is also referred to as the Benedictine land. Even the name Munich, the capital and largest city of the German state of Bavaria, literally means monks (or, more loosely translated, home of the monks). A monk appears in the city’s official coat of arms – on a golden background, wearing red shoes on his feet and a black tunic with a collar that wraps around his body, carrying a red book in his left hand, while the right rises as a sign of blessing.

Benedict XVI’s love for monasticism and monastics ran deep, since his childhood. Bavaria is the land of Benedictine monasteries of both men and women – monasteries that, with their educational activities, have helped shape Bavarians for centuries. The future pope knew their value personally, as he explained:

The gradual expansion of the Benedictine Order that he (St Benedict) founded had an enormous influence on the spread of Christianity across the Continent. St Benedict is therefore deeply venerated, also in Germany and particularly in Bavaria, my birthplace.

Besides this close “genetic” connection to his native Bavaria, land of monks and monasticism, Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI was referred to as the Monk of Bavaria or the Monk-Pope for several other reasons.

When he was still head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, on the eve of his election to the see of St Peter, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger made a special visit to the convent of St

³ This article originally appeared at the National Catholic Register

Scholastica (twin sister of St Benedict) in Subiaco, Italy, cradle of Benedictine monasticism, and delivered a lecture that turned out to be prophetic of his future papacy. He was following in the footsteps of St Benedict, whose mission and vision shaped his papacy and his life to the end. It was April 1, 2005, when he left Rome in the late afternoon, the evening before the death of John Paul II:

“We need men whose intellects are enlightened by the light of God, and whose hearts God opens, so that their intellects can speak to the intellects of others, and so that their hearts are able to open up to the hearts of others. Only through men who have been touched by God, can God come near to men. We need men like Benedict of Norcia, who at a time of dissipation and decadence, plunged into the most profound solitude, succeeding, after all the purifications he had to suffer, to ascend again to the light, to return and to found Montecassino, the city on the mountain that, with so many ruins, gathered together the forces from which a new world was formed.

“In this way Benedict, like Abraham, became the father of many nations. The recommendations to his monks presented at the end of his ‘Rule’ are guidelines that show us also the way that leads on high, beyond the crisis and the ruins.”

In his first general audience on April 27, 2005, Pope Benedict explained his reasons for choosing St Benedict as patron of his pontificate.

The name Benedict, of course, brings to mind his predecessor Benedict XV, known as the Pope of Missions and the Pope of Peace, who guided the Church through World War I and continued the Church’s commitment to peacebuilding. But the Pope also chose the name to honour St Benedict of Norcia himself.

The merit of St Benedict was to indicate to his followers the search for God as a fundamental purpose of existence – the search for God (*quaerere Deum*) leads us to proceed on the path mapped out by the humble and obedient Christ in order to let ourselves be

found by him. Those who enter the monastery enter a profound union with Christ as prescribed in Rule Chapter 4, 21:

“The love of Christ must come before all else.”

This is the significance of Christian holiness, and St Benedict and his Rule are the anchor of this path.

Moreover, St Benedict of Norcia, with his life and his work, had a fundamental influence on the development of European civilization and culture. But there is additional value in the name choice.

“(St Benedict) is a fundamental reference point for European unity and a powerful reminder of the indispensable Christian roots of his culture and civilization.”

Benedict XVI was keen on the Christian roots of Europe and saw monasticism as a uniting juncture between Eastern and Western Europe. For Pope Benedict, East and West co-exist in the tradition of Christian monasticism. Monasticism, as the new bloodless martyrdom, which substituted for the real martyrdom after Constantine’s Edict of Milan (A.D. 313), had its beginning in the Christian East, and in a later period, it spread in the West.

In his book *Values in a Time of Upheaval*, Cardinal Ratzinger reflected on what stood at the roots of a united Europe. At the top of the list, he put the common inheritance of the Sacred Scriptures and the tradition of the early Church, the same understanding of the empire and ecclesiology, and Christian monasticism – an enormous force lying outside and above politics.

According to Ratzinger, monasticism had provided again and again the impetus for a necessary rebirth of society and the Church. But, for Ratzinger, unity is also about continuity and a common collective memory, and a shared spirituality. Continuity has to do with a continuous memory of classical culture, and an awareness of common Christian faith in its Eastern and Western expressions, which translated into two traditions (East and West) of the same Church.

This was a conception of Europe as a distinct society, consisting of diversity in unity – diversity of peoples and cultures that were bound together by a network of mutual rights and obligations, and founded on a common spiritual citizenship and a common moral and intellectual culture. He conceived of Europe not as just geographical reality, but as a cultural, spiritual reality – a meeting place of the God of Israel and classical Greek thought.

Moreover, Ratzinger understood the European Union not only as a representation of economic unity but also as a manifestation of cultural and spiritual unity, founded on the Christian roots to which monasticism was one of the main contributors. This is what he said about European unity:

“Of course, in order to create new and lasting unity, political, economic and juridical instruments are important, but it is also necessary to awaken an ethical and spiritual renewal which draws on the Christian roots of the Continent, otherwise a new Europe cannot be built.”

Pope Benedict XVI’s concept of history is the history of a civilization that is solidly build on the dialogue between faith and reason. Thus, distancing the society from its Christian roots, identity and values is the reason for crisis. According to Ratzinger, Europe needs to recognize Christianity as the source of unity and identity:

“... Europe which at one time, we can say, was the Christian continent, but which was also the starting point of that new scientific rationality which has given us great possibilities, as well as great threats. Christianity, it is true, did not start in Europe, and therefore it cannot even be classified as a European religion, the religion of the European cultural realm. But it received precisely in Europe its most effective cultural and intellectual imprint and remains, therefore, identified in a special way with Europe.

“Furthermore, it is also true that this Europe, since the time of the Renaissance, and in a fuller sense since the time of the Enlightenment, has developed precisely that scientific

rationality which not only in the era of the discoveries led to the geographic unity of the world, to the meeting of continents and cultures, but which today, much more profoundly, thanks to the technical culture made possible by science, imprints itself on the whole world, and even more than that, in a certain sense, gives it uniformity” (April 1, 2005).

European civilization was built thanks to the work of the Benedictine monks and their schools of God’s service. Monasticism and monks welcomed the image of the creator God and his intervention in history. The founding of Europe as we know it would have been unthinkable without monasticism. What is at the foundations of Europe, according to Benedict XVI? What is his European legacy?

“Quaerere Deum – to seek God and to let oneself be found by him, that is today no less necessary than in former times. A purely positivistic culture which tried to drive the question concerning God into the subjective realm, as being unscientific, would be the capitulation of reason, the renunciation of its highest possibilities, and hence a disaster for humanity, with very grave consequences. What gave Europe’s culture its foundation – the search for God and the readiness to listen to him – remains today the basis of any genuine culture.” (Paris, 2008)

Monasticism, monastic values and prayers accompanied Pope Benedict XVI on every step in his life and his pontificate. When he resigned, he retired to his Benedictine core – a life of silence and prayer in Mater Ecclesiae monastery in the Vatican.

When he resigned, he asked the contemplative monasteries and convents throughout the world for special prayers for the conclave:

“His Holiness Benedict XVI has asked all the faithful to accompany him with their prayers as he commends the Petrine ministry into the Lord’s hands, and to await with trust the arrival of the new Pope. In a particularly urgent way this appeal

is addressed to those chosen members of the Church who are contemplatives. The Holy Father is certain that you, in your monasteries and convents throughout the world, will provide the precious resource of that prayerful faith which down the centuries has accompanied and sustained the Church along her pilgrim path. The coming conclave will thus depend in a special way on the transparent purity of your prayer and worship.”

This was in a nutshell the “monk” in Pope Benedict XVI and his monastic theology and vision, which directed him throughout his entire life in search for and love of God, as his final words specify: “Jesus, ich liebe dich” (“Jesus, I love you”). In these last words, Pope Benedict XVI revealed that his life and work had led him to union with Christ. He had, through years of *ora et labora*, come to exemplify the Benedictine principle: “The love of Christ must come before all else.”

This is the foundation of European culture; it is the foundation of civilization; it is the foundation of human existence.

Dr Ines Angeli Murzaku

Dr Ines Angeli Murzaku is Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Director of the Catholic Studies Program, and the Founding Chair of the Department of Catholic Studies at Seton Hall University in New Jersey.

NOTES ON THE COAT OF ARMS OF THE LATE EMERITUS POPE BENEDICT XVI

Pope Benedict XVI's personal papal coat of arms were designed by Cardinal, then archbishop, Andrea Cordero Lanza di Montezemolo in 2005. Although the composition is new, the arms essentially retain most of the elements which made up the late Pope's arms as archbishop of Munich and Freising. They represent both continuity and innovation, characteristic of the man himself, who was grounded in the Tradition, as well as an original theologian able *to bring out things both new and old*.

The official heraldic description is called a *blazon*, by convention written in a rather archaic style of English, using a great many terms mostly deriving from Norman-French, and precisely delineates the overall arrangement of the arms and manner in which they are to be correctly depicted or *tricked*.

The blazon for the Pope's arms reads: A field gules, chief [or chape] ployé Or, with scallop shell Or; the dexter chief charged with a moor's head proper, crown with collar Gules; sinister chief charged with a bear passant [or trippant] Proper, carrying a pack Gules belted sable.

This in ordinary English translates as: A red shield 'mantled' in gold and with a gold scallop shell; the right (for the bearer of the shield, but the left for the viewer) part of the mantle has the head of a moor in his natural colour (brown) wearing a red crown and red collar; the left part of the mantle has a walking bear in its natural colour (brown) carrying a red pack tied with black bands. All of these various elements have meaning.

The mantle: Within the shield this is a religious symbol, and indicates the ideals inspired by monastic spirituality and is also an oblique reference to our order. Various other orders and congregations, such as the Carmelites and the early Dominicans, have used this form of *chief* or *chape*.

The charges of the arms and insignia: *charges* are the symbolic and decorative objects placed on the field and divisions of the shield, in this case: a scallop shell; a Moor's head; St

Corbinian's bear. All these *charges* featured on the Pope's previous coat of arms, when he was Archbishop of Munich and Freising. The insignia are elements specific to the papal office and dignity, that is: the mitre or tiara; keys and *pallium*.

The scallop shell has multiple meanings:

(a) St Augustine, walking along the seashore as he was meditating on the mystery of the Holy Trinity, saw a boy using a shell to pour sea water into a hole in the sand. When Augustine asked him what he was doing, he replied, "I am emptying the sea into this hole." Augustine saw in this incident a metaphor for the inexhaustible and infinite depths of the mystery of God. In 1953, the then Fr Joseph Ratzinger wrote a doctoral dissertation on "The People of God and the House of God in Augustine's Teaching" and so we read into the symbol of the shell a very personal connection with the thought of St Augustine.

(b) The shell also alludes to the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. At papal celebrations of the sacrament, and elsewhere in the Church, a seashell is often used to pour water over the head of the one being baptized.

(c) The scallop shell is a badge of the pilgrim and of pilgrimage, especially associated with the apostle St James the Great and his sanctuary at Santiago de Compostela. It thus also alludes to the sojourning of "the pilgrim people of God". The scallop is also found in the insignia of the Schottenkloster in Regensburg, where the major seminary of that diocese is located, a place where Benedict taught. It should be noted that both Compostella and Schotten were formerly Benedictine foundations.

(d) The pilgrimage symbolism of the shell may also refer the shift in the role of the pope from that of a more temporal role of governance to one of being a fellow pilgrim going out to, and also spiritually accompanying, peoples and nations.

The Moor's head: Is associated with Wörth in Upper Bavaria. The origin of the Moor's head in Freising is uncertain. It typically faces to the onlookers left in profile and is depicted as "proper", that is, of natural appearance with red lips, together with a crown

and collar. This is also the ancient emblem of the diocese of Freising, which was founded in the 8th century and eventually became a metropolitan archdiocese with the name of München and Freising. The Moor's head is a frequently occurring motif in European heraldry. The crown, or sometimes a white headband, both indicate a freed slave. The Moor's head is common in the Bavarian tradition and is known as either the *caput Ethiopicum* or the Moor of Freising.

St Corbinian's bear: St Corbinian, by ancient tradition, was the first Bishop of Freising, (born c. 680 in Châtres, France; died 8 September 730). While on a journey on horseback to Rome, riding through a forest, he was attacked by a bear which killed his horse. St Corbinian tamed the beast and also made it carry his baggage for the rest of the journey. Once he arrived at his destination, the saint released the bear from his service, and it then returned to Bavaria. The bear thus symbolises the conversion of a pagan people to the Faith and at the same time to the bishop as God's beast of burden carrying the weight of the pastoral office.

The papal mitre: The Supreme Pontiff's arms have featured a "tiara" from ancient times. To begin with, it was a simple kind of woven cap or *tocque*. In 1130, a crown was added, to symbolise the Church's sovereignty over states. Then in 1301, Boniface VIII added a second crown to show that his spiritual authority was superior to any civil authority at a time when he was in conflict with the King of France, Philip the Fair. Finally, in 1342, Benedict XII added a third crown to indicate in addition the Pope's moral authority over all secular monarchs, and to reaffirm possession of Avignon. Over time the silver tiara with its three gold crowns came to represent the three powers of the pontiff: Sacred Orders, Jurisdiction and Magisterium. Popes generally wore the tiara at solemn official celebrations and especially at their "coronation" at the beginning of their Pontificate. Paul VI was the last pope to use a jewelled tiara. The tiara which was presented to him by the Archdiocese of Milan, he subsequently donated to charity and introduced the use of the *mitre*. However, he left the *tiara* and the crossed keys as the emblem of the Apostolic See. Today, the

ceremony which inaugurates the Petrine Ministry, the beginning of a pontificate, is no longer referred to as a “coronation” to differentiate it clearly from the crowning of a secular monarch. In fact, the Pope has full jurisdiction the moment he accepts his election by the college of cardinals in the Conclave. Though the tiara has been replaced, its symbolism is alluded to by the silver mitre bearing three bands of gold. The bands are joined by a central vertical bar, to show that the *three powers* are united in the same person.

The *pallium*: This is a new addition to the arms of a pope and not normally included. However, the *pallium* belongs to the ancient liturgical insignia of the Supreme Pontiff. It symbolises the Pope's responsibility as pastor of the flock of Christ. In the first few centuries it was an actual lambskin draped over the shoulders. This was later replaced by a stole of pure white wool, normally decorated with several black crosses, but occasionally with red. By the fourth century the *pallium* had become a characteristic liturgical symbol of the Pope. The Pope's conferral of the *pallium* upon Metropolitan Archbishops began in the sixth century. The *pallium* is seen in iconography of popes from the fifth and fourteenth centuries. The conferring of the *pallium* is a visible sign of the “collegiality and subsidiarity” of the episcopacy. Pope Benedict adopted the more ancient form of a long stole at the beginning his pontificate, but later reverted to a design closer to the more developed and familiar later type, which is the one incorporated into his arms.

The crossed keys of Saint Peter: These together with a cord and tassels have been retained. The keys, one silver and one gold, represent the power to “loose and bind on earth and in heaven” (cf. Mt 16:19). However, the tiara and keys together still remain the official symbol of the papacy and appear on the coat of arms of the Holy See and state flag of the Vatican City.

The motto: For artistic reasons the Pope's episcopal motto *Cooperatores Veritatis* (cf. 3 Jn 1,8) has been included in the rendering of this issue, but strictly speaking, he does not use one.

DCB