



# **Latin Allocution and the Applications and Usage of Latin as a Modern Language by the Vatican City State**

**A thesis submitted to the Miami University  
Honors Program in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for University Honors**

**by**

**Michael Thomas Connaughton**

**August, 2003  
Oxford, Ohio**

## ABSTRACT

### LATIN ALLOCUTION AND THE APPLICATIONS AND USAGE OF LATIN AS A MODERN LANGUAGE BY THE VATICAN CITY STATE

by Michael Thomas Connaughton

The adjoined thesis is an analysis of a field research project of the same name conducted by the author in Rome, Italy, during the summer months of 2002. The subject of research concerns the modern use of the Latin language by the Vatican City State, or Holy See. As recent as the early 1960's, the ability to read, write, and speak Latin extemporaneously was a prerequisite for entry into the society observed in this study, as demonstrated by the proceedings of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council (1962-1965). The objectives of this thesis are to determine the following: In what ways is Latin still employed by the Holy See? What changes have occurred in Vatican Latin usage, and how is this expressed at the societal level? Does the Vatican's current employment of Latin constitute that of a modern language? Field research for this thesis was conducted by the participation of the researcher in Latin fluency seminars offered by one of the Vatican's senior Latin experts and by gathering personal statements, questionnaire responses, and interviews with various members of Vatican society.



**Latin Allocution and the Applications and Usage of Latin as a Modern Language by  
the Vatican City State**

**by Michael Thomas Connaughton**

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_, Advisor  
Prof. Denise E. M<sup>c</sup>Coskey

\_\_\_\_\_, Reader  
Prof. Judith de Luce

\_\_\_\_\_, Reader  
Dr. Steven L. Tuck

Accepted by:

\_\_\_\_\_, Director,  
University Honors Program



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I offer earnest thanks to Prof. Denise E. M<sup>c</sup>Coskey, Associate Professor of Classics, who was my faculty advisor in all stages of the grant applications, field research, and thesis. I thank my thesis readers: Prof. Judith de Luce, Chair of the Miami University Department of Classics, and Dr. Steven L. Tuck, Assistant Professor of Classics.

I offer special thanks to my teacher, the Rev. Fr. Reginaldus Foster OCD, Vatican Secretariat of State (Latin Letters Office) and Professor of Latin at the Pontifical Gregorian University, without whose learning and insight this study of the Vatican could never have been carried out. For their participation in the study, I also thank Fr. Joseph Murphy of the Vatican Secretariat of State, Msgr. Arthur Calkins and Msgr. Camille Perl of the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, and Fr. Nikolaus Schöch of the Roman Rota.

This project was funded by an “Undergraduate Summer Scholars Award” provided by Miami University as well as the “Henry Montgomery Travel Award” provided by the Miami University Department of Classics.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	<i>page</i> iii
Approval Page	v
Acknowledgements	vii
<b>Preface</b>	<b>ix</b>
<i>Historical Context</i>	ix
<i>Motivations</i>	xxii
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Methods, Approach, and Limitations</i>	2
Participant Observation	3
Key Informant Interviewing	5
Interview Protocol	8
Limitations	10
<i>Definition of Modern Language</i>	12
<b>Analysis</b>	<b>16</b>
<i>Fr. Joseph Murphy: Scripted Allocution</i>	17
<i>Monsignor Arthur Calkins: The Sacred Language</i>	19
<i>Monsignor Camille Perl: Hierarchical Context</i>	24
<i>Fr. Nikolaus Schöch: Unique Modernity</i>	31
<i>Fr. Reginald Foster: Cultural Change and Crisis</i>	36
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Appendix I: <i>Field Documents</i></b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendix II: <i>Calendar of Correspondences</i></b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Appendix III: <i>Archive of Correspondences</i></b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Appendix IV: <i>Responses to Questionnaire</i></b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Appendix V: <i>Interview Transcriptions</i></b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Index of Appendices</b>	<b>134</b>



## PREFACE

My proposal to study (through observation) how a modern society uses Latin as a modern language required considerable explanation. “After all, is not Latin the defunct tongue of a distant past? Certainly,” many thought, “no such place exists or has existed for some time.” To the contrary, such a society does still exist within what is today called the Vatican City State, and their utilization of the Latin language is not a modern anachronism. The Vatican has employed Latin as its *modus communicationis* since the language was still widely spoken throughout Europe, as shall be explained below.

### *Historical Context*

When speaking historically of the Vatican, it is more accurate to employ the term ‘Holy See,’ which signifies the headquarters of the Catholic Church, the diocese of Rome (the diocese of St. Peter the Apostle). The modern ‘Vatican City State,’ or ‘*Città del Vaticano*,’ is a strictly geopolitical designation created by the Lateran Treaties of 1929. These three treaties officially recognized the forfeiture of the Papal States, which comprised much of the central Italian peninsula for more than a millenium, and codified Italy’s relationship with the Catholic Church. Whether one is speaking of the present Vatican situation, the Papal States, or an even more ancient scenario that predates the collapse of the Roman Empire, the term ‘Holy See’ will always apply to the central locale of the society in question. Later, when discussing the current situation, the terms ‘Vatican’ and ‘Vatican City State’ will be used interchangeably with each other and the ‘Holy See.’ The technical differences remain, i.e., the ‘Vatican’ is simply a hill in Rome upon which the ‘Vatican City State’ is located, and the ‘Vatican City State’ is actually

only a small portion of the ‘Holy See’. This is acceptable for the purposes of the thesis, however, because all three terms are in common use to describe in the present day this study’s subject of observation, the clerical society surrounding the Papacy and Roman Curia.

In order to understand the study at hand in its proper context, it is necessary to summarize the history of Latin and the Holy See. The earliest Church community in Rome was comprised mostly of Greek-speaking Jews. For the first couple centuries of Christianity, the primary language of worship in the Roman Church seems to have been Greek, the language of what is now called the *New Testament*. As Christianity opened to the Gentile population, which it did almost immediately, it also opened to the common tongue of the West: Latin. The sacred texts, accordingly, were translated in piecemeal into a stylized form of colloquial Latin, which was created to preserve the more expansive Greek vocabulary, often simply Latinizing Greek terms.<sup>1</sup> This sacred idiom, which resultantly includes many words of Greek origin (e.g., *baptizo*, *presbyter*, *exorcizo*, etc.), was distinct from the ‘proper’ Latin of the time but grew in use along with the Latin-speaking Christian communities. The special definitions imposed upon some Latin words were so strained, however, that it was not uncommon, even for ancient scholars, to consider these earliest, unauthorized translations of Scripture to be mistranslations. Nevertheless, many of these linguistic conventions were consciously retained for purposes of familiarity, when St Jerome composed his *Vulgate* (Latin) edition of the four Gospels (c. AD 384).

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Mohrmann, Christine. *Liturgical Latin: Its Origins and Character*. 1957.

Although Latin was not originally used in sacred worship, it was the common language of western Christians very early in Church history because it was the vernacular language of Western Europe. The Eastern Churches likewise used Greek, the *lingua franca* of the eastern Mediterranean. When both “lungs”<sup>2</sup> of the early Church came together, both languages were employed to some extent (depending upon who was present); although Greek was certainly the theological language since it was the original language of the *Sacred Scriptures*. This bilingual system dates to Apostolic times, and is clearly demonstrated in such documents as *I Clement*, or the *First Letter of Clement to the Corinthians*, which was written by Pope St Clement in Greek (c. AD 96) to the Greek-speaking Church in Corinth. The theological connotation of Greek words diverged, as debate over different doctrinal questions would arise within different Local Churches. This caused communication problems when the Church Universal gathered (e.g., Council of Nicaea, AD 325). Eventually, common knowledge of Greek in the West and Latin in the East died out, isolating the two major halves of the Church from one another.

After the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, Latin became the only language employed by the Holy See, theologically and otherwise. It would remain the vernacular tongue of many Westerners for centuries. For much longer, however, Latin would serve as the international language of travelers, merchants, and academics. A common European language was a practical necessity for the only remaining international institution, the Catholic Church, which required it for the purposes of ecclesiastical

---

<sup>2</sup> The term “lungs” is a modern ecumenical usage used to describe the Latin Church in the West and Greek

governance and evangelization. The Church actively maintained Latin as such amidst an otherwise disunited Europe.

We begin to see inchoate signs of an awareness within the Holy See of the great value of Latin to the Church as early as Pope St Gelasius I (AD 492 – 496). In his epistle, *Necessaria Rerum*, dated March 11, 494 he writes against the ordination of “*illiteratos*,” or people who are unable to read Latin. He argues “*quia nec literis carens sacris esse potest aptus officiis*,”<sup>3</sup> or “for a man cut-off from the sacred texts cannot be fit for official duties.”<sup>4</sup> A growing bulk of sacred texts, whether Scriptural or theological, was proliferating in the Latin Church. The clergy needed to be educated in them; those who did not possess the intellectual aptitude for this education, not only could not function properly in their ceremonial duties, but, as St Gelasius continues, were not the best priestly specimens to offer to God (N.B., both the priest and sacrifice must be of the finest quality). Priests who could not access the “sacred texts” due to illiteracy were of little value. While this statement does not explicitly emphasize Latin proficiency, as it does intelligence<sup>5</sup>, such proficiency is implied by the literacy requirement. More importantly, the quote demonstrates an acknowledgement of the Church’s reliance on its massive literary infrastructure, upon which it had grown to rely for all ecclesiastical tasks. This infrastructure, however, was functional only because it was universally

---

Churches in the East as equally vital Catholic traditions.

<sup>3</sup> N.B. All Latin quotes provided in this Preface have been copied from the *Enchiridion Clericorum*. Sacred Congregation for Catholic Teaching. 1976.

<sup>4</sup> N.B. All translations of Latin quotes in this Preface have been provided by the author, M. T. Connaughton.

<sup>5</sup> It is unclear that Gelasius would have drawn a distinction between the ignorance and intelligence. For Gelasius may be assuming that an education was provided to candidates but unsuccessfully because the candidate lacked the ability to learn to read. In this instance, Gelasius is setting a standard for intelligence.

accessible to clerics. Hence, assuring its continued accessibility becomes of the highest priority. Since Latin is still the common language at the time of St Gelasius, ignorance of Latin was too uncommon among Christians to be considered a serious threat to the accessibility of that literature. Illiteracy, on the other hand, posed a very real threat. As Latin dies out as a vernacular language, ignorance of Latin itself would eventually become problematic and require countermeasures.

By the time of Pope Blessed (Bl.) Urban V (1362-1370), the stakes are much higher than they were even during the time of St Gelasius. For the theological, administrative, literary infrastructure upon which the Church had so keenly relied in the fifth century had continued to be cultivated and expanded for another nine centuries, as had the Church's intimate reliance upon it. If it were possible for Gelasius to discard it and face the problems brought by the resulting disunity and nonconformity through some other means, it was not possible for Urban. This infrastructure was not only the "daily planner" and "rule book" of the Latin Church, it was the "memoirs." The very definition of Christianity lay within this library of understanding, which was composed by Councils, theologians, and saints. It was the storehouse of Divine Revelation and Apostolic Tradition and it was all in Latin. Thus, in 1386, Pope Bl. Urban V writes, "*Ne ignorans grammaticam praesentetur aut ad Ordines dignetur promoveri...ne ad sacros promoveantur Ordines, nisi personae quae grammaticam sciant, seu Latinis verbis loqui valeant competenter.*" This translates as, "Let he, who does not know grammar, not be presented or allowed to be promoted to Orders... neither may men be advanced to Holy

---

This would be consistent with the rest of the prohibitions set forth in his document, which deal with

Orders unless they are persons who know grammar, or are able to speak competently with Latin words.” He further writes, “*Potestatem autem dispensandi super iis ex causa, et quatenus a jure permittitur, per hoc non intendimus episcopis interdictam,*” or “Through this, however, We do not intend for bishops a restricted power of dispensing beyond these things for good reason, insofar as it is permitted by law.”

Pope Sixtus IV reiterates this mandate in 1473, “*nullum ad sacros ordines de cetero promovendum, nisi sciat Latinaliter loqui,*” or, “for the future none should be promoted to Holy Orders, unless he knows how to speak Latin.” In contrast to Urban, Pope Sixtus IV specifies a penalty of excommunication (“*sub excommunicationis poena*”) for violating this norm “*nisi ex causa rationabili et multum necessaria*” except for when the violation occurs for a just and reasonable cause. Pope Urban had guarded, in his canon, the authority of individual bishops to allow for legitimate exceptions to the Latin requirement. Implicit by his clause, “*et quatenus a jure permittitur,*” however, Urban made clear that some (if not most) exemptions are indeed illegitimate, but provides no penalty for defying the canon. The existence of Sixtus’ statement indicates that the effectiveness of Urban’s legislation had waned over the past century, if it was ever observed in the first place, and needed reaffirmation. The articulation by Sixtus of a penalty for noncompliance with his norm may simply have been a difference in leadership style between him and Urban, or it may have been a measure truly necessary for the implementation of the mandate in his time. Either way, times were changing for education. Catholic educational innovations, such as the ‘university,’ were facilitating

---

physical handicaps.

broader cultural and economic shifts in Europe. The great Latin revival supported by ecclesiastical endorsement and brought to fruition in the Renaissance was the superabundant realization of papal wishes.

After this point, the deep anxiety over the need for the Church to preserve knowledge of Latin fades. A lasting ‘rebirth of learning’ had taken hold, which provided the clergy and even some laity with access to education that had been unprecedented for a millennium; integral to this education was the Latin language. Furthermore, the Church was now busy with other issues, namely, a religious movement that would come to be called the Protestant Reformation, which did not hinder access to the body of Christian thought the Church had been cultivating for fifteen hundred years, but would denounce varying aspects within it. Fundamental among these objections was to deny the legitimacy of papal authority. Since, at the time, all Christians still referred to themselves as ‘Catholic,’ the term ‘Roman Catholic’ was pejoratively<sup>6</sup> coined to describe Christians who remained loyal to the Holy See. Likewise, distinguishing terms such as ‘Lutheran,’ ‘Calvinist,’ and ‘Protestant’ would also be created and applied, originally as insults, since all were claiming to be the true embodiment of the Catholic Church.<sup>7</sup>

The Church’s response to dissidence was uniformity. For the first time, the liturgy (i.e., ritual of worship) was codified and standardized into what is now called the ‘Tridentine’ liturgy (named for the Council of Trent). The only other rites that were permitted to continue were those that had been in existence for over two hundred years. As a measure against heretical scriptural translations and insertions, the Tridentine rite is

---

<sup>6</sup> cf. Catholic Encyclopedia article “Roman Catholic.”

nearly exclusively in Latin, the Protestant desire for worship in the vernacular having been explicitly rejected. The only regular exceptions to the all-Latin rule are the words *amen* and *alleluia*, which are of Semitic origin, and the ancient Greek prayer called the *Kyrie Eleison*. Some special feasts bring additional exceptions, but these always appear in either Greek or Hebrew.<sup>8</sup> Nor was this trilingual usage accidental. Latin, Greek, and Hebrew had come to be known as the three sacred languages.

Hebrew and Greek were sacred because they were the original languages of the canon of sacred writings called the *Biblia Sacra*, or *Holy Bible*. The Church had sanctified Latin by its consistent employment, especially as a theological language and the language of worship. Furthermore, it is written in John 19:20 and Luke 23:38 that the sign affixed to the Cross at the Crucifixion of Jesus carried the message, “Jesus of Nazareth King of the Jews,” or, by the Lucan account, “This is the King of the Jews,” in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. Hence, the retention of Latin in the liturgy was not only a practical measure against disunity, but considered integral to the practice of divine worship, which ought to be conducted using a sacred language.

The numerous products of the Reformation, however, mostly fall outside the scope of this thesis and will not be broached in the ‘historical context.’ For our purposes it is enough to note that the Church recognized the widespread doctrinal departures and innovations (i.e. ‘heresies’) of those reformers who would come to be called ‘Protestants’

---

<sup>7</sup> Since this term is still viewed as pejorative among many Catholics, I will avoid using the term ‘Roman Catholic’ in my thesis.

<sup>8</sup> N.B. The priests would give their homilies in the common language, but homilies were not considered part of the liturgy.



as being signs of ignorance (and sometimes demonic inspiration). This led to another Catholic educational reform: the seminary.

Whereas clerics had previously been educated in cathedral schools, universities or even by apprenticeship, they would now be educated in institutions exclusively concerned with priestly formation. The university system was created by the Church to preserve learning during the Middle Ages, and required a scholar to have attained a certain level of Holy Orders before he would be conferred a certain degree (e.g., Doctorates often required priestly Ordination). The seminary system operated in the reverse; seminarians would need to complete their education at the seminary as a prerequisite to Ordination. The development of seminaries meant that the practical burden of ensuring that clergy were sufficiently educated no longer rested solely upon bishops. There was now an easily regulated process, during which defective candidates could be eliminated. The bishop remained ultimately responsible for the education of his priests, but could now monitor a process, as opposed to assessing individuals, each with his own unique circumstances. This allowed the Latin fluency requirement to be taken (once again) for granted. Like the university, all subjects at the seminary were studied in Latin. Hence, it was impossible for a candidate to complete his formation without a fluent knowledge of the language.

We, thus, see a shift in the way Latin education is maintained by the Holy See as general educational standards rose. Pope Clement XIII writes in his Apostolic Constitution *Cum Scriptura* (August 18, 1760) about the importance of Latin, but also promotes the teaching of Greek and Hebrew at seminaries as a means to understand

*Sacred Scriptures* more thoroughly. He quotes St Augustine of Hippo, “*Magnum remedium est linguarum cognitio: Latinae quidem linguae homines quos instruendos suscipimus, duabus aliis ad Scripturarum Divinarum cognitionem opus habent, Hebraea scilicet, et Graeca, ut ad exemplaria praecedentia recurratur.*” This translates as, “A knowledge of languages is a great remedy: indeed men of the Latin tongue, whom we receive to instruct, need two other [languages] for knowledge of Sacred Scriptures, namely Hebrew, and Greek, in order that it may have recourse to authoritative manuscripts.” The method of regulating standards of education among the clergy now took the form of Vatican treatises on seminary curriculum. Latin would be mentioned with an assumed preeminence, as it was in the above quote when Clement refers to seminarians of his own time as “*Latinae linguae homines,*” or “men of the Latin tongue.” One need not make special rules concerning Latin; it was the starting point of the entire education.

This unconcerned attitude towards Latin begins to change near the turn of the twentieth century, no doubt in response to secular trends that had moved away from Latin-immersed education. Pope St Leo XIII writes an instruction in a letter to French bishops on September 8, 1899, written (unusually) in French, entitled *Depuis le jour*, in which he includes a paragraph emphasizing the importance of Latin. He quickly follows this letter with another, written in Latin, to the Bishop of Namur on May 20, 1901, entitled *Ea disciplinae ratio*. This second letter also included a case for Latin proficiency. It was Leo’s successor, Pope St Pius X, however, who directed a letter to all bishops, entitled *Vehementer sane*, on July 1, 1908. Pope Pius writes as follows:

*In primis, quod maximi momenti et ponderis est, notari atque animadverti volumus, linguam latinam iure meritoque dici et esse linguam Ecclesiae propriam. Et profecto hac lingua, si quando necessitas exigat, Sacerdotes disiunctarum diversarumque civitatum colloqui et scribere inter se solent ad sensa mentis pandenda, quae aliter inter se pandere non possent. Hac lingua, in quam sacri libri veteris novique Testamenti versi sunt, Clerus canonicas recitat preces, Sacrum facit omnesque sacros ritus et caeremonias, quas Liturgia praescribit, exequitur. Quin etiam hac lingua Summus Pontifex et sacra Consilia Ecclesiae negotiis curandis in litteris actisque omnibus edendis utuntur. Accedit quod quos doctissimos libros sancti Patres Ecclesiaeque Doctores latini scripsere, eos et huic linguae commendarunt... Quapropter, quum ex his quae diximus satis appareat summa sacrorum alumnis huius linguae cognitione opus esse...*

This translates into English as:

Firstly, we wish a matter of the greatest importance and weight to be noted and attended to, that the Latin language justly and rightly is said to be and is the proper language of the Church. Truly, whenever necessity demands, priests of separate and opposing nationalities usually speak and write with each other in this language for exposing the thoughts of the mind, which they would otherwise be unable to share. In this language, into which the sacred books of the old and new Testaments were translated, the Holy Clergy recites the canonical prayers, does all sacred rites and performs all ceremonies, which are prescribed by the Liturgy. Yea indeed the Supreme Pontiff and holy Councils of the Church use this tongue for attending to business in writing and performing all actions. There is the additional fact that the Fathers and Doctors of the Church wrote in Latin those most learned books, which to this tongue they committed... Wherefore, because of what we have said it is exceedingly clear that students need a complete knowledge of this language...

The French had historically kept a national pronunciation of Latin distinct from other nations.<sup>9</sup> Since Latin was spoken as a means of communication, uniform pronunciation of Latin was also important. The debate over which of the many pronunciations to use had been continuing since the end of the Middle Ages. Pope St. Pius X writes on this matter in a letter to French Archbishop L. E. Dubois on July 10,

1912 entitled *Votre lettre*. In his letter, he endorses the Roman method of pronunciation and exhorts the French clergy to adopt it for the sake of unity and because “it is the pronunciation that influenced the formation of the rhythms and melodies of Gregorian chant.”<sup>10</sup>

In the twentieth century, four additional popes would produce literature on the importance of the Latin language to the Catholic Church. In his *Ex Motu Proprio* given on October 20, 1924, entitled *Latinarum litterarum*, Pope Pius XI reiterates (and quotes) the opinions and arguments of his predecessors Leo XIII and Pius X. His successor, Pope Pius XII, writes extensively on the necessity of Latin fluency (in speaking as well as writing) in the seminary in his letter *Latinam excolere*, given on October 27, 1957. This would soon be followed by the 1961 Apostolic Constitution of Pope Bl. John XXIII, entitled *Veterum Sapientia*. Pope John writes as follows.

*Suae enim sponte naturae lingua Latina ad provehendum apud populos quoslibet omnem humanitatis cultum est peraccommodata: cum invidiam non commoveat, singulis gentibus se aequabilem praestet, nullius partibus faveat, omnibus postremo sit grata et amica... Etenim Ecclesia, ut quae et nationes omnes complexu suo contineat, et usque ad consummationem saeculorum sit permansura..., sermonem suapte natura requirit universalem, immutabilem, non vulgarem... Cum enim nostris temporibus sermonis Romani usus multis locis in controversiam coeptus sit vocari, atque adeo plurimi quid Apostolica Sedes hac de re sentiat exquirant, in animum propterea induximus, opportunis normis gravi hoc documento editis, cavere ut vetus et numquam intermissa linguae Latinae retineatur consuetudo, et, sicubi prope exoleverit, plane redintegretur.*

---

<sup>9</sup> For extensive discussion on the history of Latin pronunciation, including the French custom, see W. Sidney Allen’s *Vox Latina*.

<sup>10</sup> N.B. Gregorian Chant was the only form of music permitted to be used in Catholic sacred worship at the time.

This translates into English as:

Of its own nature the Latin language is most convenient for promoting every standard of culture among all peoples: since it excites no jealousy, offers itself to each race equally, favors the faction of no one, and is helpful and welcoming to everyone... And indeed the Church, because it contains all nations within its embrace, and shall persist unto the end of the world, requires by its very nature a language that is universal, immutable, and non-vernacular... Since in our time the use of the language of the [ancient] Romans has begun to be called into controversy in many places, and since many are inquiring as to what the Holy See thinks concerning this matter, we have therefore resolved to provide the timely directives disclosed in this weighty document so that the ancient custom of using the Latin tongue might be retained without interruption and, wheresoever it has become nearly obsolete, let it be completely revived.

It is clear that “*periculis denuntiatis ex eius negligentia manantibus*,” or “having forewarned of the dangers arising from the neglect [of Latin]” *Veterum Sapientia* was an effort by the Pope to avert a crisis already beginning to be felt (i.e., the worldwide decline of Latin fluency). Pope Bl. John XXIII took this matter so seriously that he was not content to issue a mere Epistle voicing his wishes, but an Apostolic Constitution, which is the most forceful and binding type of document that a pope can issue. He rightfully needed to exercise such authority, for the “timely directives” of which Pope John speaks are instructions for the implementation of changes that run in direct opposition to contemporary educational trends. *Veterum Sapientia*, or “The Wisdom of the Ancients,” mandated a return to Latin-centered, humanities-based education in seminaries and Catholic schools around the world.

Despite the weightiness of John XXIII’s constitution, it was never implemented. One need only go to the local seminary or Catholic school today to observe this fact. It was eclipsed by the momentous ecclesiastical event known as the Second Vatican

Ecumenical Council (Vatican II), and nearly forgotten with the death of Pope Bl. John XXIII in 1963. The Apostolic Constitution was never overturned or repealed, however, and technically remains in effect to this day. Pope Paul VI would issue reaffirmations of his predecessor's document following the Council, and would even organize and maintain the Pontifical Institute *Latinitas*, devoted to the promotion of Latin education. Paul VI, however, did not seem to have the same enthusiasm for Latin as John XXIII, nor has John Paul II. The matter seems to have been all but dropped.

### *Motivations*

As a Catholic and a student of Latin Letters, I find the use of Latin as a 'modern' language by the Holy See to be a topic of extraordinary appeal. Before undertaking this project, I had seen modern Latin documents that were issued by the Vatican in the form of papal encyclicals and decrees. Clients had even hired me at times to translate Vatican trial proceedings from Latin to English. "How vibrant is modern Latin?" I thought, "Is the Vatican still an entirely Latin-speaking society? What does a modern Latin culture look like?"

I had doubts about the sudden halt in papal demands to maintain the ubiquitous use of Latin as the common language of the world's clerics. The fact that many of the clerics I know have no interest in or knowledge of Latin indicated to me that this silence was not because the *pericula* forewarned of by Pope Bl. John XXIII had been averted. Rather, I suspected all had happened just as he had feared. Could this mean that Latin was finally dying after twenty-five hundred years of continuous use? What implications

does this have for a culture centered upon Latin, like that of the Vatican City State, especially since the Vatican City State wholly relies on immigration to maintain its population? Questions such as these along with the possibility that, in our modern world, Latin still functions in a context where it is truly more than letters-on-a-page motivated me to conduct the adjoined study.

# Latin Allocution and the Applications and Usage of Latin as a Modern Language by the Vatican City State

*Field Research Analysis*

## INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on the modern use of languages by the Vatican City State, or Holy See. Specifically, it is an inquiry into the nature of the Vatican's use of the Latin language in both the context of its application and function within Vatican culture, and whether or not Latin remains a modern language to this day. At the outset of this study, the current use of Latin by the Holy See was largely unknown beyond the confines of that community. Heretofore, no published study seems ever to have been conducted on the applications and usage of Latin as a modern language by the Vatican City State, although such a utilization of Latin is a widely known historical fact. My hypothesis was formulated as follows: "Latin is the 'second language'<sup>1</sup> of members of Vatican society; within that society, it is exclusively the language used for official and sacred actions, and is the chosen language employed casually between members who are of different native tongues."

I could not assume that the present function of Latin is in any way the same as it was in the past, nor that it even has any function within contemporary Vatican culture. I, thus, could not limit this study strictly to the Latin language, but needed to be open to the possibility that other languages are also regularly employed, perhaps occupying functions once held by Latin.



Another matter I needed to consider when planning the structure of my study concerns the culture of the Vatican itself. The community I was proposing to study is the clerical society directly surrounding the papacy and the Roman Curia. This community, which comprises the Vatican City State, is very small, not exceeding a thousand people<sup>2</sup>. It has no native citizens and consists almost entirely of celibate men from a multitude of different countries (though mostly European and American). It is also a very closed and private society that is not known for its willingness to discuss internal matters with outsiders. Indubitably, this has contributed to the absence of published research concerning the subject matter of our present inquiry. It was certainly the greatest obstacle needing to be overcome, for without so doing the study could not begin. I was only partially successful in this regard.

#### *Methods, Approach, and Limitations*

The two major processes in ethnographic research (which is one category under which this study falls) are ‘participant observation’ and ‘key informant interviewing.’ Both techniques are forms of qualitative research. The former process requires the researcher to live among the community that is being studied and become familiar with the culture through close, daily contact. It precedes the stage of inquiry called ‘key informant interviewing.’ For a layman wishing to study the clerical society of the Vatican City State, ‘participant observation’ is not an option in the standard sense. Indeed, it is probably not an option for any person not already associated with the society

---

<sup>1</sup> Second language: a non-native language that has an official role in a country...used for purposes of

in question. My attempts to compensate for this inadequacy are described below. The second process, ‘key informant interviewing,’ requires the researcher to conduct direct interviews with members of the community, whom the researcher deems to be representative of the community at large (for the question at hand). For someone like me, who has no connections within the Holy See, obtaining informants too is an uphill effort with highly uncertain prospects.

### *Participant Observation*

Direct observation of public Vatican proceedings was considered, but abandoned as form of ‘participant observation.’ The proceedings, to which I had access, were directed toward people outside the Vatican, and reveal nothing about internal social customs. Hence, they were of little relevance to my study.

Since I could not live and work among the community in question, I needed to learn their customs and etiquette by other means. This was a chief concern for me during the preparatory research stage that began several months before leaving for Rome. It was during this stage that I realized that very little credible research has been conducted on Vatican culture, and none has been conducted on Vatican Latin. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* was able to provide me with an outline of written and some direct etiquette employed by the Roman Curia. This source, however, was written in 1913 and was out-of-date. Proof of this was found when I happened upon a document reforming ecclesiastical titles and dress that had been issued by the Vatican Secretariat of State in 1969, entitled *Ut sive sollicite*. The Vatican did not issue this document and others like

---

communication. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*

it, as a synopsis of Vatican culture meant to be understood by those outside of the cultural context of the Roman Curia. It is simply a list of certain changed customs involving the public display of social status within the Vatican hierarchy. Reading documents of this type, therefore, only allows me to speculate on some elements of Vatican culture.

The only relevant contemporary commentary I found was *When in Rome: A Journal of Life in Vatican City*, written by journalist Robert Hutchinson in 1998. In this text, the author explained the common problems faced by reporters covering Vatican affairs. The most important details it provided were the common cultural blunders made by American journalists during interviews. Hutchinson's book was written to entertain and was mostly based on personal experience and uncorroborated anecdotes. Lacking any thorough anthropological treatise, however, this was the best source available to me on Vatican etiquette before I got to Rome. Once in Rome, I had the assistance of Fr. Reginald Foster.

Three months before I set out to Rome, I received word from Fr. Foster, a leading Latinist at the Vatican Secretariat of State, that I had successfully secured a place in his Latin fluency seminar. This extremely intensive seminar, which I attended throughout the course of my field research, comprised approximately sixty hours of my average workweek. The experience was intended to constitute the 'participant observation' portion of my study, which was otherwise unattainable.

Fr. Foster's Latin classes, intensive as they are, do not constitute living among the Roman Curia. Indeed, nearly all his students were secular scholars gathered from around

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the CIA *World Factbook 2002*, the Vatican population is estimated at 900 as of July 2002.

the world, who have no connection with the Holy See whatsoever. In a study seeking to research more about Vatican culture than just Latin usage, this would in no way come close to ‘participant observation.’ In the case of my study, however, I believe it is sufficient although far less than ideal. For Fr. Foster’s classes exposed me daily to the perspective of the Latin language, which is held by members of traditional Vatican culture (N.B. Fr. Foster had been at the Vatican for over thirty-three years at the time of the study). Through my close contact with Fr. Foster, the society’s foremost expert on Latin language, I was also able to gain a general sense of how Vatican Latin has changed over the last three or four decades, where it is still used in the traditional ways and where it is not. This is indeed the purpose of the ‘participant observation’ process.<sup>3</sup>

#### *Key Informant Interviewing*

I began to search for inroads and points of contact within the Vatican eight months before the scheduled beginning of the field research stage of the study. I contacted the Diocese of Columbus, the local Catholic diocese, which turned out to be unable to assist me, though the Vice Chancellor initially thought he might be able to do so. Under the advice of the Vice Chancellor, I asked a priest of the diocese, who had recently studied in Rome, for acquaintances he had made in the Vatican itself. This priest was willing to assist me and offered me two such names. With his permission, I mentioned the priest’s name when contacting the potential study participants. Only one of the individuals, Fr. Joseph Murphy, responded to my inquiries. He provided no suggestions for others, whom I might contact, nor could he meet with me in person. I,

---

<sup>3</sup> cf. Duranti, Alessandro. *Linguistic Anthropology*. 1997. 104-105

therefore, needed to wait until I got to Rome before I could renew my search for informants.

Once in Rome, I obtained a Vatican City State mailing directory and proceeded to send out letters to people throughout the Roman Curia, hoping that a good cross-section would respond favorably. By my judgement, a good cross-section of the Roman Curia would include the following participants: one member of the Office of Latin Letters, one or more cardinals or high-ranking prelates, one or more canon lawyers, and the remainder without particular qualifications (i.e., standard bureaucrats). Members of the Office of Latin Letters are the Vatican's Latin experts and could offer their specialized perspectives on Latin use, which would presumably differ from the average Vatican citizen. Cardinals or high-ranking prelates occupy high social rank within the Holy See, and could serve as indicators of differing Latin usage among different social classes. Cardinals, who have been at the Vatican for a long time, could also provide a top-down history of any cultural change. Canon lawyers supposedly use Latin more than other clerics of the same rank; learning why this is the case reveals much about the social function of Latin. Since I assumed Cardinals and similar high-ranking prelates to be more selective with their interviews, the composition of my interview-request mailings was intentionally top-heavy (cf. Appendix II). This method for selecting a participant set based on known characteristics of the population in question is referred to as 'stratigraphical modeling.' It is an accepted anthropological research method, and especially employed when dealing with populations to which one has limited access. It was abundantly clear long before I reached Rome that participants would be difficult to come by.

All requested interviewees received a form letter appropriate to their rank with a copy in both Latin and English. Most cardinals were sent a very neatly handwritten letter, which is preferred to typewritten in traditional etiquette. The purpose of the English letter was to ensure that if someone at the Vatican were unable to read Latin, he would not be barred from the study *a priori*; Latin non-use at the Vatican is a relevant issue. I could not assume before undertaking the actual study that all members of the Roman Curia could even read Latin although such a minimal standard of Latin comprehension would have historically gone without question. English was chosen as the alternative language because it is the only language with which I have speaking fluency. Appendix II is the calendar of all correspondences sent after the beginning of June 2002 until the end of the field research in August 2002. Appendix III is the archive of correspondence that occurred beyond the initial stage of contact (N.B. most personal information such as addresses and telephone numbers has been edited out of the documents, which appear in the appendices).

All interviews were necessarily in person, according to European etiquette, at a location and time of convenience for the informant. They were recorded both on micro-cassette (to be transcribed later) and with notes taken by hand. A standard, predetermined set of questions was asked in such a way as to allow the conversation to flow smoothly, so as not to hinder the participant from volunteering additional relevant information. I have included the interview protocol (i.e., the set of questions asked to each interviewee) as Appendix I. k. This protocol was also offered as a questionnaire to be completed by willing informants, who were unable to meet for a direct interview or

who preferred this option. I had hoped to secure at least ten direct interviews. In the end, I acquired only two direct interviews, one independently completed questionnaire, and two relevant statements on Latin usage: five participants in total. The transcriptions of the direct interviews can be read in their entirety in Appendix V. The independently completed questionnaire is listed as Appendix IV a. The statement given by Fr. Joseph Murphy is Appendix III a.; the statement given by Msgr. Camille Perl is Appendix III c.

#### *Interview Protocol*

I began to design the list of questions to ask informants before the start of the field research, but continued to make adjustments through the first portion of the ‘participant observation’ stage. My faculty advisor, Prof. Denise E. M<sup>c</sup>Coskey, oversaw the process to help minimize the presence of theoretical preconceptions about Latin usage at the Vatican and to ensure that the questions were clear and specific.

I designed the questionnaire, which is included as Appendix I. k., for use in direct interviews. As such, the five categorical sets of questions are meant to transition smoothly, both internally and externally, to minimize the disruption created in the interview dialogue. It begins with questions concerning the general background of the informant (e.g., name, age, title, etc.).

A section of questions about the extent and nature of the informant’s language education follows the first. This second section asks what his native tongue is, and to list other languages in which he has proficiency. These questions provide me with context for evaluating future questions that ask the informant to compare Latin to other languages he uses. This section also asks specifics about the extent and type of Latin training the

informant receive before coming to the Vatican. These questions about the nature of each participant's past Latin education can be compared to their ability and willingness to use Latin in the present in order to identify usage trends that stem from education.

The third section is entitled 'General Use of Latin,' and inquires about the different types and frequency of casual Latin use, comfort, and perceived ability. These questions are important in cataloging the range of applications of Latin at the Vatican. One question in this section groups Latin among modern languages. This is because it is specifically asking the informant to name differences between Latin and the modern languages he uses. The fourth section of questions is very similar to the third, except that it asks about the ways in which the informant uses Latin in a professional context.

The final section examines the informant's perceptions of Latin use at the Vatican as a whole, how it functions within Vatican culture, and where the informant perceives himself falling within the spectrum of uses. This section poses analytical questions about behavioral trends at the Vatican to someone who is actually a part of the culture himself. With this information, it becomes possible to identify trends in the perception of the cultural role of Latin among its inhabitants<sup>4</sup>. It also affords the informant an opportunity to volunteer potentially useful cultural or historical information that would not otherwise become known in the study. The entire interview can be comfortably conducted in one hour.

Since my study involves the surveying and observation of human subjects, the Miami University Office of Advanced Scholarship necessarily monitored it for ethical



soundness. All field research for this study was conducted in accordance with United States federal law governing the testing and study of human subjects, and observed all scholarly and scientific ethical standards as set by The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. Their rights concerning the retraction of statements made, the withholding of personal information from publication (including anonymity), and non-answering of questions were made known to all participants. The statement of participants' rights was provided in both Latin and English and is included in Appendix I.

### *Limitations*

There are understandable limitations to this unique study that are worthy of note. Firstly, because it is the first of its kind, no scientific studies are available from previous decades or the present with which one can benchmark cultural trends within the Vatican. Some elements about former language use in the Vatican necessarily (but reliably) were inferred from historical events, policies, and the oral history of Vatican citizens.

Secondly, this study is limited (due to my personal abilities) to those members of the Vatican able and willing either to speak English or write in Latin. It cannot be assumed that all or even most people are able to do this. Nor can one assume that most are willing to use English, even when able (q.v., section on Msgr. Perl). In retrospect, I would have used Italian or French as the alternative language of my communiqués, were I fluent in those languages. I believe that this would have made participation in the study both more accessible and more appealing to everyone within the Roman Curia, and may

---

<sup>4</sup> The term 'inhabitants' is loosely applied; most members of the Roman Curia have apartments beyond the

have resulted in a greater response. English usage seems to retain stronger negative connotations than Italian or French, which are languages historically that Vatican clergy have known, among certain members of the Vatican.

Thirdly, I would have preferred to interview ten people (as stated above) representing a good cross-section of Vatican society. My field research included only five participants; only two were interviewed. I did interview a member of the Office of Latin Letters<sup>5</sup> and a canon lawyer, but no Cardinals or high-ranking prelates accepted my invitation for an interview, which affects the completeness of cross-section that I had hoped to obtain. I did have consistent access to a second canon lawyer, who was a student in Fr. Foster's classes. Unfortunately, she spoke only Latin, Italian, and Korean, which prevented me from approaching her for an English interview. The three remaining participants, who were unable or unwilling to be interviewed directly, were representative of the average Vatican cleric.

The brevity of the period of the field research can partially be blamed for the poor response, as can the study's placement in the summertime. The Roman summer is quite hot, and most Vatican personnel are on vacation during the months in which this study was being conducted (and were, thus, unavailable for interview). The length and dates of the study were unavoidable, however.

In short, this cannot be considered a proper, full-length scientific study; nor was it intended to be that at the outset. The forty-four day period allotted for the field research

---

confines of the Vatican City State (but within the Holy See).

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that, at the behest of Fr. Foster, his interview was conducted simultaneously with the non-scientific interview requested by another student. While the interview resultantly contains superfluous information, it did answer the questions required by the interview protocol.

portion of the study is far too short. The ‘participant observation’ process typically lasts an entire year before the ‘key informant interviewing’ stage of the project begins. By necessity, I was less than three weeks into my ‘participant observation’ before I began my main pursuit of interviews. Furthermore, my objective of ten informants, even if I had achieved it, would be too small for a full-length ethnographic study, which would normally interview about fifty participants in a community of this size. Hence, this study was never meant to be exhaustive. Rather, the nature of this project is groundbreaking (i.e., paving the way for a greater project); it is preliminary field research meant to provide a foundation for a full-length project on the use of Latin at the Vatican City State, which may be conducted by either some other researcher or myself.

Although the project falls short of a full-length study, my conclusions and analysis of the information collected are valid and useful for researchers, who utilize qualitative research methods. The participants all provide details derived from their personal experiences and perspectives and collectively begin to paint a consistent portrait of the present cultural situation at the Vatican. This takes their input beyond the realm of uncorroborated anecdotes. I believe that my analysis of the statements collected reflects an accurate (though preliminary) assessment of Vatican culture, which other researchers can safely rely upon for initial guidance when devising future projects on this subject.

### *Definition of Modern Language*

The term ‘modern’ language is often used, but loosely and without thought. The same is true for other commonly employed linguistic terms. For example, if you look-up

the term ‘dead’ language in the *Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* you will find the definition “a language which is no longer spoken by anyone as their main language.” The definition is then immediately followed by the example, “Latin is a dead language.”

Regardless of whether or not this is a true statement, defining Latin as the archetypal ‘dead,’ ‘non-modern,’ or any other designation, language is an unfitting bias for a study that is investigating the nature of Latin. Before I can proceed with the analysis of my findings, it is necessary for me to establish a definition for a ‘modern’ language in such a way so as to render a complete and (hopefully) unbiased understanding of terms that is appropriate to the question at hand. It shall be the goal in the remainder of this introduction to create a precise, working definition of what explicitly constitutes a ‘modern’ language. In so doing, I shall strive for a definition that is consistent with the common meaning of the term itself. Through this process, I hope to detach it from the common prejudices so often employed, which may result in the disqualification of legitimately modern languages.

A modern scholar reading an ancient text (and understanding it) does not use that language as a ‘modern’ language. This is despite the fact that it is being used for the communication of ideas still in the modern day (i.e., to the modern scholar). The statement “a language that can effectively communicate ideas in the present is a ‘modern’ language” is inaccurate by the above-mentioned ‘scholar’ scenario, which is in accord with the common use of the term ‘modern’ language. The negation, however, is true; “A language that cannot (or does not) effectively communicate ideas in the present is not a modern language.” In this second statement, we have a relationship between the present,

or modern time, and a language's status as 'modern'. This is not, however, a defining relationship since it can only discount a language as modern, never affirm it.

Furthermore, it does not apply to Latin. Therefore, we must continue to explore possible ways of actively defining something to be a modern language.

Perhaps the 'modern' status assigned to a language is based partially upon the ideas being conveyed. This could help explain why the previous scenario about a modern scholar reading an ancient text does not make the text's language modern: it had ancient ideas. This too is clearly faulty. Most human ideas have been around for a while, and new ideas build on old ones. It would be futile to try to differentiate between the two. For this reason, the statement, "if a language expresses ancient ideas, then the language is not modern," is unreasonable. Further, the same ideas could be conveyed just as effectively in what all would consider a modern language without diminishing in anyway the modernity of this other language. Nor is the negation of the above statement true; for many non-modern languages exist that do not convey ancient ideas because they no longer convey ideas at all. They are lost or undecipherable. Even if we reorganize the previous statement to say, "if a language is modern, it conveys modern ideas," or "if a language conveys modern ideas, it is a modern language" we are no better off, for we still have the problem of distinguishing 'modern' ideas from 'non-modern' ideas. For reasons stated above, I would argue that to be an untenable burden. Hence, the content has no direct bearing upon the modernity of a particular language.

If the defining principle of a modern language is based not upon 'content,' then perhaps it is based on 'participant'. Let us examine following, participant-based

definition for a modern language. “If a language is used as a means of communication between two (or more) modern communicators, it is being used as a ‘modern’ language.” This definition would allow our ‘scholar’ scenario to remain non-modern; a classicist reading an ancient manuscript does not involve two modern communicators. The scholar is modern, but the author is ancient.

“If a language is used as a means of communication between two (or more) modern communicators, it is being used as a ‘modern’ language,” serves to define the use of a language as modern, but neglects to define the language itself as such. Therefore, we now have a working definition of modern language use, but not of a modern language. What is the difference? Well, I might decide to take up a habit of correspondence with my cousin in which we send short notes to each other written in Linear B. We are then using Linear B as though it were a modern language, but it indeed is not a modern language regardless of our obscure note passing.

With this in mind, let us explore the following statement, “A language is itself a modern language if and only if it is consistently used as a modern language by a sustained community of people in the present day.” This definition depends largely upon the meaning of the words ‘consistent’ and ‘sustained’. ‘Consistent use’ means that the language has an established and active function within the community. For our definition, this function must also constitute modern language usage, which has already been defined. ‘Sustained community’ means ‘a community that is capable of replacing its members’.

For our purposes, the community in question must be able to pass on its modern use of the language to new members, who replace those who die or leave. Most communities replace members by child rearing and thereby pass the use of the language on to another generation of members. A community, which does not rear its own children (i.e., the Holy See), must have some source of attaining replacement members, who can (and will) continue to use the language of the community as a modern language in order for that community to be considered ‘sustained.’ This definition is more stringent than the standard definition for modern languages, which is simply “languages that are spoken at the present time.”<sup>6</sup>

## ANALYSIS

To begin assessing the scope and nature of the modern use of Latin by the Vatican City State, both its context and function, we shall firstly examine the statements collected outside of a direct interview. These consist of one completed questionnaire and three statements given in letter format. All three respondents are priests, two of whom serve on a minor pontifical commission, the other works in the Vatican Secretariat of State. They represent the standard Vatican bureaucrat.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Definition taken from *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*.

<sup>7</sup> It is worthy to note that anyone employed at the Vatican itself or associated with the Roman Curia holds a position of extreme prestige within the Catholic Church. The descriptions given to gauge a member's place within the Holy See is relative to the Vatican's social hierarchy. Hence, a man who holds a position, which is described for the purposes of this study as being a “standard Vatican bureaucrat” in no way holds an

*Fr. Joseph Murphy: Scripted Allocution*

The first respondent, Father (Fr.) Joseph Murphy from the Secretariat of State, could not be interviewed, but volunteered the following statement about Latin's place at the Vatican. Fr. Murphy does not directly discuss his own use of the Latin language. Rather he describes the use of Latin in the Vatican at large. The statement is accommodating, but somewhat generic. It mostly reiterates what can be easily determined about Vatican practice without special insight.

Speaking generally, Latin still has an important role, although it is infrequently used as a spoken language. The authoritative version of the Church's legal texts, such as the *Codex Iuris Canonici*, and major Papal documents is the Latin one. Papal Bulls, e.g. for the appointment of Bishops or the establishment of dioceses, and various other kinds of correspondence are drawn up in Latin. Latin is also used in sentences of the various tribunals of the Holy See, such as the Segnatura [sic] and the Rota.

Apart from documents, the other main use of Latin is in the liturgy. If you go to St. Peter's during your stay in Rome, you will be able to assist at Mass (10.30 on Sundays, 5 p.m. on weekdays) and Vespers ... celebrated in Latin. Mass will be celebrated in Latin (for the most part) at St. Peter's by the Holy Father.... (Appendix III. a.)

In his first sentence, Fr. Murphy labels modern Latin as an infrequently 'spoken' language. He nevertheless devotes the final paragraph of his statement to the use of Latin in the liturgy, which he calls the 'other main use of Latin' in the modern Vatican. Fr. Murphy places the liturgical use of Latin on par with the massive bulk of Latin texts the Vatican produces and disseminates not only in diplomatic correspondences to most countries throughout the world, but in the governance of approximately one billion

---

undignified post, nor is this label meant as a diminutive or to imply that the Roman Curia is comparable to



Catholics. By this estimate, its liturgical use is not negligible. In fact, the Latin liturgy is regularly used in the Vatican's daily public services, i.e., even for pilgrims and native Italians who (presumably) do not know Latin.

The spoken word is the primary forum of prayer in Catholic worship and the prayers of modern Catholic liturgy<sup>8</sup> are spoken loud enough for all present to hear. In fact, most of the liturgy known of as the 'Canon' takes the form of a dialogue between the presider and the congregation. There remain only a few prayers of the priest (known of as the 'Secrets') that are spoken inaudibly. Even before the liturgical reforms of the 1960's and 70's, however, the much more expansive 'Secrets' were still read aloud by the priest (as they are today), although they were inaudible to anyone not standing near to him. Therefore, if Latin is still commonly used in the liturgy, it is indeed still commonly spoken.

Liturgical dialogue, however, is scripted, whereas casual dialogue is not. This difference, which Fr. Murphy has implicitly made in the above statement, is significant. Scripted dialogue does not entail unique and spontaneous self-expression. Nor does it require its participant to fashion his own thoughts into sustained grammatical structures. Indeed, it does not even require the participant to know what he is saying. Hence, the distinction between the two rightly ought to be made. We shall devote further discussion to these distinctions below.

---

a corporation.

*Monsignor Arthur Calkins: The Sacred Language*

Monsignor (Msgr.) Arthur Calkins of the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* has been at the Vatican for thirteen years and reiterates the above-mentioned contrast in the following statement. Unlike Fr. Murphy, Msgr. Calkins specifically discusses his personal use of the Latin language and describes in greater depth the circumstances accompanying his liturgical use of Latin.

I frequently celebrate Mass in Latin, occasionally recite the breviary in Latin (and am comfortable going to the liturgy of the hours in communities which recite it in Latin) and for research purposes am able to use my knowledge of Latin in consulting papal and theological texts. I am also always happy to support the celebration of the Church's liturgy in Latin according to the present liturgical books or those of 1962. I do not, however, use Latin as a spoken or modern language. (Appendix III. c.)

Upon reading the quote directly above, one immediately notices the verbs Msgr. Calkins employs to describe his Latin activity. They are ‘celebrate’, ‘recite’, ‘consult’ and ‘not...spoke’. For many, his choice of words would prove perplexing or contradictory. He admits to ‘reciting’ Latin, yet claims not to ‘speak’ it. Furthermore, Msgr. Calkins claims to ‘celebrate’ in Latin (as did Fr. Murphy). What could he mean by this? As we shall discuss in the following analysis and explanation of Msgr. Calkins’ statement, he is merely employing the standard English translation of the Christian Latin idiom (the development of which dates back to the third century Anno Domini and before)<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> This refers to the liturgy of the Latin Rite, the near-universal liturgy of the Catholic Church.

<sup>9</sup> cf. Mohrmann, Christine. 1957. “Early Christian Latin and the Origins of Liturgical Latin.” In C. Mohrmann, ed., *Liturgical Latin-its origins and character*. Washington D.C. 30-60.

The primary liturgical use of Latin for Msgr. Calkins is at the celebration of Mass, which he celebrates everyday. The term ‘celebrate,’ which Fr. Murphy also employed, is standard Catholic terminology in English-speaking countries. It is a translation of the Latin *celebrare*, which is the verb used to describe sacerdotal participation in all seven sacraments.<sup>10</sup> It should be noted that the Mass, or “*Missa*” in Latin, has a number of essential and non-essential components, including the consecration of the Eucharist, the liturgy of the Word, the Offertory, etc. The participation of an ordained priest is necessary for the consecration of the Eucharist. The Eucharist is an essential part, integral (and central) to the Catholic Mass. It is the only sacramental part of the Mass. The remaining components, therefore, would not individually merit the term *celebrare*. Without a consecration, however, no Mass can occur. *Celebrare*, therefore, is used to describe the Mass in general because the Mass implies the consecration of the Eucharist in addition to its many non-sacramental prayers.

Msgr. Calkins also makes mention of occasionally ‘reciting’ the breviary in Latin and being “comfortable going to...communities which recite it in Latin.” Again, his choice of words was deliberate and technical. The English word ‘recite’ is translated from the standard Catholic usage of *recitare* to describe the liturgical action of the liturgy of hours. The liturgy of hours is not a sacrament, but a prayer. Hence, the verb proper to it is not *celebrare*.

---

<sup>10</sup> As it is used in this context, it does not correspond to today’s common English usage. The word ‘celebrate,’ however, first entered the English language as a cognate mimicking the Catholic idiom. This is a mark of the historical dominance of Latin as the ‘authoritative’ language within the Catholic Church, which is retained to this day (q.v. quoted statement of Fr. Murphy). The dependence upon Latin for precision in language has even necessitated the development of new vocabulary in vernacular tongues.

The ‘liturgy of hours’ is the daily prayer (originating in Benedictine monasteries) that Catholic priests, nuns, and monks are obligated to pray. For this reason, it is sometimes called the ‘Divine Office.’ Many will also refer to it as the ‘breviary’ (as Msgr. Calkins did above), which is the name of the handbook owned by priests and religious that contains the liturgy of hours. The liturgy of hours is prayed throughout the day at several canonical hours, the major hours being Lauds (in the Morning) and Vespers (in the evening). The prayer works on a rotating pattern of psalms, hymns, and other prayers in addition to the fixed prayers for each canonical hour of the day. The modern breviary comes in four volumes (for different times in the year). Praying the liturgy of hours in Latin is no short commitment. Indeed, the Divine Office is considered the center of a Catholic priest’s spirituality. He spends hours praying it each day. This is even more the case for those religious communities Msgr. Calkins alludes to above, who recite the liturgy of hours ‘in common.’ In these communities, the members will gather daily for each canonical hour (or at least Lauds and Vespers) and chant the Office back and forth with each other. This process can take a considerable amount of time depending upon the solemnity of the occasion and practice of the community. A significant portion of their daily life is spent praying vocally in Latin.

Msgr. Calkins concludes with, “I do not, however, use Latin as a spoken or modern language,” drawing the same distinction as Fr. Murphy between scripted dialogue and casual conversation. He does not consider scripted dialogue to be properly using Latin as a spoken language. We note also that Msgr. Calkins makes another observation: his use of Latin is not (by his measure) that of a ‘modern’ language.

He further reiterates this in the questionnaire, which he completed (Appendix IV. a.). “I do not consider or use Latin as a modern language.”<sup>11</sup> His account of Latin and that of Fr Murphy show it to be still used extensively for certain functions within Vatican (and perhaps broader Catholic) society in the present day. Even Msgr. Calkins describes his liturgical use of Latin as a “daily” event<sup>12</sup>. Thus, his objection to it being considered a ‘modern’ language is obviously not on chronological grounds.

Latin is spoken (albeit scripted) and used frequently on a daily basis by certain religious communities within and without the Vatican. It has a specific function and place in the modern life and society of these groups. Therefore, on what basis does Msgr. Calkins deny it the title of ‘modern’ language? The context of its function provides an answer.

Msgr. Calkins needs to read Latin in the course of his research and sometimes uses Latin in his office work,<sup>13</sup> but his use is almost exclusively limited to liturgical settings. As stated above, translating documents for research happens everyday, but it does not constitute the use of Latin as a ‘modern’ language. Msgr. Calkins’ use of Latin is not quite the same, since many of the texts he translates are so recent that he himself describes them as simply being part of his “office work”. This latter scenario of Latin ‘office work’ will be discussed below (q.v. section on Fr. Nikolaus Schöch). At present, we shall examine simply the nature of liturgical Latin.

---

<sup>11</sup> Appendix IV. a. The quote is Msgr. Calkins’ answer to Q: “In what ways does your use of Latin differ from other modern languages?”

<sup>12</sup> Appendix IV. a. Q: “How frequently and in what contexts must you read Latin aloud?” A: “Daily Liturgy.”

<sup>13</sup> Appendix IV. a. Q: “Are there professional duties that require you to use Latin?” A: “Liturgy, office work, research—study.”

In the context of the liturgy, communication is almost entirely directed not at other living humans, but to God *et alii*. Thus, the context of liturgical actions is one of prayer and Latin's function as the exclusive vocal medium of that prayer is a 'sacred' one. In this context, we also see Latin being used not simply for communication, but for expression (another function of language). Hence, in Catholic liturgical settings, Latin is being used as a 'sacred' language<sup>14</sup>, distinct perhaps from a 'modern' language in the normal sense of the term. Certainly, this is the case for Msgr. Calkins who rarely uses Latin in any other context. His situation, where Latin is mostly reserved for prayer, only reinforces its sacred nature for someone of the Judeo-Christian tradition.<sup>15</sup>

Does Latin's sacred function expel it from the realm of the modern language? In the personal experience of Msgr. Calkins, Latin is now used (perhaps) predominately as a sacred language. He and others use it to pray. A sacred language used to pray to God involves one modern communicator (the penitent) and a supra-modern one (God). As such, in their experience, it conveys 'timeless' messages to modern listeners and, more importantly, to a Godhead, who transcends time. Thus, there is nothing peculiarly modern about it; rather it is transcendent. The use of Latin in this setting is seen as 'a-temporal'. Those who use it in this manner, therefore, may see little reason to call it 'modern' *per se*. Hence, some (like Msgr. Calkins) may understandably be loath to call it so. A sacred language still in use today, therefore, is 'modern', but in a special sense of the term.

---

<sup>14</sup> Linguists sometimes refer to this as a 'liturgical' language.

*Monsignor Camille Perl: Hierarchical Context*

The third respondent, Msgr. Camille Perl, is the secretary of the Pontifical Commission *Ecclesia Dei* and colleague of Msgr. Calkins. His statement was received via facsimile, handwritten and, most interestingly, in Latin (Appendix III.c.). The request for an interview or statement was sent to him (just as it was to all others) in Latin with an accompanying English translation. He responded to my request on the very morning he received it. The following is an excerpt from the translation of his communiqué.

The Latin language has always been the “official” language of the Holy See, the “diplomatic” language, however, is French; that English, which is devoid of all beauty and, although today is most widespread, remains barbaric, is forever excluded. Therefore, it is very much agreed that English speakers are to learn and pour forth the language of the Romans. (Appendix III. b. ii.).

Msgr. Perl refers to Latin as the “official” (*officialis*) language of the Holy See, contrasting it with the “diplomatic” (*diplomatica*) language, which he says is French. This is the first instance thus far where we have seen the word “official” used to describe the capacity in which the Vatican employs Latin. Fr. Murphy (v. sup.) used the term ‘authoritative’ to describe the Latin version of documents and also listed a number of activities conducted in Latin, which would certainly be considered official, but never directly applied the adjective to Latin itself. Msgr. Perl does not elaborate and declined to comment further, but it is reasonable to assume that he has in mind the same ‘official’ functions as those described by Fr. Murphy.

---

<sup>15</sup> For Biblical evidence for the idea that ‘sacred’ things should be used only for sacred functions cf., e.g., Lv 23:1-3, Dt 5:11, Dt 12:13, Ez 44:2, Mt 1:25, 2 Cor 11:2.

Whereas Fr. Murphy contrasts the function of Latin in the Vatican with the ‘speaking’ of Latin, Msgr. Perl contrasts its ‘official’ use with the ‘diplomatic’ use of French. The question is then, of course, begged, “what does he mean by ‘diplomatic language?’” Fr. Murphy has already stated that Latin is used for, “Papal Bulls, e.g. for the appointment of Bishops or the establishment of dioceses, and various other kinds of correspondence are drawn up in Latin.” Papal bulls can be used as diplomatic correspondences, but today tend to be for strictly internal Church matters such as those cited by Fr. Murphy. However, he proceeds in the quoted statement mentioning, “various other kinds of correspondence.” These include official communiqués sent by the Holy See to foreign governments through its embassies<sup>16</sup>. The Vatican embassies will then provide an official translation for those foreign governments, who require it, in the language of the country.

So, if the Vatican issues all its intergovernmental correspondences in Latin, what ‘diplomatic’ use remains for it to have of the French language? Re-examining Msgr. Perl’s statement in its entirety, we note that he immediately follows his claim about French with another about English and English speakers (*anglophonos*) at the Vatican. In fact, these latter comments seem to be the point of the paragraph; he devotes two of three sentences to the discussion of English. His comment about French and Latin was almost in passing.

He introduced the topic of English without prompting, as it was never mentioned in the letter sent to him, which only requested an interview. We recall, however, that the

---

<sup>16</sup> cf. *Percontatio de Usu Linguae Latinae cum Reverentia Sua: Pater Reginaldus Foster*, “we send they [sic]



letter was sent in Latin with an accompanying English translation (to prevent any Latin *illiterati* from being inadvertently barred from survey). The letter also stated that the requested interview would be conducted in English. This may very well have been the impetus of his comments.

Msgr. Perl is a native of Luxembourg; French is quite possibly his native tongue. In French, the word *diplomatique* need not refer to intergovernmental affairs. It can mean simply “tactful” or even “able.” Hence, Msgr. Perl may have meant his choice of the Latin word *diplomatica* to convey just that meaning. Nor would this seem inappropriate. The letter sent to him merely requested an interview, “concerning your Latin education and your personal experience using Latin as a modern language” (Appendix I.f.). If this hypothesis is incorrect, then Msgr. Perl has also independently chosen to bring up the issue of Vatican foreign policy. That is unlikely considering that Msgr. Perl is not an employee of the Vatican Secretariat of State and the request asked explicitly for his “personal experience.” Furthermore, this new interpretation of *diplomatica* would provide his statement about French with a logical relationship to the comments made about English. Indeed, his comments about English applied specifically to its use within the Vatican itself, not in foreign affairs. Hence, Msgr. Perl’s contrast between “official” and “diplomatic” is one between the public sphere and that of the private. Latin is used for ‘official’ communication; but French is the ‘tactful’ language that is employed in polite company.

---

Latin documents to the embassies of the Vatican around the world... Also the answers that the Pope writes to heads of State. Their new ambassadors present their letters in Latin.”

Furthermore, Msgr. Perl insists that residents of the Vatican employ French, not English, the language in which I purposed to interview Vatican residents and in which I wrote the translated copy of my Latin interview request. English is “devoid of all beauty...and remains barbaric...and is forever excluded [from use in the Holy See].” French, by contrast, is presumably everything that English is not, namely, ‘beautiful’ and ‘civilized’ (‘tactful’ perhaps) and thus its use is ‘included.’ In his eyes, I had committed a faux pas by writing and planning to conduct interviews in English (i.e., not French).

He had commented previously in his letter on what he perceived to be another social blunder of mine<sup>17</sup> and even suggests better wording for my Latin<sup>18</sup>. The general theme of his communiqué, indeed, is correction. Thus, his remarks about the use of English are fitting in the context of his entire letter. This having been said, let us return to the examination of his statement.

The alternative that he provides for English speakers, who (presumably) cannot speak French, is for them to “learn and pour forth the language of the Romans.” This statement is ambiguous; there are two distinct and relevant languages that could readily be described as “the language of the Romans,” namely, Latin and Italian. Msgr. Perl has already used the adjectives for Latin (*Latina*), French (*Gallica*), and English (*Anglica*). Why would he not simply say Italian (*Italica*)? It may be that, for the sake of eloquence, he is avoiding the repetition of the word for Latin. On the other hand, having already

---

<sup>17</sup>*Versio Testimonii: Monsignor Camille Perl*, “Permit me to question whether it would be very appropriate to “interview” [*percontari*] or, more simply, to investigate [*perscrutari*] the young seminarians (?), the venerable Princes of the Church, either Cardinals or Bishops or other employees of the Holy See, as if they were peers of the same class.” (Appendix III. b. ii.).

<sup>18</sup> Msgr. Perl recommends using the verb *perscrutari* in place of my use of *percontari*, meaning ‘to interview’ (Appendix III.b.)

established that he would directly specify Latin if he meant ‘Latin,’ he may be assuming that the contrast makes it clearly mean Italian.

In this context, “the language of the Romans” must mean the language of the *modern* Romans (i.e., Italians), not the language of the Roman Empire. For this statement extends the explanation of “diplomatic” language in its relationship to “official” language. It would not make sense to contrast Latin, the “official” language, with Latin. Hence, Msgr. Perl must mean ‘Italian’ by his phrase “language of the Romans.” Since the Vatican is a culture and society separate from that of Rome, his segregation of Roman custom from that of the Holy See is expected and historical.<sup>19</sup> This further confirms that “the language of the Romans” must mean Italian.

In summary, Msgr. Perl has stated the following. Namely, Latin has always (*semper*) been the “official” language of the Holy See. Hence, the Vatican employs Latin, either exclusively or as the norm, for its official communicative actions and always has. At present, in contrast with ‘always’ (implied by the lack of repetition of *semper*), the ‘tactful’ or ‘cordial’ language of the Vatican, which is used for nonofficial communicative actions, is French. Those people, specifically English speakers who do not speak French, are expected to learn Italian for cordial discourse. Therefore, either French or Italian may be employed. He makes no mention of Latin in this regard. This demonstrates the specialization of languages within Vatican society; a certain language being employed for one type of action, certain other languages being used for other purposes.

Msgr. Perl's understanding that the Vatican employs both an 'official' language and a 'cordial' language is not contradicted by Fr. Murphy's statement, which itself implies the necessity of a second language when he (i.e., Fr. Murphy) states that Latin "is infrequently used as a spoken language." Msgr. Perl's comment also explains a remark made (not discussed above) by Msgr. Calkins, "even if the official language of the Holy See is Latin, the de facto language is Italian" (Appendix III. c.). We note that Msgr. Calkins differs with his colleague, Msgr. Perl, as to what the 'cordial' language actually is. Msgr. Calkins claims the 'cordial' language is Italian, a secondary language to French according to Msgr. Perl. We also note the difference in terms chosen for contrast. Msgr. Calkins contrasts "official" with "de facto." Whereas Msgr. Perl contrasts "*officialis*" with "*diplomatica*." The term "de facto" is usually opposed to "de jure," "in practice" as opposed to "in law." 'In law' is nearly synonymous with 'official' and 'de facto' is in many ways similar with our reinterpretation of Msgr. Perl's "*diplomatica*." Hence, one might conclude that the two statements are consistent with one another. A significant difference does exist between the two statements, however.

Msgr. Perl says that English "is forever excluded" (*semper exclusa*), which is a passive construction implying an agent that is actively "excluding" English. In the next sentence, he says, "it is...agreed" (*convenit*) that Italian be used if French is unknown. Agreement or consensus indicates deliberation by the unmentioned agents (presumably members of the Vatican) over the matter of non-Latin language use. This is especially the case with the Latin verb at hand, which literally means 'to assemble, or come

---

<sup>19</sup> "Vatican offices was in the past there was more closure I think. It was more life apart from the

together.’ Furthermore, the translation of *convenit* as “it is... agreed” interprets it as being present. It is quite possible that *convênit*, the perfect form of the verb, was intended (recall that the message was written, not spoken). In this event, the implication of prior deliberation becomes even stronger, with the meaning now “it has been... agreed.”

None of this is supported by Msgr. Calkins’ use of the phrase ‘de facto,’ which simply indicates a state of being. Rather, Msgr. Calkins indicates that no language but Latin has been consciously assigned for use at the Vatican under any circumstance. We note that his comparison begins with the qualification “even if.” This indicates that Msgr. Calkins’ choice to contrast between ‘official’ and ‘de facto’ gains meaning from contradiction. That is to say, the ‘de facto’ use of Italian contradicts the official nature of Latin. For Msgr. Calkins, saying that Latin is the official language means that its use is meant to be ubiquitous (or virtually ubiquitous), not simply limited to official actions, though specifically mandated for them.

The discrepancy between Msgr. Calkins’ and Msgr. Perl’s account is perhaps indicative of a wider social phenomenon occurring within Vatican society. We shall address that issue below. First, it is necessary for us to continue our inquiry concerning the current functions of Latin within the Vatican.

---

people...” (Appendix V. a.).

*Fr. Nikolaus Schöch: Unique Modernity*

We shall now expand our discussion to include the interview of Fr. Nikolaus Schöch, who is Deputy Defender of the Bond at the Roman Rota, a legal consultant to the Apostolic Signatura, and commissioner for the dispensation of clerical celibacy and unconsummated marriages at the Congregation of Divine Worship. Fr. Schöch was ordained a priest in 1988 and began his work at the Vatican in 1992 as a canon lawyer at the Roman Rota. The Rota is, in brief, the court of appeals of the Catholic Church; it spends most of its time dealing with cases involving marriage annulments. More significant to us, however, is the Rota's mandatory employment of the Latin language.

Fr. Schöch's interview provides us with extensive, detailed information concerning his personal use of the Latin language, as well as how it is used in the judicial wing of the Roman Curia (i.e. the central governmental apparatus of the Catholic Church). His experience bears the same traits as the men we have examined from other areas of the Curia. He does not speak Latin, but uses it regularly in reading and writing.

I don't have [sic] ever used [Latin] orally. I actually don't have any experience in speaking Latin. Neither in school as spoken language, nor the University, nor at my work at the Apostolic See now where I write continuously in Latin but I never speak, because the spoken language here is in the Vatican offices is now Italian nearly exclusively. It is a very particular knowledge of Latin. I read Latin without problem and I write, but never speak, so it is a very strange knowledge of Latin, which I have. (Appendix V. a).

His statement, in general, reaffirms that of Msgr. Calkins. Fr. Schöch does not use Latin orally. He reports that Italian is used "nearly exclusively" as the spoken language, supporting Msgr. Calkins' claim of 'de facto' Italian usage. Nor would Latin regularly be employed as an alternative to speaking Italian. One might assume by Msgr.

Perl's assertion that French occupies this category, although Fr. Schöch never states this himself. Like Msgr. Calkins, he also fails to indicate the existence of any consensus or hierarchy of 'included' and 'excluded' languages, which Msgr. Perl described. Fr. Schöch explains why he believes Italian replaced Latin instead of other languages.

We live in an Italian context. And the distinction between the life in the convents and the Vatican offices was in the past there was more closure I think. It was more life apart from the people... now the life is more open I think; we are all the time to use more the language of the people than in there (Appendix V. a).

Indeed, if there were such a hierarchy among spoken Vatican languages, Italian would seem to prevail over French by Fr. Schöch's account. In the following quote, he describes the one instance where he needed to use Latin as a cordial language.

I used [oral Latin] in Hungary once with a friar. But I had a bit of difficulty again because I was not used to speaking... It was that context because there was some old people because it was in a congress... for dinner and the night I was in a convent, the Franciscan convent of Budapest... with the young friars, I could speak in German or in Italian, or in English, but with the oldest one only [Latin]. But this was a conversation quite difficult; less difficult for them, but more difficult for me. Because it was also a question of vocabulary, and also a question of the use of the Latin (Appendix V.a.).

We note that while French was not among the languages spoken by the young friars, English, an 'excluded' language, was. This, however, in no way diminishes Msgr. Perl's claim of current French linguistic supremacy at the Vatican. It may simply be an example of the "most widespread" nature of English, which he cited. The story, after all, occurred in Budapest, not the Vatican City State. The 'oldest' friar at the convent belongs to the worldwide extension of the culture we are currently investigating at the Vatican; historically, he would only have communicated in Latin (which indeed was the

case here). When this practice changed, developments within Vatican culture may well have diverged from the customs outside the Vatican, as will be discussed below. Fr. Schöch does reveal a Vatican policy that gives privilege to the French language, however, and may thereby shed light on Msgr. Perl's statement. The following excerpt speaks of the old rules governing language use at diocesan tribunals.

There is in the past, the only official language of all Catholic tribunals in the world was Latin. That means that all the sentences of all Catholic tribunals in the whole world they're written in Latin...The only thing you could use other languages was for the interrogations of the witnesses...For that was allowed to use the language of the place. But they had to translate the witnesses—the testimony of the witnesses—was translated at the Rota, also in the past, not to Latin, not necessarily to Latin, but would be translated also to Italian or French. But only the interrogation of the witnesses. Not the questionnaires of the witnesses; not the act of the tribunals: the decrees and sentences (Appendix V.a).

The rule was an acknowledgement that most of the clerics working at the higher ecclesiastical courts knew French or Italian, and could work with either just as well as they could Latin. Witnesses could be anyone, and could not be expected to know Latin or any other language; thus, they need only speak their own. Yet, good translations are time-consuming and can be misleading. Therefore, if the witness spoke in one of these two languages, his testimony need not be altered. Likewise, if a translation was needed, it was acceptable to translate the testimony into French or Italian, which may often be the easier option.

The acknowledgement of trilingualism does not imply its employment within the Holy See. Rather, it is indicative of the demographics and educational standard of the Roman Curia. At the time that norm was in effect, the Vatican was almost completely occupied by Europeans, specifically Italians and Frenchmen. Additionally, French was



the international language of diplomacy outside the Vatican. Even for those who did not speak French as a native language, French was a standard feature in education at the time. All clerics at the Vatican had received an extensive education, and were likely to know French as a result. This state of affairs remains the case today, although the demographics are more diverse and the language selection is now even greater. According to Msgr. Calkins “English, Italian, or French,” (Appendix IV. a.) are all normal options for vocal communication.<sup>20</sup>

To this point, we have discussed the many ways in which Fr. Schöch’s statement parallels Msgr. Calkins’ and the others. There exists a major difference between Fr. Schöch and the rest of the men, however. Namely, Fr. Schöch primarily uses Latin in his ‘office work,’ not his worship. This is the opposite situation to those previously covered. The following quote discusses the worship practices of Fr. Schöch’s religious community.

Only at the beginning there’s always used the same Latin prayer. But then the Vespers, the Psalms and so on are in Italian. In the past they were Latin, which was more international...we have prayer books all in Italian of the house. Those of the house, unfortunately, are all in Italian now. They have been first, before the Second Vatican Council: certainly all in Latin. But now the new liturgical books we only have in Italian (Appendix V.a).

Now let us compare this to what Fr. Schöch says about his work life.

Now I use [Latin] very frequently, but only in two offices of the Holy See... the Roman Rota...and...*Signatura Apostolica*... every dimension is written because it is a written process... It is not an oral process. The oral process is used very rarely. In fact, I have never participated in the oral process, because can’t be used for marriage nullity processes, which are

---

<sup>20</sup> Q: To which groups of people must you most often speak in Latin? A: Only those with whom I cannot communicate in English, Italian, or French. This would be very rare.

from 130 sentences over a year there are 129 on marriage nullity. And theirs is a written process... during the process at any stage I have to do in Latin exclusively... There are 50-60 pages that I write in Latin every month (Appendix V. a.).

Compared to the rest of the Vatican, Fr. Schöch uses Latin at an above-average rate of frequency.<sup>21</sup> This is necessarily the case, though, because nearly all tasks that he performs in his capacity as a canon lawyer in the Vatican judiciary system are ‘on the record’ and, thus, ‘official.’

Fr. Schöch’s statement is, so far, unique in the course of our study. We know from others that Latin is the ‘official’ language of the Holy See. We also know that Vatican custom now differentiates it from the cordial language of oral conversation, a function Latin also occupied at one time.<sup>22</sup> As the official language, Latin is both a sacred tongue in worship and a secular tongue used for more worldly administrative actions. The other men all indicated this latter function of Latin’s ‘official’ status within Vatican culture, but provided no personal examples of how they use it in this capacity other than to mention undefined use in “office work and research.” Fr. Schöch now gives us the specific context and frequency in which he uses official non-sacred Latin and the knowledge that his application of Latin is of above-average frequency. We therefore can infer that the form of so called ‘office work’ is similar among other members of the society, though not as prolific. One’s use of written Latin has much to do with one’s position, i.e., the frequency at which one actively writes in Latin depends upon how

---

<sup>21</sup> cf. Appendix IV. a.

<sup>22</sup> Q: You’ve said before that ... [Latin] has been used more frequently in the past than it is now—  
A: Certainly, because in the past it was also a spoken language that is the biggest difference (Appendix V.a.).

frequently one's actions are considered official. Presumably, high-ranking personnel commit more official actions than those of a lower rank do. Hence, a cardinal would use Latin more frequently than his subordinates would, except in special cases (e.g., canon lawyers). Likewise, a secretary to a cardinal or a pontifical commission (e.g., Msgr. Perl) would need to write in Latin more frequently than a colleague of his (e.g., Msgr. Calkins), who may rarely (if ever) need to create official documents. Reading Latin, on the other hand, must be universal within the Vatican. For since all official texts (which can be extensive in length) are written in Latin, one must read Latin as often as one must read official texts. No doubt, this is a constant process for most members of the Roman Curia.

The written trials of the Roman Rota are similar to their spoken, secular counterparts. Much of what Fr. Schöch does, as a lawyer, in these trials is debate before the court against an adversary, who is also writing in Latin. Hence, in the course of his day Fr. Schöch is “communicating unique ideas that are only...communicated in Latin.”<sup>23</sup> He clearly uses Latin as a modern language, in the normal sense of the term. Likewise, do his colleagues and, by extension, many others at the Vatican.

*Fr. Reginald Foster: Cultural Change and Crisis*

Few people within the Vatican are known to use Latin more often than canon lawyers do. The main exception to this is the Secretariat of State, which handles the Vatican's diplomatic relations with foreign governments, and other entities abroad.

Within the Secretariat of State, none use Latin more than the Office of Latin Letters, which is responsible for composing or proofreading almost all official documents sent beyond the boundaries of the Holy See. Fr. Reginald Foster, a discalced Carmelite friar, has worked in this office as a Latin speechwriter of sorts for over thirty-four years<sup>24</sup> and has witnessed the rapid changes that have swept through Vatican culture over the last three and a half decades.

His office, if it is not the very last, is one of the last enclaves at the Vatican that maintains the old linguistic practices in their fullness amidst an otherwise changed Vatican culture.

Well,...we speak Latin in the office. But other people come in—well, you probably have to go back into Italian... you have to be charitable, in a certain sense, not to embarrass them. Because some people would understand everything, I could say anything, ...they would understand, but they... wouldn't know how to answer. They would be so ... they have to think about a half-hour to get four words out. And then they'd get it wrong anyway... Of course, in the office, ... we write notes to each other, we are speaking in Latin, all of our documents—although we are very conscious of the fact that most of the stuff we are doing—I'll just be quite honest about it—most of the stuff we are doing is not being understood. (Appendix V. b.).

Complete fluency in Latin is a practical matter for members of the Office of Latin Letters. For this reason, the custom of speaking only in Latin was deliberately retained, by office policy, as spoken Latin fell into disuse throughout the rest of the Vatican. Indeed, while Fr. Foster and his colleagues (and their predecessors) have always been the

---

<sup>23</sup> Q: you would say that... you very frequently, or constantly, perhaps, are communicating with people in the Latin language... in such a way that the purpose is communicating unique ideas that are only then communicated in Latin? A: Yes. (Appendix V. a.).

<sup>24</sup> He had been there thirty-three years at the time of the interview.

Latin experts of a Latin-speaking society, they now provide us with a bridge to the recent past.

Oh, when I came in '69, this is thirty-three years ago. Heaven sakes! We have one or two—this is for Paul VI, of course—one or two Latin speeches to some international group—or some bishops from the Eastern Bloc, let's say—every week and letters and things, of course the Liturgy was being changed and all like the Missal, and the Liturgy of the Hours all that stuff was in tremendous ferment that was all being done in Latin, you see... And even the first Synods of Bishops—this is 1970—...were all in Latin. On both sides; I mean the Pope would talk or say something and then the directors of the Synod would speak in Latin. It was kind of a crazy thing because... there were about five of us in this City, who were doing the whole Synod. And in the morning, we were doing the Pope's [speech]—let's say for the next day. In the afternoon, I would go to some college like the Brazilian college out here, or other places and meet with the Bishops who wanted to have an intervention the next day. And then we would do that Latin in the afternoon. And then, and then, the next morning I would have the Pope's answer to the Latin I wrote the night before! I said, "we should have the Synod right here in this room!" (Appendix V. b.).

The Synods and meetings described by Fr. Foster provided no translations or translators for the participants. They were conducted entirely in Latin with all present completely able to follow and understand by ear. The reason Fr. Foster and his colleagues composed speeches for bishops was not because the bishops did not know Latin. Most bishops still had the ability to converse in the language at the time; it was a practical skill that enabled them to communicate with other bishops and priests around the world.<sup>25</sup> Indeed, many bishops, especially those from the Eastern Bloc spoke languages that were very uncommon among Westerners, and resultantly they relied

---

<sup>25</sup> This is the use of Latin as an 'auxiliary' language by the Catholic Church; cf. Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 2003.

heavily upon Latin for communicating. They simply could not speak in it as eloquently as the Vatican speechwriters could.

That's the passive and active use of the language... of course, I would insist on, there has to be some active use but in general most people would say, "fine I understand, that's wonderful," and *et quid dicam?* Even if I were speaking with the Pope, he would understand that. But he probably couldn't answer... I met Paul VI in a little group of another sort... it must have been about... 1972... something in there— "You won't believe"... he said, "there were some Hungarian bishops today"—or yesterday or something—"in the Vatican, and so I gave my little speech in Latin" that we would write-up anyway, "and after that, the bishops came up and they started speaking in Latin about their dioceses and under Communism and all that stuff, and about the future—and to think,"... he said, "I couldn't answer these people. I was hesitating, I was looking for words, vocabulary and forms and everything else," —and he was just sharing his own sentiments with us, and he said, "To think here that the Bishop of Rome had a difficulty answering these Hungarian bishops in Latin." Well, it's just because he doesn't have the *usum*, you see. It's just *consuetudinem*, that's the whole problem (Appendix V. b.).

Unlike the Hungarian bishops, the many Italians within the Vatican could very easily get by using their native tongue instead of Latin. The Second Vatican Ecumenical Council officially lifted the prohibitions against the use of the vernacular in sacred worship. No doubt, the Vatican cultural taboos against using languages other than Latin in cordial discourse were quick to follow. This was apparently the case within the inner circle of Pope Paul VI, who lamented the declined state of his oral Latin only a decade later. As Fr. Foster notes, this decline could only have occurred from a lack of practice.

Then in '78, ... much of the reform was over with but ...of course, [Pope John Paul II] came. And I mean, it's to his credit, for sure, but he knew all those languages: Polish, Russian... Lithuanian—And so he starts speaking to all these people of the Eastern Bloc in their languages. Course, the people of the West, even North, South American, who were trained in Rome, knew Italian. And so the need for Latin just about disappeared over night. In that sense (Appendix V. b.).

The presence of the bishops of the Eastern Bloc had perpetuated the use of Latin for high level, cordial discourse during the reigns of the post-conciliar Italian popes. Now, and for the past twenty-five years, however, the reign of the multilingual John Paul II (the third longest in Church history), has removed this necessity entirely. Not only does John Paul II speak the standard, French, Italian, and English, but also being Polish and having formerly lived under Soviet rule, he speaks a plethora of Slavic tongues. With the incentive for speaking Latin now removed, it has fallen out of use among the (former) Eastern Bloc bishops, and thus, the Vatican. For the prelates from the Far East and Africa are more likely to have received an education in English or French than in Latin, which has never been a part of the educational tradition in their respective homelands. Latin, nevertheless, is still seen as an international and neutral language, belonging to everyone. In the following quote, Fr. Schöch expresses his thoughts on why Latin is retained as an official language.

I think why? because of tradition: 2000 years and second, because of internationality. Because [Latin is] a neutral language. So it is not an explicit preference for one nation or culture (Appendix V. a.).

The Vatican City State, of course, has no native citizens; its population is comprised almost entirely of celibate clerics, who come from a multitude of countries. In a group such as this, internationality is extremely important. Perceived favoritism shown to any one native group can seriously disrupt the fragile cooperation that gives order to this unique society. What are described as “neutral,” or as having no particular culture associated with it, are in fact aspects of the indigenous Vatican culture we are examining in this study. All members of that society have equal claim to these elements by virtue of

their common Catholic heritage and by the privilege of their initiation into the elite Roman Curia. These norms and mores act as a source of unity, or common identity, within the Vatican City State, and include common worship practices and religious beliefs, language, dress and etiquette. Likewise, removing these societal building blocks, which developed naturally over centuries within the Holy See, creates tension, confusion, and disunity. This sentiment is supported by Fr. Foster, who describes the crisis created by not using Latin in cordial discourse.

As I say, international things: things that would belong to everybody... Like the Pope's Christmas card... just has to be in Latin. What language are you going to put the Pope's Christmas card in, eh?... there's a certain amount of rumbling...because they wanted... to fall back because some of the... officials in the Church, cannot deal with Latin... they're English and Italian and French, you see. And then people are going to say [about a different language], "What is this business?" Of course, English and Americans, the Americans are at a cultural occupation of the world, which I don't like, okay. And people are accusing the Church even of that. The Italians, of course, that's the whole Mafia here, the whole Italian thing: trying to run the Church again. And then you can't even use some of these other languages. They say, "Ah, that's the old French trying to get back with their Empire, or whatever it is... So all this stuff, so there is a little bit of rumbling but most people just accept the fact—they would say, "Well okay, okay. If you don't like American imperialism...—what language are you gonna use?" You see. Latin. "No, no. Forget about Latin; no one knows it anymore." And then you're right back to where you started (Appendix V. b.).

Indeed, the change occurred so swiftly and so recently that Vatican culture has yet to adapt to it. The disappearance of spoken Latin has left a cultural vacuum. Even if the practical solution has been to use Italian, a culturally acceptable resolution has yet to materialize. This is clearly illustrated by Fr. Foster's quote directly above. We also find it demonstrated by the disparaging accounts of language usage given by the various men examined in this study.



The hierarchy of ‘included’ and ‘excluded’ languages implicit by Msgr. Perl’s statement may be one potential solution to the current crisis, but the presence of any such system is unknown to the remaining participants of the study because it has not been universally adopted at the Vatican. It would be reasonable to conjecture that the linguistic hierarchy is simply a method used by Msgr. Perl (and probably many others) to try to create order in a disorganized language free-for-all, where one simply uses what works at the time. A native French-speaker, like Msgr. Perl, would understandably have a preference for the use of his own language, French, whenever he is able to utilize it, just as would the native speaker of any language. This is, indubitably, the impetus of his language hierarchy, which places French above Italian.

The reasons a substitute for Latin is so hard to come by stem from the unique qualities of the language. Latin is the historic language of the Holy See, neutral, equally belonging to everyone, but no longer common in the outside world. The lattermost quality of Latin brought about its undoing as a conversational tongue. Whichever language replaces it will need to be common outside the Vatican, but like Latin will need to be neutral, and equally belonging to everyone. This creates a great dilemma, however, because both the negative and positive qualities of Latin result from the fact that it is no longer a native tongue to anyone. Hence, the matter is still quite open. Usually the substitute is Italian because, as Fr. Schöch stated “we live in an Italian context” (Appendix V. b.); but Italian, because it is still a native tongue, is neither neutral, nor equally belonging to everyone. Fr. Schöch, indeed, expounds upon the inappropriateness of Italian within a judicial setting.

It's also the feel[ing]... to keep the internationality. So everybody has to use another language: also the Italians. There is not convenient as much for the Italians to use their own language. It is all the more... at a tribunal that the language is very important, ... that as an Italian you don't have the home advantage... And especially as a lawyer, if you have to express your ideas in Latin... everybody has difficulty (Appendix V. a.).

Although it almost immediately preceded the reforms of Vatican II, the change in Latin usage at the Vatican was not deliberate, nor did it emanate from cultural developments within the Vatican itself. Rather, it was largely the product of external influences acting on what has historically been, despite its international population, a culturally insulated society. Fr. Schöch offers his theory for the decline of spoken Latin at the Vatican.

It was, I think because there was already less Latin knowledge, and the modern communications and also because of the spreading of modern ways of communications. Phone, television, radio, where you never have Latin (Appendix V. a.).

Fr. Foster concurs with Fr. Schöch in the following statement.

Actually, I think it was way before Vatican Council. In the 1950's we had fights in the seminary. I was for Latin and my Latin teacher, he was for Latin, but there was a rumbling already in 1955, 56, this is six years before Vatican II. There was a rumbling already. Liturgy and stuff, and the Greeks in the old days, "that was the language and they had Greek, then everyone spoke Latin. Well, everyone is speaking English now, why can't we do what they did in the ancient world?" Of course, all these historical studies were coming out and there was this big movement. And one of the reasons it switched from Greek to Latin is because people didn't know Greek anymore, but they knew Latin. So they said, "Fine. No one knows Latin today, why don't we just make it French?" (Appendix V. b.).

History demonstrates that these two priests are not alone in their hypothesis that less knowledge of Latin outside the Vatican is the chief mechanism for the cultural shifting we see today. Nor was the current crisis realized only in retrospect. Before the

Second Vatican Council, several twentieth century attempts took place to maintain Latin within the Catholic Church and to avoid this crisis, which was predicted by some (cf. Preface: historical context). Fr. Foster's quote directly above proves the existence of forces pulling the Church away from Latin by the mere fact that the appropriateness of its use was being debated by seminarians. While this does not tell us about the Vatican culture contemporary to Fr. Foster's seminary experience, it is a harbinger of what would come. It reveals the presence of a mentality of indifference towards Latin among the clerical generation, which came to the Vatican during the late reign of Pope Paul VI, the generation that brought the *coup de grâce* to spoken Latin.

In the second half of the twentieth century, the population of the Vatican became more diverse than it had previously been. Prelates from Africa and the Far East grew in numbers along with Catholicism in those regions. There is no solid evidence to indicate that these prelates were at a disadvantage to their European and American counterparts concerning Latin fluency. The fact remains, however, that Latin language is neither a traditional part of the their national cultural legacy nor their educational systems. Many of these prelates would have begun their Latin education in the seminary. Therefore, it seems highly likely that some of them would (understandably) require the use of another language for cordial discourse. As we saw in the first quote from Fr. Foster's interview, the response to this need is to be "charitable" and switch into a language in which both people can converse easily.

Due to a lack of historical data on internal Vatican cultural shifts, this thesis can only speculate that such exceptions, which permitted non-Latin languages to be used in

one instance, led to expanded allowances. After the incorporation of vernacular tongues into the liturgy, employing a vernacular language when speaking to people of the same native tongue at the Vatican may also have begun to lose its taboo. The maintenance of Latin as a universal language among the clergy has historically been closely linked to its sacred function. If an act of divine worship no longer required the use of a sacred tongue, why should casual speech?

The change in Latin usage at the Vatican can also be linked to the abandonment of Latin fluency as a mainstream Latin educational goal in the Western world, the source upon which the Vatican relies for the bulk of its new members. Because of this change the Vatican can be described in terms of two generations, which we do not differentiate by age so much as by their perspective of the Latin language instilled in them through their education. Fr. Foster caught the tail end of the older of these two ‘linguistic’ generations. Like the Vatican clerics before him, he was taught to speak Latin and to think of it as a modern language. Consequently, when he entered the Vatican community in the late 1960s, he had no trouble adopting the traditional Vatican mores that required Latin to be spoken as the preferred language during casual discourse. This is despite the fact that the use of spoken Latin had already begun to decline in some Vatican circles. Indeed, Fr. Foster even became one of the culture’s language experts. On the other hand, neither Fr. Schöch<sup>26</sup> nor Msgr. Calkins<sup>27</sup> ever learned to speak Latin; they were taught to think of it as a dead language before they entered the Vatican. Resultantly, they do not speak Latin, and use it in a non-sacred, modern context only when Vatican cultural norms

---

<sup>26</sup> cf. Appendix V. a.

absolutely demand it. They represent the new linguistic generation, which began to enter the Vatican in the 1970s.

Since the taboos concerning the use of vernacular languages had been broken either because of the increase of non-Western prelates at the Vatican or because Latin was no longer required for sacred worship, the mores governing Latin use in casual dialogue were not imposed upon the new generation when they arrived. Whereas the ability to speak in Latin would have previously been demanded of Westerners, the trends in Western Latin education made this far less practical. The ability to speak Latin had rapidly become a rarity. The new generation entering the Vatican could not conform to the linguistic mores of the standing culture, and the society was not prepared to teach the new members itself. The precedent of being “charitable” to those who had trouble conversing in Latin had already been established (presumably) for some non-Westerners; this allowance was expanded to include the new generation. As the portion of new generation speakers increased within the Vatican’s population, the opportunity to use spoken Latin as an effective means of communication became so rare that it ceased to be a feasible option. What had been an exception, now became the rule, (though not yet acknowledged officially). In turn, this inactivity caused Latin to become a dormant language for many members of the old generation, who could once speak it fluently. We see evidence for this change in Fr. Foster’s account of Paul VI, who had become out of practice in his spoken Latin by 1973.

---

<sup>27</sup> cf. Appendix IV. a.

## CONCLUSION

As we have seen, Latin is indeed still used as a modern language by the Vatican City State, or Holy See. In the past, its application was ubiquitous, utilized for all communicative actions. It was the ‘official’ language, the ‘sacred’ language, and the ‘cordial’ language. Now, its application has changed. Latin is used only in its ‘official’ function (by mandate) and its ‘sacred’ function (by preference), but has fallen out of use as a ‘cordial’ or ‘spoken’ language used for unique and spontaneous oral self-expression throughout most of the Vatican. This means that the initial hypothesis was only partially correct. Latin is still the ‘second language’ of members of Vatican society insofar as it is exclusively the language used for official actions and predominantly used for sacred actions. It is no longer, however, the chosen language employed casually between most members of the Vatican City State, who are of different native tongues.

Yet, while its application necessarily has changed as a result of the lack of speaking fluency in new members, its cultural function has remained the same. This is demonstrated by the unresolved social crisis created by not using oral Latin in cordial speech. No language but Latin (which is largely inaccessible) is entirely free of connotation or perceived favoritism among all members of the Holy See. Vatican culture, therefore, still anticipates the use of Latin in casual discourse, even though most of its inhabitants are no longer capable of speaking it freely. We see this in Fr. Schöch’s description of Latin as being “more international” than Italian. We see this in the words of Msgr. Calkins, who acknowledges the ideal of spoken Latin, while at the same time denying it the status of a modern language. This contradiction is to be expected,

however, among the generation of clerics who never saw a Latin-speaking Vatican, because they have inherited Vatican culture from a generation that did speak Latin.

Language is central to culture, and the Latin culture surrounding the papacy and the Roman Curia has been developing for over fifteen hundred years. Despite external influences, this culture has not changed so quickly as its Latin usage because the internal demand for a language, that can function at the Vatican as Latin has in the past, remains (i.e., the population of the Vatican remains international in character). The change in usage, rather, reflects a failure of the community to pass on the fullness of its language use to new members. Indubitably, this situation will lead to a permanent cultural solution, which may come in the form of the adoption of another language (or possibly other languages) to take Latin's place or the resurrection of spoken Latin itself. Indeed, while the lack of cultural change in the presence of a diverged linguistic circumstance demonstrates a slowness on the part of the culture to react to sudden changes, it does not necessitate a permanent move away from spoken Latin. To the contrary, the cultural reaction may well come not in the form of a yielding to external influences, but in the form of a revival of its internal customs. It may result in a renewed emphasis on the language at the center of its culture, which was allowed to fall to the wayside because it had been taken for granted. This latter reaction is a common phenomenon known to anthropologists as 'language loyalty.'<sup>28</sup>

At this point, we may decide whether the Vatican meets our definition of a sustained community. For this study has shown there to be a serious deficiency in the

---

<sup>28</sup> cf. Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 2003

community's ability (or willingness) to pass along one of its chief and most impressive uses of Latin as a modern language to new members. In this regard, Vatican Latin expresses the linguistic symptoms of a 'moribund' language. But what about Latin's other modern cultural functions within the Vatican? Can writing rightfully be considered the language it represents?

Silent writing and reading neglects the primary nature of the Latin language, which is vocal, and constitutes, as Fr. Schöch mentioned, "a strange knowledge of Latin." It rightfully ought to be considered an equally valid (though perhaps secondary) use of the Latin language, however.<sup>29</sup> Writing Latin without speaking it deprives written Latin of neither its meaning nor its Latinity. Hence, the Vatican's use of written Latin is both rightly considered to be that of a modern language and to be Latin.

Even if a spoken Latin revival never comes and a new language (perhaps Italian) replaces Latin functionally within Vatican culture, the use of written Latin as a means of communication between modern communicators has been consistently maintained. The same can be said to some extent for the 'sacred' or 'liturgical' use of the Latin language. This means that the Holy See meets our definition of a sustained community, consistently uses Latin as a modern language, and passes this usage on to new members. Latin, therefore, does not fit the linguistic definition of 'dead,' which describes a language that "ceases to be used by a community."<sup>30</sup> Latin is indeed both a modern language as well as an ancient language because it has been consistently used as a modern language for twenty-five centuries.

---

<sup>29</sup> cf. Crystal, David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. 1987. 179



The information gathered in this initial study is not expansive enough to determine how many members of Vatican society are fluent in Latin. Nor can it be conclusively determined how many of them still use Latin as their main form of communication. While there may be other groups within the Vatican that still speak Latin on a regular basis, this study has only revealed the Office of Latin Letters for certain. Concerning the rest of the Vatican, both Msgr. Calkins and Fr. Schöch, who only rate themselves as ‘functional’ in Latin, believe they use the language more frequently than most. The other three participants support this account of the general use of Latin by the Vatican community. This means Latin fits the linguistic definition of an ‘endangered’ language because there remain a handful of speakers, perhaps less than twenty, who still speak it regularly; but it has no native speakers and is competing with the dominant language of the surrounding area, Italian.

If we are correct in assuming that Fr. Foster marks the (virtual) end of the old linguistic generation, it can be assumed that the majority of the surviving members of this group are now in their seventies or older. This fact, makes the need for a full-length study on the changes in the use of spoken Latin by the Vatican City State ever more urgent. The expiration of the living memory of an entirely Latin-speaking Vatican is quickly approaching and will soon render all first-hand accounts of this culture utterly lost.

*Iam opus perfecti egomet totum  
da mihi pro Christi nomine potum!*

---

<sup>30</sup> Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 2003

## Appendix I: *Field Documents*

I. a.

## Iura Participis Percontationis

Ex lege Americana mihi explananda sunt certa jura tua quae particeps percontationis habes subsequenta.

- 1) Tibi licet aliquando percontationem avocare.
- 2) Tibi ullis quaestionibus quibus nolis respondere non necesse est.
- 3) Si personam tuam agnoscere ceteros nolis, voluntate tua mihi narrata, in editione non nomineris, sed a me procuratoreque meo solo nomen tuum agnoscatur. Tibi item licet responsa tua emendare.

Me attingere subsequentibus poteris:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Procuraticem meam attingere subsequentibus poteris:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

De quaestionibus jurum tuorum, quae particeps investigationis habes, in universitate mea Officinam Promotionis Litterarum Docendique (OAST) attingere subsequenti numero telephoni poteris: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

Gratias tibi ago ob magnanimum adjumentum tuum.

## Rights of the Interview Participant

United States federal law requires that you be made aware of the following rights, which you hold as a participant in a research project.

- 1) You may withdraw from this interview at anytime.
- 2) You are not obligated to answer questions you do not wish to answer.
- 3) If for any reason you wish your identity to be suppressed, tell me this and it shall remain known only to myself and my supervisor, but shall be suppressed in any publication. Likewise, should you wish information given by you to be amended, this may be done at anytime by informing me of your will.

You will be able to contact me at the following address:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

You will be able to contact my supervisor at the following address:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, you will be able to contact my university's Office of Advancement of Scholarship and Teaching at the following telephone number: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

Thank you for your magnanimous cooperation.

I. c.

## Iura Personae Observatae

Domine,

Scholasticus linguae Latinae ex Universitate Miamiense investigo linguae Latinae usum ut linguam hodiernam in Urbe Vaticana. In qua investigatione, ut scias me usurum esse scientia, quam die \_\_\_\_\_ Iulii in \_\_\_\_\_ collegerim dum te observem, tibi hoc epistulum misi. Sive participem esse investigationis meae nolis, sive personam tuam agnosci in editione nolis, voluntatem tuam mihi narra. Si personam tuam agnosci in editione nolis, a me procuratoreque meo solo nomen tuum agnoscatur. Me attingere subsequentibus poteris:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Procuraticem meam attingere subsequentibus poteris:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

De quaestionibus jurum tuorum, quae particeps investigationis habes, in universitate mea Officinam Promotionis Litterarum Docendique (OAST) attingere subsequenti numero telephoni poteris: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

Sincere,

M. T. Connaughton

I. d.

## Rights of Persons Who Have Been Observed

Dear Sir,

I am a student of Latin at Miami University (Ohio, USA) currently researching the use of Latin as a modern language by the Vatican City State. I write to inform you that it is my intention to use information gathered whilst observing you on the \_\_\_\_\_ of July 2002 during \_\_\_\_\_. If you should wish not to be a participant in this study, or for your identity to be suppressed in the publication of my thesis, please inform me. In the case of the latter, your identity will be known only to my supervisor and myself. You will be able to contact me at the following address:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

You will be able to contact my supervisor at the following address:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, you will be able to contact my university's Office of Advancement of Scholarship and Teaching at the following telephone number: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

Sincerely,

M. T. Connaughton

I. e.

## Introductory Letter: Priest (Latin)

Romae, die ?? Iulii, anno Domini MMII

Reverende Domine,

Hoc epistolum te bene inveniat. Scholasticus ego linguae Latinae ex Universitate Miamiensi investigo linguae Latinae usum ut linguae hodiernae in Urbe Vaticana. Si placet, Reverentiam Tuam percontari magnopere velim de Latina eruditione tua et usu tuo linguae Latinae ut linguae hodiernae. Percontatio coram Anglice (an Latine, si non Anglice loqui potes) administretur, et unam horam tantum habeat, et in loco commodo Reverentiae Tuae. Sive mihi percontari te permittere vis, sive quaestionario respondere mavis, me attingere subsequentibus sub indicatiis poteris in diem 5 Augusti, quo Roma abibo.

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 58331116

E-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Humillimus servus  
Reverentiae Tuae,

Michael T. Connaughton

I. f.

## Introductory Letter: Priest (English)

In Rome, July ??, 2002

Your Reverence,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am a student of Latin from Miami University conducting a study on the use of Latin as a modern language by the Vatican City State. If it pleases, I would very much like to interview Your Reverence concerning your Latin education and your personal experience using Latin as a modern language. The interview would be conducted in English (or Latin if necessary), would take no more than one hour, and would be at a location of convenience for Your Reverence. If you are willing to be interviewed, or to fill-out a simple questionnaire, I can be reached at the following address until I leave Rome on August 5<sup>th</sup>:

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 58331116

E-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

The humble servant  
of Your Reverence,

Michael T. Connaughton



I. g.

## Introductory Letter: Bishop (Latin)

Romae, die ?? Iulii, anno Domini MMII

Reverendissime Domine,

Hoc epistolum te bene inveniatur. Scholasticus ego linguae Latinae ex Universitate Miamiensi investigo linguae Latinae usum ut linguae hodiernae in Urbe Vaticana. Si placet, Excellentiam Tuam percontari magnopere velim de Latina eruditione tua et usu tuo linguae Latinae ut linguae hodiernae. Percontatio coram Anglice (an Latine, si non Anglice loqui potes) administretur, et unam horam tantum habeat, et in loco commodo Excellentiae Tuae. Sive mihi percontari te permittere vis, sive quaestionario respondere mavis, me attingere subsequentibus sub indicibus poteris in diem 5 Augusti, quo Roma abibo.

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 58331116

E-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Humillimus servus  
Excellentiae Tuae,

Michael T. Connaughton

I. h.

## Introductory Letter: Bishop (English)

In Rome, July ??, 2002

Your Excellency,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am a student of Latin from Miami University conducting a study on the use of Latin as a modern language by the Vatican City State. If it pleases, I would very much like to interview Your Excellency concerning your Latin education and your personal experience using Latin as a modern language. The interview would be conducted in English (or Latin if necessary), would take no more than one hour, and would be at a location of convenience for Your Excellency. If you are willing to be interviewed, or to fill-out a simple questionnaire, I can be reached at the following address until I leave Rome on August 5<sup>th</sup>:

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 58331116

E-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

The humble servant  
of Your Excellency,

Michael T. Connaughton

## Introductory Letter: Cardinal (Latin)

Romae, die ?? Iulii, anno Domini MMII

Eminentissime Domine,

Hoc epistolium te bene inveniatur. Scholasticus ego linguae Latinae ex Universitate Miamiensi investigo linguae Latinae usum ut linguae hodiernae in Urbe Vaticana. Si placet, Eminentiam Tuam percontari magnopere velim de Latina eruditione tua et usu tuo linguae Latinae ut linguae hodiernae. Percontatio coram Anglice (an Latine, si non Anglice loqui potes) administretur, et unam horam tantum habeat, et in loco commodo Eminentiae Tuae. Sive mihi percontari te permittere vis, sive quaestionario respondere mavis, me attingere subsequentibus sub indicibus poteris in diem 5 Augusti, quo Roma abibo.

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 58331116

E-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Humillimus servus  
Eminentiae Tuae,

Michael T. Connaughton

I. j.

## Introductory Letter: Cardinal (English)

In Rome, July ??, 2002

Your Eminence,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am a student of Latin from Miami University conducting a study on the use of Latin as a modern language by the Vatican City State. If it pleases, I would very much like to interview Your Eminence concerning your Latin education and your personal experience using Latin as a modern language. The interview would be conducted in English (or Latin if necessary), would take no more than one hour, and would be at a location of convenience for Your Eminence. If you are willing to be interviewed, or to fill-out a simple questionnaire, I can be reached at the following address until I leave Rome on August 5<sup>th</sup>:

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 58331116

E-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

The humble servant  
of Your Eminence,

Michael T. Connaughton

N.B. The “Questionnaire” given to correspondents is identical to the “Interview Protocol” except that the following subtitle reads “Questionnaire” and that extra spacing between each question was given to allow for written answers.

## **Modern Latin Usage**

### *Interview Protocol (English)*

Name:

Age:

Date of Ordination/Religious Consecration:

Country of Citizenship:

Current Title/Official Position:

Length of Time at the Vatican City State:

#### LANGUAGE EDUCATION:

What is your native language?:

Are you proficient in any other languages?:

Please list these languages:

Have you ever studied Latin formally?:

For how long did your formal studies continue?:

Did this training focus on Classical Latin  
or Ecclesiastical Latin of a later period?:

Which aspects of Latin were stressed most in your education;  
reading/translation; writing composition; speaking impromptu?:

Which did you most enjoy?:

#### GENERAL USE OF LATIN:

Are you able to converse comfortably in Latin both orally and in writing?:

Would you categorize your general ability in Latin as ‘remedial’, ‘functional’, ‘proficient’, or ‘fluent’?

How frequently do you speak Latin in an informal context?:

Why is Latin used instead of another language?:

## I. k. (continued)

To which groups of people do you most often speak informally in Latin?:

Has the frequency of your general use of Latin changed over time?:

How has it changed?:

In your own opinion, why has this change occurred?:

In what ways does your use of Latin differ from your use of other modern languages?:

Why do you think these differences exist?:

### PROFESSIONAL USE OF LATIN:

Are there professional duties that require you to use Latin?:

How frequently and in what contexts must you...

read Latin texts?:

read Latin texts aloud?:

write in Latin?:

speak in Latin impromptu?:

To which groups of people must you most often speak in Latin?:

Has the frequency of your general use of Latin changed over time?:

How has it changed?:

In your own opinion, why has this change occurred?:

In what contexts at the Vatican do you find it most advantageous to use Latin?:

In what contexts at the Vatican do you find it most burdensome to use Latin?:

### PRECEPTIONS OF LATIN USE AT THE VATICAN:

In comparison with other Vatican personnel, would you describe the frequency of your daily Latin usage as 'below average', 'average', or 'above average'?:

I. k. (continued)

How common is it to hear Latin spoken informally at the Vatican?:

Do you believe that the use of Latin within the Vatican City State promotes a common Vatican identity among its citizens and personnel?:

In what respects?:

Why do you think the Vatican continues to identify Latin as its official language?:

Has the use of Latin at the Vatican changed over time?:

In your opinion, how will the use of Latin at the Vatican change in the future?:

Do you have any further observations you would like to share?:

May I contact you in the future should I have follow-up questions?:

## I. 1.

In Oxfordiense, die ?? Augusti, 2002

Reverende Domine,

Gratias tibi ago quod inquisitioni meae epistulae die ?? Iulii tibi missae respondisti. Tuae Reverentiae responsionem in renuntiationem meam disputare proferreque (si necesse erit) atque in appendicibus includere volo. Si epistulam vel personam Reverentiae Tuae agnoscere ceteros nolis, quam primum quaeso me denuntia. Si hoc cum ita sit, voluntate tua mihi narrata, in ultimo exemplare non nomineris, sed a me procuratoreque meo solo nomen tuum agnoscatur. Si non mihi respondebis, omnia esse bene sumam. Me vel procuratorem attingere subsequentibus sub indiciis poteris:

M. T. Connaughton  
224 Bishop Hall  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-2064

e-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

(Procuratrix mea)

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall, Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

De quaestionibus jurum tuorum, quae particeps investigationis habes, in universitate mea Officinam Promotionis Litterarum Docendique (OAST) attingere subsequenti numero telefoni poteris: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

Maneo...

Humillimus servus  
Reverentiae Tuae,

Michael Connaughton



I. m.  
In Oxford, August ??, 2002

Reverend Lordship,

Thank you for responding to the inquiry of my previous letter of July ??. I would like to discuss Your Reverence's response letter in the write-up of my thesis, quote it (if necessary), and include it amongst my appendices. If Your Reverence wishes your letter or identity to be suppressed in the final version of my thesis, please contact me as soon as possible. In the latter instance, the name of Your Reverence will remain known only to my supervisor and me. I shall assume that you consent to my above mentioned requests, if you do not respond. Your Reverence will be able to reach my supervisor or me by means of the following information.

M. T. Connaughton  
224 Bishop Hall  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-2064

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

(My Supervisor)

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall, Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, Your Reverence will be able to contact my university's Office of Advancement of Scholarship and Teaching at the following telephone number: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

I remain...

The humble servant  
of Your Reverence,

Michael Connaughton

I. n.

In Oxfordiense, die ?? Augusti, 2002

Reverendissime Domine,

Gratias tibi ago quod inquisitioni meae epistulae die ?? Iulii tibi missae respondisti. Tuae Excellentiae responsionem in renuntiationem meam disputare proferreque (si necesse erit) atque in appendicibus includere volo. Si epistulam vel personam Excellentiae Tuae agnoscere ceteros nolis, quam primum quaeso me denuntia. Si hoc cum ita sit, voluntate tua mihi narrata, in ultimo exemplare non nomineris, sed a me procuratoreque meo solo nomen tuum agnoscatur. Si non mihi respondebis, omnia esse bene sumam. Me vel procuratorem attingere subsequentibus sub indiciis poteris:

M. T. Connaughton  
224 Bishop Hall  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-2064

e-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

(Procuratrix mea)

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall, Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

De quaestionibus jurum tuorum, quae particeps investigationis habes, in universitate mea Officinam Promotionis Litterarum Docendique (OAST) attingere subsequenti numero telefoni poteris: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

Maneo...

Humillimus servus  
Excellentiae Tuae,

Michael Connaughton

I. o.  
In Oxford, August ??, 2002

Most Reverend Lordship,

Thank you for responding to the inquiry of my previous letter of July ??. I would like to discuss Your Excellency's response letter in the write-up of my thesis, quote it (if necessary), and include it amongst my appendices. If Your Excellency wishes your letter or identity to be suppressed in the final version of my thesis, please contact me as soon as possible. In the latter instance, the name of Your Excellency will remain known only to my supervisor and me. I shall assume that you consent to my above mentioned requests, if you do not respond. Your Excellency will be able to reach my supervisor or me by means of the following information.

M. T. Connaughton  
224 Bishop Hall  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-2064

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

(My Supervisor)

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall, Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, Your Excellency will be able to contact my university's Office of Advancement of Scholarship and Teaching at the following telephone number: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

I remain...

The humble servant  
of Your Excellency,

Michael Connaughton

I. p.

In Oxfordiense, die ?? Augusti, 2002

Eminentissime Domine,

Gratias tibi ago quod inquisitioni meae epistulae die ?? Iulii tibi missae respondisti. Tuae Eminentiae responsionem in renuntiationem meam disputare proferreque (si necesse erit) atque in appendicibus includere volo. Si epistulam vel personam Eminentiae Tuae agnoscere ceteros nolis, quam primum quaeso me denuntia. Si hoc cum ita sit, voluntate tua mihi narrata, in ultimo exemplare non nomineris, sed a me procuratoreque meo solo nomen tuum agnoscatur. Si non mihi respondebis, omnia esse bene sumam. Me vel procuratorem attingere subsequentibus sub indiciis poteris:

M. T. Connaughton  
224 Bishop Hall  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-2064

e-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

(Procuratrix mea)

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall, Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

De quaestionibus jurum tuorum, quae particeps investigationis habes, in universitate mea Officinam Promotionis Litterarum Docendique (OAST) attingere subsequenti numero telefoni poteris: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

Maneo...

Humillimus servus  
Eminentiae Tuae,

Michael Connaughton

I. q.  
In Oxford, August ??, 2002

Most Eminent Lordship,

Thank you for responding to the inquiry of my previous letter of July ??. I would like to discuss Your Eminence's response letter in the write-up of my thesis, quote it (if necessary), and include it amongst my appendices. If Your Eminence wishes your letter or identity to be suppressed in the final version of my thesis, please contact me as soon as possible. In the latter instance, the name of Your Eminence will remain known only to my supervisor and me. I shall assume that you consent to my above mentioned requests, if you do not respond. Your Eminence will be able to reach my supervisor or me by means of the following information.

M. T. Connaughton  
224 Bishop Hall  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-2064

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

(My Supervisor)

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall, Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, Your Eminence will be able to contact my university's Office of Advancement of Scholarship and Teaching at the following telephone number: 00-1-(513) 529-3734.

I remain...

The humble servant  
of Your Eminence,

Michael Connaughton

## Appendix II: *Calendar of Correspondences*

## Calendar of Correspondences

### *Timeline*

#### **June 3, 2002**

Communiqué sent to:  
Reverendus Pater Joseph Murphy (*III. n.*)

#### **June 4, 2002**

Communiqué sent to:  
Monsignor Michael Banach (*III. o.*)

#### **June 8, 2002**

Recusatio et Testimonium sent by:  
Reverendus Pater Joseph Murphy (*III. a.*)

#### **July 4, 2002**

Response sent to:  
Reverendus Pater Joseph Murphy (*III. h.*)

Second Communiqué sent to:  
Monsignor Michael Banach (*III. p.*)

#### **July 12, 2002**

Rank-appropriate Introductory Letters in both Latin and English sent to (*I. e.-j.*):  
 Reverendus Pater Ivan Fucek  
 Reverendus Pater Gutierrez Domingo Javier Andres C.M.F.  
 Reverendus Pater Nikolaus Schöch O.F.M.  
 Monsignor Arthur Burton Calkins  
 Monsignor Salvatore Cordileone  
 Monsignor Jean-Marie Gervais  
 Monsignor Joaquin Llobell  
 Reverendissimus Monsignor Joseph R. Punderson  
 Reverendissimus Monsignor Abdou Yaacoub  
 Excellens et Reverendissimus Monsignor Luigi De Magistris

## II. (continued)

Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Gilberto Cardinal Agustoni  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Fiorenzo Cardinal Angelini  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Lorenzo Cardinal Antonetti  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Corrado Cardinal Bafile  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus William Wakefield Cardinal Baum  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Agostino Cardinal Cacciavillan  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Giovanni Cardinal Canestri  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Giuseppe Cardinal Caprio  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Hoyos Dario Cardinal Castrillon  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Mario Francesco Cardinal Pompedda  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger

### July 15, 2002

Recusatio received from:

Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Hoyos Dario Cardinal Castrillon (*III. b.*)

Monsignor Jean-Marie Gervais (*III. d.*)

Monsignor Arthur Burton Calkins (*III. c.*)

Response (via e-mail) sent to:

Monsignor Arthur Burton Calkins (*III. s.*)

### July 17, 2002

Response and Questionnaire sent to:

Monsignor Arthur Burton Calkins (*III. l.*) (*I. k.*)

Monsignor Camille Perl (*III. i.*) (*I. k.*)

Response (Latin and English) and Questionnaire sent to:

Monsignor Jean-Marie Gervais (*III. j.-k.*) (*I. k.*)

### July 19, 2002

Completed Questionnaire received from:

Monsignor Arthur Burton Calkins (*IV. a.*)

### July 23, 2002

Recusatio received from:

Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Agostino Cardinal Cacciavillan (*III. e.*)



## II. (continued)

### July 25, 2002

Acceptio received from:  
Reverendus Pater Nikolaus Schöch O.F.M. (*III. g.*)

### July 28, 2002

Response and Questionnaire sent to:  
Reverendus Pater Nikolaus Schöch O.F.M. (*III. m.*) (*I. k.*)

### July 29, 2002

Recusatio received from:  
Eminentissimus et Reverendissimus Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (*III. f.*)

Telephone contact with:  
Reverendus Pater Nikolaus Schöch O.F.M.

### July 30, 2002

Communiqué (Latin and English) sent to:  
Pater Anacleto Pavanetto (*III. q.-r.*)

Interview with:  
Reverendus Pater Nikolaus Schöch O.F.M. (*V. a.*)

### August 4, 2002

Interview with:  
Reverendus Pater Reginaldus Foster (*V. b.*)

## Appendix III: *Archive of Correspondences*

### III. a.

#### Recusatio et Testimonium Reverentiae Suae: Pater Joseph Murphy

Fr. Joseph Murphy  
Secretariat of State

Vatican City, June 8, 2002

Dear Mr. Connaughton,

I am writing in reply to your recent letter regarding the use of Latin here in the Vatican City.

I am not too sure how I can be of extra assistance to you, seeing that you will be studying Latin during the summer with Fr. Reginald Foster, the *peritus in materia*. As Fr. Buffer has probably told you, Fr. Foster works in the Latin-language section of the Secretariat of State. As he has first-hand experience of the contexts in which Latin is used at the Holy See, he would be the best person to ask.

Speaking generally, Latin still has an important role, although it is infrequently used as a spoken language. The authoritative version of the Church's legal texts, such as the *Codex Iuris Canonici*, and major Papal documents is the Latin one. Papal Bulls, e.g. for the appointment of Bishops or the establishment of dioceses, and various other kinds of correspondence are drawn up in Latin. Latin is also used in sentences of the various tribunals of the Holy See, such as the Segnatura and the Rota.

Apart from documents, the other main use of Latin is in the liturgy. If you go to St. Peter's during your stay in Rome, you will be able to assist at Mass (10.30 on Sundays, 5 p.m. on weekdays) and Vespers (5 p.m. on Sundays) celebrated in Latin. Mass will be celebrated in Latin (for the most part) at St. Peter's by the Holy Father in Latin on June 29 – if you wish to attend, you can write for tickets to the Prefecture of the Papal Household, Vatican City.

I do not know if it will be possible to meet during your stay, as I am on vacation for the month of July. However, Fr. Foster will certainly be able to guide your steps!

With good wishes for your Latin studies, I am

Yours sincerely,

Fr. Joseph Murphy

### III. b.

## Recusatio Eminentiae Suae: Hoyos Dario Cardinal Castrillon et Testimonium: Monsignor Camille Perl

N. B. The original message, which was received by fax, was handwritten.

Pontificia Commissio “Ecclesia Dei”

fax: all’ attenzione del Sñ M. T. Connaughton

15 iulii MMII

Egregie Domine,

Litteras Tuas die 12 iulii huius omni datas hodie invenimur. Sed opus est dicere quod Eminentissimus Dominus Cardinalis Dario Castrillon hoc tempore in Urbe non est, sed in patria sua Columbia vocationibus annis gaudet.

Licet mihi quaerere, utrum sit valde conveniens, iuvenes (?) scholasticos venerabiles Ecclesiae Principes, Cardinales aut Episcopos aut alias Sanctae Sedis cooperatores, ac si fuissent condiscipulos eiusdem scholae, simpliciter “percontari” aut perscrutari.

Lingua autem “officialis” Sanctae Sedis semper est latina, lingua autem “diplomatica” est gallica, exclusa semper illa anglica, quae pulchritudine omnino caret et, quamvis hodie diffussiissima, barbarica manet. Valde ergo convenit, anglophonos Romanorum linguam discere atque diffundere.

Valeas!

Camille Perl a secretii

### III. b. ii.

#### Versio Testimonii: Monsignor Camille Perl

Pontifical Commission ‘Ecclesia Dei’

15 July, 2002

Noble Lord,

We discovered today your letters sent to us all on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of this July. But it is necessary to say that His Most Eminent Lordship Dario Cardinal Castrillon is not in the City at this time, but is enjoying his annual vacation in his homeland Columbia.

Permit me to question whether it would be very appropriate to “interview” [*percontari*] or, more simply, to investigate [*perscrutari*] the young seminarians (?), the venerable Princes of the Church, either Cardinals or Bishops or other employees of the Holy See, as if they were peers of the same class.

The Latin language has always been the “official” language of the Holy See, the “diplomatic” language, however, is French; that English, which is devoid of all beauty and, although today is most widespread, remains barbaric, is forever excluded. Therefore, it is very much agreed that English speakers are to learn and pour forth the language of the Romans.

Farewell!

— Camille Perl, secretary

Recusatio et Testimonium: Monsignor Arthur Calkins

[E-mail Response] 15 July, 2002

SUBJECT: Latin Interview

Care Domne Connaughton,

Salutationes in cordibus Jesu et Mariæ. Thank you for your recent communication. I understand that Msgr. Perl (who is a far better Latinist than I) has already answered you on behalf of Cardinal Castrillón (who is now on holiday) in lingua latina.

I don't believe that there would be much to be gained by an interview with me. I frequently celebrate Mass in Latin, occasionally recite the breviary in Latin (and am comfortable going to the liturgy of the hours in communities which recite it in Latin) and for research purposes am able to use my knowledge of Latin in consulting papal and theological texts. I am also always happy to support the celebration of the Church's liturgy in Latin according to the present liturgical books or those of 1962. I do not, however, use Latin as a spoken or modern language. Even if the official language of the Holy See is Latin, the de facto language is Italian.

Oremus pro invicem!

In cordibus Jesu et Mariæ,  
Msgr. Arthur B. Calkins

III. d.

Recusatio Reverentiae Suae: Pater Jean-Marie Gervais

Joannes Maria Gervais  
Paenitentiarum Apostolica  
fax: XX.XXXXXXXXXXX

Alla cortese attenzione di:  
M. T. Connaughton (room 5)  
c/o Suore Francescane della Croce  
Roma

Prot. N. XXX/XX

Romae, die 15 iulii 2002

Egregie Domine,

in Apostolica Paenitentiarum lingua (instrumentum) et materies (casus conscientiae) quae per ipsam exprimitur sunt adeo inter se conexas ut valde difficile possent invicem disiungi.

Sed casus conscientiae sunt sub strictissimo secreto tegendi.

Et ideo desideriis Dominationis Tuae non valeo satisfacere.

Quod attinet vero ad meam personalem "historiam" in lingua latina addiscenda et adhibenda, res est minimi momenti, et non est operae pretium de illa inquirere.

Accepta Tibi sit mea salutatio et, Domino benigne concedente, valeas

+Aloisius De Uli...

Pac. Ioannes Maria Gervais

III. e.

## Recusatio Eminentiae Suae: Agostino Cardinal Cacciavillan

Amministrazione del Patrimonio della Sede Apostolica  
00120 Vatican City – Rome-Italy

Mr. Michael T. Connaughton  
c/o Suore Francescane della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Vatican City, 23 July 2002

Dear Mr. Connaughton,

Thank you for your kind letter of July 12.

I am glad to know of you as a student of Miami University and of you as a student of Miami University and of your special interest for the Latin language.

As to your request for interviewing me I would ask to kindly be excused. Of course, I am confident you know the way to eventually contact those at the Vatican who are in a position to meet your wish.

With cordial greetings,

+ A. Card. Cacciavillon



III. f.

## Recusatio Eminentiae Suae: Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger

Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger  
Sekretariat  
I-00120 Città del Vaticano

Mr. Michael T. Connaughton  
Suore Franciscane della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera 19 – Stanza 5  
00152 Roma  
Fax: XX.XXX.XXXXX

July 29, 2002

Dear Mr. Connaughton

His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger has asked me to thank you for your letter of July 12, 2002, in which you requested an interview with him on the use of the Latin language.

The Cardinal regrets to respond that, because of the intensity of his schedule, it will not be possible for him to grant an interview at the present time.

He would recommend that you contact the President of the “Latinitas” Foundation here in Vatican City:

Father Anacleto Pavanetto, S.D.B.  
Fondazione “Latinitas”  
00120 Città del Vaticano

tel. XX.XXXX.XX.XX

Trusting in your understanding, and with prayerful best wishes, I remain Sincerely yours  
in Christ,

Birgit Wansing

III. g.

Acceptio: Pater Nikolaus Schöch

[E-mail Response] 25 July, 2002

SUBJECT: [Blank]

Dear Mr. Connaughton,

I received your letter at the Tribunal of the Signatura Apostolica. I am Refenderarius (at the Congregations it is called "Consultor") at that Tribunal as the other Deans of the Faculties of Canon Law. I am also depute-defender of the Bond at the Roman Rota. If an hour of conversation with me would be useful for you, you can come and visit me at the Pontifical Athenaeum Antonianum, Via Merulana XXXX, entrance on the upper side of our Basilica. I shall be here till the middle of August because I am preparing articles and book reviews in canon law.

My phone numbers are: XX/XXXXXXXX or cell. XXX/XXXXXXXX

Yours sincereley

Fr. Nikolaus Schöch (Dean)

III. h.

## Response to Father Joseph Murphy

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Reverendo Padre Murphy  
Secretariat di Stato  
00120 Citta del Vaticano  
Europa

July 4, 2002

Your Reverence,

Your gracious and prompt response to my inquiry concerning a possible meeting, which you sent on June 8, was eagerly received. Thank you for your generous consideration. I would still like very much to meet with Your Reverence in person, should a free moment grace your schedule.

I shall be in Rome until August 5<sup>th</sup>. Your Reverence can contact me at the following address, should you be so inclined.

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax (addressed to M. T. Connaughton): XX XXXXXXXX  
E-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Kind Regards,

Michael Connaughton

P. S. Please feel free to extend my invitation to any of your colleagues, whom you believe may be willing to be interviewed about their use of the Latin language.

### III. i.

## Response to Monsignor Camille Perl

In Rome, July 17, in the year of Our Lord, 2002

Reverende Domine,

Thank you for responding so quickly to my inquiry with such a thoughtful and generous response. I would not think to take up any more of Your Reverence's limited time, but I have included with this letter a questionnaire written in English for your perusal. Should Your Reverence find the time to fill out the questionnaire, I would be most pleased.

If Your Reverence does not wish to answer certain questions, feel free to leave them unmarked. If Your Reverence does not desire to have your identity known to others, please tell me, so that I shall suppress your identity in my thesis. In that instance, Your Reverence's name shall remain known only to my supervisor and myself. Likewise, should Your Reverence desire to amend your responses, please inform me of your will.

Your Reverence shall be able to contact me by means of the following:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

My supervisor may be contacted by means of the following:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

I thank Your magnanimous Reverence for your time.

I remain...

The Humble servant  
of Your Reverence,

Michael T. Connaughton

III. j.

## Response to Father Jean-Marie Gervais (Latin)

Romae, die 17 Iulii, anno Domini MMII

Reverende Domine,

Gratias tibi ago quod inquisitioni meae tam celeriter respondisti. Quaestionarium Anglice scriptum cum hac epistula inclusi. Credo Reverentiam Tuam inventuram quaestionarium esse vacuum a quaestionibus de laboribus Paenitentiariae Apostolicae. Reverentiae Tuae vero ullis quaestionibus quibus nolis respondere non necesse est.

Si personam Reverentiae Tuae agnoscere ceteros nolis, voluntate tua mihi narrata, in editione non nomineris, sed a me procuratoreque meo solo nomen tuum agnoscatur. Reverentiae Tuae item licet responsa tua emendare.

Me attingere subsequentibus sub indiciis poteris:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Procuraticem meam attingere subsequentibus sub indiciis poteris:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

Gratias magnanimae Reverentiae Tuae ago ob tempus tuum.

Maneo...

Humillimus servus  
Reverentiae Tuae,

Michael T. Connaughton

III. k.

## Response to Father Jean-Marie Gervais (English)

In Rome, July 17, in the year of Our Lord 2002

Your Reverence,

Thank you for responding so quickly to my inquiry. I have included with this letter a questionnaire written in English. I believe that Your Reverence will find the questionnaire to be free from questions concerning the toils of the Apostolic Penitentiary. Should, however, Your Reverence not wish to answer certain questions, feel free to leave them unmarked.

If Your Reverence does not desire to have your identity known to others, please tell me, and I shall suppress your identity in my thesis. In that instance, Your Reverence's name shall remain known only to my supervisor and myself. Likewise, should Your Reverence desire to amend your responses, please inform me of your will.

Your Reverence shall be able to contact me by means of the following:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

My supervisor may be contacted by means of the following:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

I thank Your magnanimous Reverence for your time.

I remain...

The Humble servant  
of Your Reverence,

Michael T. Connaughton

### III. 1.

## Response to Monsignor Arthur Calkins

In Rome, July 17, in the year of Our Lord, 2002

Reverende Domine,

Thank you once again for responding so quickly to my inquiry with such a thoughtful and generous response. As promised, I have included with this letter a questionnaire written in English for your perusal. Should Your Reverence find the time to fill it out, I would be most pleased.

If Your Reverence does not wish to answer certain questions, feel free to leave them unmarked. If Your Reverence does not desire to have your identity known to others, please tell me, so that I shall suppress your identity in my thesis. In that instance, Your Reverence's name shall remain known only to my supervisor and myself. Likewise, should Your Reverence desire to amend your responses, please inform me of your will.

Your Reverence shall be able to contact me by means of the following:

Mr. M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(614) 336-3795

e-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

My supervisor may be contacted by means of the following:

Prof. D. E. McCoskey  
Irvin Hall Room 105  
Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056-1859  
USA

Tele: 00-1-(513) 529-1480

Fax: 00-1-(513) 529-1807

I thank Your magnanimous Reverence for your time.

I remain...

The Humble servant  
of Your Reverence,

Michael T. Connaughton

III. m.

## Response to Father Nikolaus Schöch

M. T. Connaughton  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Reverentiae Suae Father N. Schöch  
Pontificio Ateneo Antonianum  
Via Merulana, XXXX  
XXXXXX Roma

Romae, 28 Iulii, 2002

Reverende Domine,

I thank Your Reverence most earnestly for allowing me to interview you concerning your use of the Latin language. Hopefully, this letter will have reached Your Reverence by Monday 29<sup>th</sup> of July (tomorrow). I shall then be contacting Your Reverence so that we might set up a convenient time to meet.

Enclosed is the list of questions I hope to ask you. Please mark any questions you do not wish to be asked. If Your Reverence does not object, I shall record the interview on tape for purposes of later transcription.

Thank you once again; I hope to contact you shortly via telephone.

Humillimus servus  
Reverentiae Tuae,

Michael Connaughton

[encl: questionnaire (English)]



Communiqué to Father Joseph Murphy

M. T. Connaughton  
Selwyn College  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, England  
CB3 9DQ

Reverendo Padre Murphy  
Secretariat di Stato  
00120 Vatican City State  
Europe

June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2002

Your Reverence,

My name is Michael T. Connaughton; I am a student of Latin at Miami University (Ohio), who shall be studying spoken Latin this summer under the Reverend Fr. Reginald Foster. Your Reverence was referred to me by the Reverend Fr. Thomas Buffer of the Pontifical College Josephinum.

My university has requested that, to supplement my studies with the Reverend Fr. Foster, I investigate how and to what extent Latin is employed by the Vatican City State as a modern, 'living' language. I feel this exposure, if it is shown that Latin is indeed not a long 'dead' language, could be most beneficial to all in the field of Classics. For it may do well to persuade many of the importance of oral and compositional fluency in this ancient language.

For my research, I hope to gain access and observe as many Vatican proceedings as possible as well as interview Vatican residents and personnel concerning their own use of Latin. Through this, I hope to show the place and function Latin has within Vatican culture, and demonstrate accurately Latin's living nature.

I would very much like to meet and speak with you or with any of your colleagues, who would be willing to be interviewed. I shall be able to conduct the interviews in English or Latin. Please let me know if you are willing and available.

I am currently studying at the University of Cambridge and can be reached by fax addressed to 'M. T. Connaughton'; fax number: 00-44 1223 335-837. Via surface mail, the following address shall be valid until I leave for Rome on June 23<sup>rd</sup>:

### III. n. (continued)

M. T. Connaughton  
Selwyn College  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, England  
CB3 9DQ

Whilst in Rome, I shall be staying at the convent of the following address:

Suore Francescane della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152, Roma

I shall be returning to the United States on August 6<sup>th</sup>, after the conclusion of Fr. Foster's classes. Thank you for your time.

In Christo,

Michael Connaughton

## Communiqué to Monsignor Michael Banach

M. T. Connaughton  
Selwyn College  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, England  
CB3 9DQ

Reverendo Monsignor M. Banach  
Secretariat di Stato  
00120 Vatican City State  
Europe

June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002

Your Reverence,

My name is Michael T. Connaughton; I am a student of Latin at Miami University (Ohio), who shall be studying spoken Latin this summer under the Reverend Fr. Reginald Foster. Your Reverence was referred to me by the Reverend Fr. Thomas Buffer of the Pontifical College Josephinum.

In addition to my studies with the Reverend Fr. Foster, Miami University has given me a summer research grant to investigate the forms and uses of Latin within the Vatican City. For my research I hope to interview as many Vatican residents and personnel as possible concerning their own use of Latin, as well as gain access and observe as many Vatican proceedings as possible. Through this study, I hope to analyze the place and function Latin has within the Vatican's culture from both personal and structural perspectives. I shall be presenting the results of my study to the Department of Classics at Miami in a written thesis this fall, as well as making an oral presentation for the Dean of my college.

I would very much like to meet and speak with you or with any of your colleagues, who would be willing to be interviewed about this topic. I shall conduct the interviews in English at a time a place of your convenience. The interview should take approximately an hour. Please let me know if you are willing and available to be interviewed. In addition, I would appreciate any recommendations you might have about other potential interviewees or about upcoming Vatican events or proceedings that would be relevant to my project. Please feel free to forward this request to other colleagues who may be interested in participating.

I am currently studying at the University of Cambridge and can be reached by fax addressed to 'M. T. Connaughton'; fax number: 00-44 1223 335-837. Via surface mail, the following address shall be valid until I leave for Rome on June 23<sup>rd</sup>:

### III. O. (continued)

M. T. Connaughton  
Selwyn College  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, England  
CB3 9DQ

Whilst in Rome, I shall be staying at the convent of the following address:

Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152, Roma

I shall be returning to the United States on August 6<sup>th</sup>, after the conclusion of Fr. Foster's classes. Thank you for your time.

In Christo,

Michael Connaughton

## Second Communiqué to Monsignor Michael Banach

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Reverendo Monsignor M. Banach  
Secretariat di Stato  
00120 Citta del Vaticano  
Europa

July 4, 2002

Your Reverence,

One month ago, Your Reverence may recall receiving a letter sent by me in which I sought an interview with Your Reverence concerning your personal use of the Latin language. I wish to inform Your Reverence that I am now in Rome and can be reached at the following address until August 5<sup>th</sup>.

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax (addressed to M. T. Connaughton, Room 5): 06 58331116  
E-mail: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

In Christo per Mariam,

Michael Connaughton

III. q.

## Communiqué to Father Anacleto Pavanetto (Latin)

Romae, die 29 Iulii, anno Domini 2002

Reverende Domine,

Te bene haec epistula inveniatur. Scholasticus ego linguae Latinae ex Universitate Miamiensi investigo linguae Latinae usum ut linguae hodiernae in Urbe Vaticana. Eminentia Sua, Cardinal Ratzinger, me colloqui Reverentiam Tuam de re suggessit.

Si placet, Reverentiam Tuam percontari magnopere velim de Latina eruditione tua et praesertim usu tuo linguae Latinae ut linguae hodiernae. Percontatio coram Anglice administretur, et unam horam tantum habeat, et in loco commodo Reverentiae Tuae. Die 5 Augusti, Roma abibo. Vereor ut epistula satis praemonitus schedulae Reverentiae Tuae sit. Si mihi percontari te permittere potes, me attingere subsequentibus sub indiciis poteris.

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 58331116

E-inscriptio: [CONNAUMT@muohio.edu](mailto:CONNAUMT@muohio.edu)

Quaestionarium quaestionum, qui rogare volo, cum hac epistula inclusi. Si Reverentia Tua quaestionarium profeceris, gratissimus ego ero. De Fundamento Latinitate quoque ullum documentum an informationem, quam habes, desidero.

Quaestionarium ad inscriptionem supra dictam an (post diem 5 Augusti) ad subsequentem mittatur:

M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Fax: 'Prof. D. E. McCoskey' 00-1-(513) 529-1807

Humillimus servus  
Reverentiae Tuae,

Michael Connaughton

III. r.

## Communiqué to Father Anacleto Pavanetto (English)

In Rome, July 29, 2002

Reverend Lordship,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am a student of the Latin at Miami University conducting research on the use of Latin as a modern language in the Vatican City State. His Eminence, Cardinal Ratzinger, suggested that I might speak Your Reverence on this matter.

If it pleases, I would very much like to interview Your Reverence concerning your personal experience with the Latin language, in particular, its use as a modern language. The interview would be conducted in English, would take no more than one hour, and would be at a location of convenience for Your Reverence. I leave Rome on August 5<sup>th</sup>, which I fear will be too short of notice for Your Reverence. If you are available, I can be reached at the following address:

M. T. Connaughton (Room 5)  
Suore Francescane Della Croce  
Via Fratelli Bandiera, 19  
00152 Roma

Fax: 06 5833116

E-mail: CONNAUMT@muohio.edu

I have enclosed the questions I would like to ask. Should Your Reverence find the time to fill out this questionnaire, I would be most grateful. I would also appreciate any material Your Reverence might have available concerning the 'Latinitas' Foundation.

The questionnaire can be sent to the above address (before August 5<sup>th</sup>), or to the following:

M. T. Connaughton  
8960 Locherbie Ct.  
Dublin, OH 43017  
USA

Fax: 'Prof. D. E. McCoskey' 00-1-(513) 529-1807

The humble servant  
of Your Reverence,

Michael Connaughton

Response to Monsignor Arthur Calkins (via e-mail)

[E-mail Response]: 15 July, 2002

SUBJECT: Re: Latin interview

Carissime Domine Monsignor,

Benigne! Your prompt and thoughtful response to my inquiry was most generous. Part of my study is not only to investigate in what context Latin continues to function as a modern language, but also to what extent. Would you be willing to fill-out a questionnaire (in English) that I have made for my research? It is thirty-nine questions long, most of which (I gather) you could answer with a simple "no". It asks questions about your Latin education as well as your perceptions of Latin use at the Vatican at large. Even (and especially) if you do not use Latin as a modern language, that would be most helpful for me in determining to what extent Latin remains a modern language (the answer to which may be 'not at all').

I realise that you and your colleagues are extremely busy, and completely understand if you are unable to find the time to accommodate me in this regard. I shall send you a copy of the questionnaire for your perusal. There is, of course, no obligation for you to fill it out.

Thank you once again for the informative and insightful letter you have already sent me.

In Christo per Mariam,

Michael Connaughton



## Appendix IV: *Responses to Questionnaire*

## Modern Latin Usage

*Questionnaire (English)*

Name: **Msgr. Arthur B. Calkins**

Age: **57**

Date of Ordination/Religious Consecration: **07. 05. 1970**

Country of Citizenship: **U. S. A.**

Current Title/Official Position: **official of Pont. Com. "Ecclesia Dei"**

Length of Time at the Vatican City State: **13 years**

### LANGUAGE EDUCATION:

What is your native language?: **English**

Are you proficient in any other languages?: **yes**

Please list these languages: **Italian, French, Latin, Greek**

Have you ever studied Latin formally?: **yes**

For how long did your formal studies continue?: **5 years**

Did this training focus on Classical Latin  
or Ecclesiastical Latin of a later period?: **mostly classical, some ecclesiastical**

Which aspects of Latin were stressed most in your education;  
reading/translation; writing composition; speaking impromptu?:  
**reading/translation**

Which did you most enjoy?: **ecclesiastical, liturgical, Christian texts**

### GENERAL USE OF LATIN:

Are you able to converse comfortably in Latin both  
orally and in writing?: **in a limited way**

Would you categorize your general ability in Latin as  
'remedial', 'functional', 'proficient', or 'fluent'? **functional**

How frequently do you speak Latin in an informal context?: **almost never**

## IV. a. (continued)

Why is Latin used instead of another language?:

To which groups of people do you most often speak informally in Latin?:

Has the frequency of your general use of Latin changed over time?:

How has it changed?: **I use it primarily to translate liturgical, magisterial, liturgical texts**

In your own opinion, why has this change occurred?:  
**Sake of necessity**

In what ways does your use of Latin differ from your use of other modern languages?:

**I do not consider or use Latin as a modern language.**

Why do you think these differences exist?:

### PROFESSIONAL USE OF LATIN:

Are there professional duties that require you to use Latin?: **Liturgy, office work, research – study**

How frequently and in what contexts must you...

read Latin texts?: **depends on my study/research**

read Latin texts aloud?: **daily Liturgy**

write in Latin?: **rarely**

speak in Latin impromptu?: **rarely**

## IV. a. (continued)

To which groups of people must you most often speak in Latin?: **Only those with whom I cannot communicate in English, Italian, or French. This would be very rare.**

Has the frequency of your professional use of Latin changed over time?:

How has it changed?: **It is almost exclusively for liturgical, study/research use.**

In your own opinion, why has this change occurred?:

**Of necessity (*per forga*)**

In what contexts at the Vatican do you find it most advantageous to use Latin?: **When needed at work.**

In what contexts at the Vatican do you find it most burdensome to use Latin?:

**When text is difficult and a good translation is not at hand.**

PRECEPTIONS OF LATIN USE AT THE VATICAN:

In comparison with other Vatican personnel, would you describe the frequency of your daily Latin usage as 'below average', 'average', or 'above average'?:

<b>average/above average</b>
<b>Canonists would use it more.</b>

How common is it to hear Latin spoken informally at the Vatican?: **I've never heard it spoken informally, except for brief phrases.**

Do you believe that the use of Latin within the Vatican City State promotes a common Vatican identity among its citizens and personnel?:

**No**

In what respects?:

Why do you think the Vatican continues to identify Latin as its official language?:

**Inertia**

## IV. a. (continued)

Has the use of Latin at the Vatican changed over time?:

**It is used less and less.**

In your opinion, how will the use of Latin at the Vatican change in the future?:

**?**

Do you have any further observations you would like to share?:

May I contact you in the future should I have follow-up questions?:

**If you wish, but I think  
I've given a fairly clear  
picture.**

## Appendix V: *Interview Transcriptions*

V. a.

Percontatio de usu lingae Latinae cum Reverentia Sua: Pater

Nikolaus Schöch

(Tuesday, 30 July, 2002)

C – M. T. Connaughton

S – Fr. Nikolaus Schöch

C: Before we can begin, Father, I must tell you that you may withdraw from the interview at any time, you do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer, and, should you wish your identity to be suppressed in my thesis, you may have it done so by simply requesting it.

S: At the end?

C: Certainly, certainly, or at anytime, at anytime –

S: I haven't heard the questions yet [chuckling] –

C: And I will give you my contact information....

Let's begin with you Latin education: what is your country of citizenship?

S: My what?

C: Your country of citizenship.

S: Ahh, yes, okay, I am Austrian, my citizenship is Austrian. I was born near the Italian border in the Alps but the citizenship is Austrian.

C: What is your native language?

S: My native language is German.

C: Are you proficient in any other languages?

S: I am, which I know Italian, French, English, and a little bit of Spanish. And you may find it interesting that my origins of my family are in the northern Italian province of Bolzano because the origin of my family is Latin language: Ladino, lingua Ladina. I do not know how you say it in English. It is spoken in valleys of Switzerland still and in the Bolzano region is officially the third official language after Italian and German. And it was my origin because that was the name of my mother, which comes is Cantral Constan. It is Latin origin.

C: Do you have any background in that language?

S: I never learned it because it was my family spoke it until the nineteenth century. From the nineteenth century onwards they did not use it anymore. And it was when they were in the **Balgardena**, which is a valley near, close to Bolzano where it is still used as a language. This language is very similar to the Italian language now.

C: That's very interesting.

S: It's only because in its origins [chuckling] is the study of Latin.

C: Did that give you an interest, then, in learning the Latin language?

S: A bit, but I don't actually, I don't speak anymore the Ladino language because I have– The neighbors of my brother, for example, lives in Austria, Innsbruck, they still know this language. Because they are from another valley of the Bolzano which Ladin is still spoken.

C: Ahh, I see.

S: [chuckling] But there is also only some places even in Austria there is this language. I don't know how you say it in English. The language as it is called in English.

C: You say "Ladino"?

V. a. (continued)

S: Lingua Ladina, in Italian. Lingua Ladina, without, not 't', but 'd'. Like 'Dorothy'.

C: I'm not sure how we say that in English, but I believe I know someone who has actually met someone—

S: The fourth language in Switzerland is it also....

C: How long have you been at the Vatican City State?

S: I, yes, I came to Rome on the 7<sup>th</sup> of October, 1990. But I did not come to the Vatican at the beginning. I was already priest, I already worked for three years in a parish in Austria. And then I was sent to Rome to study canon law. I was Bachelor only of Theology before, and then I study two years for the license degree, two years for the Doctorate degree, and in that time I didn't do any work at the Vatican. I studied at the Vatican in the month of November 1992, at the Roman Rota, the course for lawyers. That was my beginning at the Vatican. So I was not called to Rome to work at the Vatican. But the Order sent me, my religious Province, to study canon law. And then professors for canon law recommend me to study at the Roman Rota for lawyer, for the title of lawyer.

C: So, you were then ordained in 198—

S: 88. I was deacon in 1987 and a priest in 1988. That is why I said there was three years work at the parish because already the deacon, as deacon, and then two years as priest.

C: What religious order are you?

S: I am Franciscan, O.F.M., Franciscan.

C: And your age—I'm sorry.

S: No, that's all right. I am now, in August within ten days I will be 42. Because I was born in 1960 on the 12<sup>th</sup> of August.

C: Were your canon law courses or any of your theology courses taught in Latin?

S: In Latin language, I, that was taught only at Roman Rota at the time. Because the Gregorian already had finished and I studied—there is more I can give you information Athenaeum [hands documents] there is some information, there is also something in English. And there's two reviews on our high school, because we are at the Athenaeum Pontificio Ateneo. There's good for example there is Medieval studies where there is much Latin used now. But my courses already were in Italian because here at every pontifical faculty the courses were taught in Latin language, but they finished as far as I know here in the 1970's but I don't remember the precise year. But when I stepped on in 1990 I was not taught anymore in Latin as an oral language.

C: As an oral language.

S: Yes.

C: How long were your formal studies of the Latin language?

S: I studied Latin language in Austria. And this was—how do you say in English? For this kind of school after elementary school. What is it; 'secondary' school?

C: Secondary.

S: I studied in secondary school in Austria.

C: That is four years in Austria?

S: Yes that is four years. Elementary school four years. Then four years secondary school and I started on the third year of secondary school. When my age was, I was thirteen years old.



V. a. (continued)

C: So, the third year of secondary school, how long was that before you went on to University?

S: I studied six years, before University, Latin.

C: Okay

S: For six years.

C: And then again at the University?

S: No, not anymore because at the University it was like this: I studied the first three years of jurist prudence, which I did not finish actually, because afterwards I entered the novitiate. Had to interrupt. And then there we had already we had some classes, but only the written texts in Latin. They were the cases of—how you say in English—of Justiniano. We had the Latin cases of Roman jurist prudence. Basically those we had to work written, do written exams and works on the Latin texts.

C: I see, so your exams were in Latin.

S: This was in Latin, but only exercises, written exercises, not the oral exam was done in Latin. But only the written exercises we had to do on the original Latin texts. The faculty of jurist prudence in Austria.

C: Where the written examinations, the questions, were they in Latin?

S: The cases.

C: Just the cases.

S: The cases were—actually I don't remember if the questions were in Latin. Because the was the case presented. And the case was from the legislation of Justinianus and so the *...tiones* or the *Digesta*. The fifty books.

C: So your education was mostly Classical Latin? Or did it also consist of ecclesiastical—

S: No, exclusively Classical. Exclusively. In school it was exclusively without any exceptions. First we started with the general notions of Latin with first the grammar introductions, then we started with *De Bello Gallico* of Caesar.

C: Okay.

S: And we finished with Tacito. It was the *Annales*, the last text we studied. Yes the *Annales* of Tacitus was the last book.

C: And in your classes were you expected to have some sort of proficiency, or encouraged to be proficient, in speaking Latin?

S: No. There was, it was only written. It was just translation.

C: Just translation.

S: Yes. We only studied in school to understand the language.

C: Mmm, I see.

S: It was the only language, which we never learnt to speak.

C: Ahhh.

S: Our, the emphasis was only for the understanding of the original Classical poetry. Of the Classical authors, not only poetry but also although history.

C: And there was no writing composition then, either?

S: No.

C: No; only translation.

V. a. (continued)

S: Yes. So, it was just in the beginning in order to understand the language we translated some texts from German to Latin but afterwards we only worked on the translation from Latin to German. And to have the understanding.

C: Which aspects of your Latin education did you most enjoy as you were learning it?

S: The historical aspects. The historical aspects and the history of the Roman Empire. Especially the Classical period of the Emperor August.

C: Augustus.

S: Augustus, yeh, sorry. Augustus and I am also thinking of Trajanus.

C: Are you able now to comfortably converse either written or orally in Latin?

S: Only written.

C: Only written.

S: I don't have ever used it orally. I actually don't have any experience in speaking Latin. Neither in school as spoken language, nor the University, nor at my work at the Apostolic See now where I write continuously in Latin but I never speak, because the spoken language here in the Vatican offices is now Italian nearly exclusively. It is a very particular knowledge of Latin. I read Latin without problem and I write, but never speak, so it is a very strange knowledge of Latin, which I have.

C: So would you classify yourself as 'functional,' 'proficient,' or 'fluent' in Latin?

S: In speaking?

C: Overall.

S: Functional.

C: Functional.

S: Functional.

C: Would you be able to speak Latin if you for some reason you needed to? Or do you not think that you have—

S: I used it in Hungary once with a friar. But I had a bit of difficulty again because I was not used to speaking.

C: And why was that used in that context?

S: It was that context because there was some old people because it was in a congress. I used it precisely because I was at a congress for canon law that were the international congress for canon law in September of the last year, 2001, which was hold at the University, Catholic University of Budapest, organized by them. And I just for dinner and the night I was in a convent, the Franciscan convent of Budapest. There was some, with the young friars, I could speak in German or in Italian, or in English, but with the oldest one only Italian. But this was a conversation quite difficult; less difficult for them, but more difficult for me. Because it was also a question of vocabulary, and also a question of the use of the Latin.

C: Okay, so the conversation you had with the eldest friar was in Latin?

S: Yes.

C: But with the younger friars?

S: Was in Italian or in Lat—sorry, sorry, or in English or Italian.

C: But they could not speak Latin with you.

S: No.

C: How has (if it has) the frequency of your Latin use changed over time?

V. a. (continued)

S: Now I use it very frequently, but only in two offices of the Holy See. I use it actively my activity because I distinguish between the lecture of Latin legal sources which is very—[TAPE END]

C: All right, Father, how often in your professional duties are you required to read Latin aloud. That is, allocution.

S: Ah, that is a big difference not only for me to understand. I frequently, during my lectures, as I am teaching sacramental marriage law, canon sacramental marriage law, I quite frequently cite the canons of the Code, the Oriental Code and Latin Code in Latin. And also both the jurist prudence. And also sometimes short sentences from the *Corpus Juris Canonici* so that, and especially the Digest of Justinianus. And also the Latin proverbs which, of the Clementines which are part of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* there are about I think as far as I can remember eighty-three Classical Latin proverbs of the Classical period of canon law not of the Classical period of Roman civil law.

C: I see.

S: [chuckling] So I distinguish between that. And those I quite frequently cite in Latin. But they are especially shorter sentences with Classical formulations. Which I explain, which I cite—already read them in Latin, and then I explain them. So, I still in my lectures nearly everyday use Latin but not as a long lecture.

C: So, the main language of the lecture would be in Italian; I see. Now you were saying before that there are two offices that you work for that require you to use Latin in a professional context.

S: Yes.

C: What are those offices?

S: They are the Roman Rota: the tribunals of the Roman Rota...

C: The tribunals of the Roman Rota.

S: And Apostolic Signature. Signatura Apostolica! sorry. I do not know how your say it in English

C: And could you possibly list all of the positions that you hold?

S: In those tribunals?

C: No, in the Vatican.

S: In the Vatican, I am Deputy Defender of the Bond in the Roman Rota. What does it mean? That I don't have an office there because there are three and sometimes also four Defenders of the Bond full-time. And I am also only part-time and external. Deputy Defender of the Bond means that I am—for every case I receive a nomination from the Dean of the Rota. For example case number 57164 I am Defender of the Bond. The only difference from the other defenders of the Bond is that I have generally the faculty to intervene as Defender of the Bond from the beginning of the process of the Rota till the end. Whereas the others they could be Defenders of the Bond generally only during the discussion. And I will from the begin to the end that means and only *instantia aufben* lawyers I respond as a Defender of the Bond. And only every dimension is written because it is a written process: the Rota.

C: Oh, I see.

S: It is not an oral process. The oral process is used very rarely. In fact I have never participated in the oral process, because can't be used for marriage nullity processes,

V. a. (continued)

which are from 130 sentences over a year there are 129 on marriage nullity. And theirs is a written process. And every interventions of any—during the process at any stage I have to do in Latin exclusively.

C: And your position on the Signatura is?

S: On the Signatura, is 'referendarius'.

C: Referendarius.

S: Which I don't like you know what it is at the Signatura. It a sort of consultant. Because every big congregation and also the Apostolic Signatura has a group of consultants appointed by the Roman Pontiff *aquincannio*. So for five years one can be renewed. I was appointed referendarius at the Signatura which it is a special term it is only in the Signatura *consultra* is called 'referendarius'.

C: Ah. I see.

S: Because he had to refer from the single cases at the beginning to the Roman Pontiff and afterwards to the judges which were cardinals.

C: I see. Because they are not necessarily as well versed in canon law as Your Reverence.

S: Yes.

C: You said that you now using Latin—

S: There is one function I am commissioner for the dispensation of clergy celibacy at the Congregation of the Divine Cult and Sacraments and I am commissioner for the [dis]solution of the marriage bond in the case of not consummation at also the same congregation. And there I don't use Latin.

C: Oh, I see.

S: There is a difference because there we write our vote exclusively in Italian. There is a difference.

C: I see; why is that? Why is that exactly?

S: Because it is not a tribunal and they kept less the tradition of the use of the Latin language. Whereas the Signatura and the Roman Rota are tribunals.

C: So, they would need then to use—why is it that the other commissions have not retain Latin, would you say?

S: I would say: first, because it is not a contentious process which needs the lawyers. There's no intervention of qualified lawyers. So, the cases are prepared by the diocese, and then only at the last moment, where there's not any process, the whole documentation is already written and presented to the commission and then the commission, we discuss the case. And there everybody just presents a short paper of the case with his observations written but the main work is the whole discussion and there are very few people who can discuss still well in Latin: practically, we use Italian.

C: So, for practical purposes.

S: Yes. Whereas at the Signatura and the Roman Rota, there's a real process also in Rome. So, it's not just a final discussion; it's a whole process.

C: Which is official then also.

S: Yes. It's much more technical.

C: Why, especially if there are so few people able to proficiently speak in Latin, why do you think it was retained as an official language of the Vatican City State, or the Holy See.

## V. a. (continued)

S: It's a question I think why? because of tradition: 2000 years and second, because of internationality. Because it's a neutral language. So it is not an explicit preference for one nation or culture.

C: Would you say then that the use of Latin promotes a common identity within the Vatican City State?

S: Yes. Certainly.

C: In what respects does this show itself if you can think of any at the Vatican? Do you—in what ways does this bond that forms through the use or lack of use of Latin—how does it enable you to overcome the international or cultural barriers that you otherwise face with people from around the world?

S: There's much, I think, it was stronger in the past because there was the Latin language present in the culture of all European, Western at least Western European nations. Because it was the language used for books mainly until the nineteenth century, or seventeenth—at least eighteenth century but nearly all scientific books were published in Latin. It's very easy to find that if I go and find a collection—a library in Italy, in Germany, in Austria, in France, in Spain the older books, all the theology—theological collections and even history and natural sciences until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were written in Latin. So it was a common language. So if something was Latin, it was not of the nation of another person, it was of a common historical background and cultural background. And I could identify with Latin, whereas I couldn't identify with being Italian.

C: And it has retained that, at least in a sense: the idea of Latin as common.

S: Yes. Yes. Yes. Because it's also the feel although it is used at the Rota, at the Apostolic Signatura, also to keep the internationality. So everybody has to use another language also the Italians. There is not convenient as much for the Italians to use their own language. It is all the more—I think it's more just at a tribunal that the language is very important you use that as an Italian you don't have the home advantage. Yes, you can use your native language. And especially as a lawyer if you have to express your ideas in Latin, so everybody has difficulty.

C: So, you would say that you very frequently, or constantly, perhaps, are communicating with people in the Latin language—

S: Yes, written—

C: and in such a way that the purpose is communicating unique ideas that are only then communicated in Latin?

S: Yes. And also because the significance of the word is more stable in Latin. Than in the modern languages.

C: Could you elaborate on that a bit?

S: Yes, because the sign—for example the juridic terms especially did not change so much from the sources till the use remain today. In the sources of law in general, and canon law especially, so that there are many technical terms which are very difficult to translate.

C: Would you say at times—are there any times that you find yourself in, where you find that using Latin is burdensome?

S: Yeh, on the new—the new—on the new technical products. For example, talking about television, mass media, cars, airplanes. Also medicine, for example, there are

V. a. (continued)

sometimes medical and psychological questions which use a new vocabulary which does not exist in Latin even though the tendency is to try and model Latin words artificially.

C: Would you say that you're use—the frequency of your use of Latin is—would you rate yourself as 'below average', 'average' or 'above average' in the frequency of use of Latin in regards to the entire Vatican, or the people who work at the Vatican?

S: Frequently, certainly. With regards to the entire Vatican certainly frequently.

C: So you would be above average.

S: Yes, there's no doubt.

C: How about for other canon lawyers? Is it a fairly standard amount of Latin that you use?

S: Above average, certainly.

C: Certainly?

S: An above average amount for canon lawyers because the canon lawyer, for example, at the tribunal of Brooklyn maybe sometimes he reads through all the decisions in which are in Latin. But even those are translated generally now to English.

C: Oh really.

S: Some, some. *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, a review, which publishes, wrote judgments to Latin—on the left side the Latin original and the right side in English.

C: But as for a rotal advocate, do you all use Latin at the same rate at which you do on a daily basis?

S: Yeh, the rotal lawyers. I think—that it depends only on the number of the cases. So, there are rotal lawyers that have more cases and there are other that have less. For example, who also work at the civil tribunal. For example, a rotal lawyer generally is also lawyer for the Italian State. And probably yes, for example, the cases, divorce cases of separation, cases of minors: questions of litigation of minors. They—there are some who have maybe, a year, only two or three cases a day, whereas there are others who have five, six and more. Imagine that—[TAPE END]

S: There are 50-60 pages that I write in Latin every month.

C: How quickly are you able to write a full page of Latin?

S: A full page of Latin I think I would be able to write—certainly afterwards I read it another time for corrections—because I write spontaneously, but with errors and then I control.

C: Is that the same, though, as how you would write in other, modern languages?

S: Nearly this is—on canonical questions it depends on the contents. On canonical questions I think I nearly can write easier in Latin than as in Italian.

C: 'As easy' or 'easier', did you say? I'm sorry.

S: Faster. It's a bit different because it depends on the contents.

C: Ah, I see.

S: If there's subjects I always write about in canon law: if it's marriage nullity questions, I'm very fast. If for example there is an administrative recourse on a question which I never treated, with a really new vocabulary, on a canonical affairs. For example there is a recourse against, for example against the closer of a church. Maybe that I would need a bit more time, particularly on economical canon words because it depends on how frequently I have to look in the dictionary.

## V. a. (continued)

C: Ah, I see.

S: Maybe not the grammar part of it: the dictionary. If it is a new vocabulary needed.

C: You have a great deal of experiences with other modern languages.

S: Yes.

C: Would you say that you find this to be the same case with, say, French, where it is easy for you to speak on certain subjects rather than others based on what you are used to using that language for? Are there ways that Latin then differs from other modern languages that you've used for certain contexts.

S: Yes. It's a different use because it's mainly—some way it's only a written language. And so I can think in Latin those things I always express. But it becomes a language also with frequent use of certain formulas. Especially at the end of your statements, at the beginning of your statements, which are sometimes very, very old. Their essence they're sometimes also from Classical Roman law.

C: How would you say, in the Vatican in general—now, you've said before that over time it has been used more frequently in the past than it is now—

S: Certainly, because in the past it was also a spoken language that is the biggest difference.

C: And why do you think that the change has occurred that Latin is no longer spoken by the people who work at the Vatican?

S: I think, it is a simple question. They learned less Latin in their country of origin; so the level of knowledge is lower now. And then that their **corenence** of those people work at the Vatican has become extremely international. Not only, as in the past, Europe and America; but now also Asia, Africa, Australia.

C: Which do not necessarily have as strong of a tradition in Latin—

S: Yeh.

C: in their education.

S: Yes.

C: In your opinion, how do think that the use of Latin at the Vatican will change in the future?

S: I think it will be still use for legislative texts, it will be still used for dogmatic definitions, for papal encyclicals; I think for all, nearly all, for most of the degrees because there are only two exceptions. For example the encyclical—how do you say in English?

C: Encyclical.

S: Encyclical letters, yes, of the Pope for example there have been only two exceptions for where the official language—I think for the moment there have been two classical exceptions, where it was against, I think, at the beginning regarding France, when the Holy See protested against the nationalization of Church property. It was I think in 1905, and then against National Socialism in 1937 when it was used in German. But all the others were written in Latin, and still are written in Latin because they are working in the Secretariat—if you want an idea—but I don't at this moment if is there. With someone at the Secretariat of State, did you talk with anybody? Because they generally translate the pontific decrees and letters and encyclical documents to Latin because the original language is not always Latin. There is a group of translators who translates to the Latin language.

V. a. (continued)

C: Actually, I will be interviewing Father Reginald Foster.

S: Ah, well that is very good, yes. He may be able to explain much better because I only know from hearsay.

C: Ah.

S: I don't have practice.

C: Do you use Latin liturgically.

S: In our church here? At St. Anthony's Church? Actually we only—at the beginning of Vespers with one Latin prayer, which I can show I have it in my room now. If you are interested, I can give you a copy. Only at the beginning there's always used the same Latin prayer. But then the Vespers, the Psalms and so on are in Italian. In the past they were Latin, which was more international.

C: Do you—that is a preference though? is that correct? It is still possible to say Vespers in Latin.

S: Actually, we never did here.

C: Never?

S: I don't remember anytime because the problem if you don't use it frequently, generally we won't have the books and you have to use the photocopies. So we have prayer books all in Italian of the house. Those of the house, unfortunately, are all in Italian now. They have been first, before the Second Vatican Council: certainly all in Latin. But now the new liturgical books we only have in Italian. Accept, I think we have one Missal in Latin.

C: So Italian really is the most common language of choice.

S: Yes. Even the house, if we have chapter in the house and the meals we generally speak Italian as a common language because we are from thirty-three nations here.

C: Why do you think Italian tends to be the common language?

S: It is a good question.

C: Is it because we are in Italy?

S: I think: one because we live in an Italian context. And the distinction between the life in the convents and the Vatican offices was in the past there was more closure I think. It was more life apart from the people. It is now the life is more open I think; we are all the time to use more the language of the people than in there.

C: Do you ever, in any contexts, hear Latin spoken at the Vatican informally? In an informal way, just between people chatting?

S: Only during the lessons for during three years participating at the Rota course, for the Rota lawyers. I always had lessons. Different professors, Rota auditors, for example **Sadar** Louis taught in Latin. They taught in Latin, but all the questions we answered and we asked in Italian.

C: Oh, I see. So, does the Vatican offer, outside of the Rota, still way to bolster ones knowledge of Latin for the people who are working at the Vatican City State? to use it? Does it encourage—

S: Yes they now for example, for certain titles, as a Rotal lawyer, now they ask—its a new thing—they ask for a previous exam in Latin. And they insist—the Congregation of Education insists more on the Latin preparation for example for canon lawyers. So that's why we introduce also now and we foster the Latin preparation of the students but mainly to—that they are capable to read the Italian—Latin—sorry, the Latin sources.



## V. a. (continued)

C: And is there an emphasis for those becoming canonists to be able to compose Latin in writing?

S: It's mainly to understand, actually. To compose it's for those who will probably use it in their work at the Roman Rota or the Apostolic Signatura. Not anymore at the diocesan tribunals. There is in the past, the only official language of all Catholic tribunals in the world was Latin. That means that all the sentences of all Catholic tribunals in the whole world they're written in Latin.

C: And when did that change?

S: Generally, it started a bit before the Second Vatican Council, but the main change was after the Second Vatican Council.

C: Why do you think that change occurred after the Second Vatican Council?

S: It was, I think because there was already less Latin knowledge, and the modern communications and also because of the spreading of modern ways of communications. Phone, television, radio, where you never have Latin.

C: I see. Did—I sorry, did you have anything else?

S: No.

C: Was that an official rule that the tribunals around the world had to use Latin?

S: Yes. It was **proberdamart** an instruction of the Congregation for the Sacraments from 1936.

C: And was that then officially repealed—

S: Yes.

C: or did simply fall off—?

S: Yes, it was officially. It was necessary. The only thing you could use other languages was for the interrogations of the witnesses.

C: Because they would not, presumably, speak Latin.

S: Yes, [chuckling] certainly. For that was allowed to use the language of the place. But they had to translate the witnesses—the testimony of the witnesses—was translated at the Rota, also in the past, not to Latin, not necessarily to Latin, but would be translated also to Italian or French. But only the interrogation of the witnesses. Not the questionnaires of the witnesses; not the act of the tribunals: the decrees and sentences.

C: Do you have any other observations concerning your use of Latin, your own personal experience, or in the Vatican in general.

S: No we for I—the experience into our faculty that we foster it very much. Because we had the exams; now we ask everybody for an exam. Our professor is called Policap Novak he is also a friar. He is working also at the Secretariat of State as a translator to Latin language. And he teaches also here. And he tries always to motivate the students also to use Latin as a spoken language. Because here is the method in teaching Latin to speak to the students from the beginning only Latin. Which is a completely different method to the method used when I was a student in school. Because it was never spoken by nobody.

C: Do you think that that is, in your observations of people who have gone through that system, is that more effective in instilling fluency of the Latin language?

S: Certainly.

C: Certainly. And it has very good results?

V. a. (continued)

S: Yeh, I think it has very good results. If it's the beginning it is difficult because nobody's used to it. Can go to know country where you hear it on the streets. [chuckling] Or on television!

C: Yeh! [chuckling] Perhaps at one time you could have gone to the Vatican City State.

S: Ah! [chuckling]

C: Well, thank you very much, Father.

[TAPE END]

Post Percontationem:

Reverentia Sua mihi de veniendo ad tempus meo et efficientia mea et gravitate mea gratulata est. Praeterea me permitti contacturum esse suum e-commerce dixit.

Die 12 Augusti, Patrem Schöch contigi ut salutem plurimam die natalis huic darem.

**N.B. Bold-print words indicate highly doubted transcriptions of phrases that are nearly inaudible as well as the uncertain spelling of proper names.**

## Percontatio de usu lingae Latinae cum Reverentia Sua: Pater

Reginaldus Foster

(Sunday, 4 August, 2002)

C – M. T. Connaughton (interviewer)      F – Fr. Reginald Foster

D – David Michaelson (another student of Fr. Foster)

C: [What is your official title?]

F: [There used to be a Secretary of] Latin letters, and they used to have a Secretary of Briefs to Princes and now that's all gone. So, I am (what do you say) **adekto**. I'm assigned secretarial work in the Department of State [Regi noises] that's the end of it. That was the simplification.

[in reference to interview tape recorders] Why don't you put it here—why don't you put those things right here [pointing to tree-stump]. Ah, that'll be much better. Ah, you see? That'll work out fine.

So we don't have titles—no one has the title anymore. The last one who had the title of 'Latin Letters' of Epistulis Latinis [Regi noises] died three years ago and he was 97. And they said, "when you go, that's the end of the title." It's all the stuff from the Middle Ages, it's all that stuff that—it was just simplified.

C: So it was just considered a simplification?

F: Yeh, I mean, the whole thing—the whole Curia was reformed and simplified in 1967: *Regimini Ecclesiae*, Paul VI. So, after that, no one has any titles anymore. Anyway [Regi noises].

C: So, is there—did there used to be a cardinal that was in charge of your office?

F: No, there was a Latin Secretary and they all became cardinals.

C: Oh, I see.

F: And then they were thrown-out. And so **Botci**, Antonius **Botci**, was the Latin secretary for 40 years and in 1962 as a reward, John XXIII made him a cardinal and then he had to leave the office. And so, that was it.

C: Because—

F: Because you can't be cardinal and be some flunky secretary at the same time. So there was near—how should I say it—they became cardinals afterwards.

C: In their retirement—

F: I'm talking about our modern day use; I'm not talking about—the Middle Ages might be another thing. That **Bembo** who wrote Horatio's inscription on his tomb? Well, he was Cardinal **Bembo**, and he was Leo X's Latin Secretary. Whether he was Latin Secretary and then became cardinal, or cardinal, Latin Secretary, I really don't know. But modern times, you were Latin Secretary, and then as a reward—Boom! That's all gone. He was the last one. His successor was never made a cardinal and I think had a heart attack because of it, he was so disappointed [chuckling]. **Tondini**; and that's when I came. And so now that's just the end of it. No one has been cardinal who has been a Latinist since 1962; so forty years now.

C: And is that—would that be based on a decline in the status of the Latin Secretary?

V. b. (continued)

F: I think so. I think so. They say, “What’s the Latin Secretary? Why don’t we make the—the Polish Secretary a Cardinal?” You see? Which has happened—but anyway. [To D. Michaelson] I know you have the same questions over here—kind of a decline, a general kind of—so it’s kind of mixed together.

D: Throw ‘em together. I’ll let him shoot his first since he’s—

F: and go down the line. Some of these things are going to be disappointing for an old-time Catholic [chuckling].

C: Would you mind if we start with a little bit about your education, just for the record?

F: [To D. Michaelson] Yeh, you have much the same thing, “When you began to learn Latin, what experiences motivated you to persevere in your studies? How long have you been using and learning Latin?” Okay, there’s 1953 I began. So that’s going to be fifty years next year when think of it. It doesn’t seem possible. And it was my first class as a freshman in the seminary that’s all. In those days everyone who went to the seminary did Latin for years and years; it was just taken for granted.

C: This was a high-school seminary?

F: Yeh, oh yeh, yeh. In Milwaukee. What motivated me, I just liked the way the thing was structured, and I like what you could say, I like the (as I point out in class there) the malleability. You can say things about twenty different ways, you know, and switch sentences around and all that, and I was fascinated by that and—

[To M. T. Connaughton fending off the swarm of mosquitoes which had landed on his legs: N.B. Fr. Foster opposes the killing of mosquitoes.] Don’t worry about it. What are you doing? Oh, you’ve been bitten, I see, enough. You shouldn’t be wearing shorts. You’re half-naked.

D: Was this the sentiment of your colleagues in seminary or were you sort of alone?

F: I wasn’t alone, of course, in those days there were 120 freshmen. I think of 120 freshman, I think there are five of us left in the priesthood out of 120, to think of it. I don’t think it was—no, I—alone, alone [Regi noises] it wasn’t the general sentiment. Most people just did Latin because you had to. That was why—there was no question about it, huh. And so everyone kind of went through the mill and we had about twenty-five, twenty teachers of Latin. And uh they would divide up, ya know, into about four groups and then four groups of sophomores, four groups of seniors and Whoooo! Latin teachers galore! That’s all disappeared now. Anyway, but that’s a—so that’s how I started and I was fascinated by this thing. And started writing Latin, I was just thought it was so clever [chuckling]. And I had good teachers and they kind of befriended me and were good to me. And they saw, kinda, I was interested and could do this and was helping them by teaching assistance, ya know, with the other students. And that was just the two years at that one seminary. Then I switched to the Carmelites (these people here) as a sophomore, junior in high school. And I met an incredible, incredible priest who is in heaven now, who died very young. But he met me at Worchester, at Worchester Mass, came down in a van there to pick me up and a few others there from Chicago on the train in those days from Chicago up to Worchester. Anyway, and um. And he noticed this, he saw my records and everything else way before and he started speaking Latin and everything else in the truck. And he spoke Latin from 1955 until he died in ’82.

C: In your education, speaking Latin impromptu and the ability to speak in Latin was stressed as part of the general education that everyone received?

## V. b. (continued)

F: Well, it was taken for granted that you could do this also. He would speak Latin in class and ask questions and people would just answer in Latin and that was part of your education to use it as a normal language.

C: So, which part did you enjoy: translation or prose composition—

F: Well, everything, everything.

D: And the teachers had a sort of broad emphasis on this? At least some of them?

F: Yes, yes, yes. He did, this man, the man who died, was my only teacher for three years. And uh.

D: What was his name?

F: Conrad Fliess. He was a Carmelite and died of Hochkins Disease about two months after my own father died. And so, anyway, there's a long story there and um. He was the big thing in town. He was the big pusher in seminary, and a young priest; he was only in his late twenties. And he was tutoring Latin and he was running everything. He had five, six Latin classes and if he didn't approve you for Latin, you didn't go on. That's how important it was. [In reference to a sudden gust of wind] Ooo, that's nice. Oh, that's darling.

D: This is in Massachusetts?

F: No this is in New Hampshire, really. Peterbough, New Hampshire. Somebody, I think, on the trip yesterday was from Peterbough, who had been—Ah! Thing there, thing there! Fred, is from—has friends who live in Peterbough, or something. Anyway.

C: Your education incorporated both Classical and Ecclesiastical?

F: There was no difference; there was no distinction. That's one of the things I learned like you have in Summer School and even Downtown. I learned from him that you just, it's just one whole experience. And so you go from one day we had a big thing: Smith. It's not available anymore. But a big blue book, I remember, some old Slovenian priest from Ohio. His name was Stephenson, in English anyway. And he wrote this like a—like a thing—like a han—oh, what should I say, like and ontology—that was it—ontology of Latin texts.

D: From across the centuries?

F: Everybody. From Plautus up to Pius XII. And so, when I grew-up like that I didn't know there was another way of doing it. So I just, I mean, one day—that would be Conrad's thing—one day we would read Augustine, the next day we'd read—not the next day, but maybe two, three days later—Caesar and all that stuff. And of course, I grew up that way with this whole range of Latin. And so there was really no distinction. He would point out, you know, “you can see that the language here is different between Ambrose and Julius Caesar. There's just a different world a different”—that he would point out, it was pretty obvious. But otherwise it was considered just one Latin language for 2200 years. That also fascinated me [chuckling].

C: Now, just for the record, though I know the answer to this: when you're in the office in the Vatican now, what is the language used to communicate?

F: Well, we in the office, we speak Latin in the office. But other people come in—well, you probably have to go back into Italian. Well you have to be charitable, in a certain sense, not to embarrass them. Because some people would understand everything, I could say anything, I could give a s—they would understand, but they, ya know, wouldn't know how to answer. They would be so rusty or something, they have to think

V. b. (continued)

about a half hour to get four words out. And then they'd get it wrong anyway [chuckling].

D: I know how that can be.

F: [Regi noises]

C: Don't we all.

F: That's the passive and active use of the language, you see. We were encouraged, of course, I would insist on, there has to be some active use but in general most people would say, "fine I understand, that's wonderful," and *et quid dicam*? Even if I were speaking with the Pope, he would understand that. But he probably couldn't answer. And that fact is, once you had a famous, a famous thing—I met Paul VI in a little group of another sort. But I was there, and he said—oh it must have been about ah! 1972, maybe, something in there—and he said, "You won't believe—he kind of *ex animo* he was speaking just there—and he said, "there were some Hungarian bishops today—or yesterday or something—in the Vatican, and so I gave my little speech in Latin that we would write-up anyway, and after that, the bishops came up and they started speaking in Latin about there dioceses and under Communism and all that stuff, and about the future—and to think," he said, he said, "I couldn't answer these people. I was hesitating, I was looking for words, vocabulary and forms and everything else," he says, ah, and he was just sharing his own sentiments with us, and he said, "To think here that the Bishop of Rome had a difficulty answering these Hungarian bishops in Latin." Well, it's just because he doesn't have the *usum*, you see. It's just *consuetudinem*, that's the whole problem.

D: How far back would you have to go—I remember you saying that some of the Popes at the turn of the twentieth century were good Latinists.

F: Oh, yeh. Yeh, Leo the ten—Leo XIII and all these other guys. But, you see, as the modern thing came along and other languages, there was only one language, that was the end of it. You're asking some of these questions "as things go today?" I think it's going to be gone. I think it just going to be gone.

C: How have you seen the use of Latin change since you've been at the Vatican?

F: Well, just down. I mean, less and less.

C: What was it like—

F: Oh, when I came in '69, this is thirty-three years ago. Heaven sakes! We have one or two—this is for Paul VI, of course—one or two Latin speeches to some international group—or some bishops from the Eastern Bloc, let's say—every week and letters and things, of course the Liturgy was being changed and all like the Missal, and the Liturgy of the Hours all that stuff was in tremendous ferment that was all being done in Latin, you see. So '69, and of course then in '78, well he died in '78 and well much of the reform was over with but he was still going strong—of course, this man came. And I mean, it's to his credit, for sure but he knew all those language: Polish, Russian, ya know, Lithuanian—

C: The current pope?

F: Yes. And so he starts speaking to all these people of the Eastern Bloc in their languages. Course, the people of the West, even North, South American, who were trained in Rome, knew Italian. And so the need for Latin just about disappeared over night. In that sense. And even the first Synods of Bishops—this is 1970—'72 was the

V. b. (continued)

first Synod of Bishops—'72—so it's '74 then he went three years—'77—and then this man came along. The first Synods of Bishops were all in Latin. On both sides; I mean the Pope would talk or say something and then the directors of the Synod would speak in Latin. It was kind of a crazy thing because we, there were about five of us in this city, who were doing the whole Synod. And in the morning, we were doing the Pope's thing—let's say for the next day. In the afternoon, I would go to some college like the Brazilian college out here, or other places and meet with the Bishops who wanted to have an intervention the next day. And then we would do that Latin in the afternoon. And then, and then, the next morning I would have the Pope's answer to the Latin I wrote the night before! I said, "we should have the Synod right here in this room!" And so—

D: What year was this?

F: Huh?!

D: What year was this again?

F: Well, this would have been '72, '74.

D: Okay.

F: But you could see it already, I mean. And so what happened and one guy, George, what's his name, he was a journalist. He never liked Latin anyway, in Washington D. C.. He said, "This whole Latin business," he said, "is really—it's not going to work." Now [Regi Noises]—[TAPE END]

F: I'm reading new authors all the time. I mentioned under the trees the other night—

D: Even after fifty years—

F: Oh yeh. Well, certainly. Certainly. And just as an example, this year, I was just kind of enthralled by this book—well the sun went down the other day we didn't have time for it—Pocacio, ya know, Francesco Pocacio's *De Claris Mulieribus*, on women. And, ya know [Regi noises] I mean you see maybe a title every once and a while, but to have this the Americans did this up in Florence. There's an American Renaissance Institute in Florence. And just to see this beautiful book—Virgina Brown (everyone knows her) did this whole book did this whole book about Pocacio in Latin and English, and wrote about Eve, about everybody, all the famous women: Julius Caesar's daughter, blah, blah, blah, everybody. I didn't know that existed. And it just was so interesting in those days that he would choose, eh, I mean because I'm gonna say women had a certain place, or didn't have a certain place. But he was determined to write these all biography about a page and a half, two pages about famous women and that was something new I never knew until this year [chuckling].

C: That, then, is the motivating force for your to continue now?

F: That's one of the things. Yes, yes. Of course, then, of course, when school started, then the motivating force was to get things interesting for the students and to keep up with things and find new stuff and huh, so I'm finding for myself too.

D: Let me bait you with this question, then. Has Latin ever bored you?

F: You mentioned that; I see this, "Does Latin?" Never, never. Never. In fifty years for ten minutes, never, never. Because you can always do something else. I mean if I get sick of the liturgy or Canon Law, then I can always read Marshall, or something [chuckling], or many—Lucr—anyone. I mean, there's never a boredom. No, I was never

## V. b. (continued)

bored. Umm. “Living language for you and your colleagues?” Of course, in the office, it is we write notes to each other, we are speaking in Latin, all of our documents—although we are very conscious of the fact that most of the stuff we are doing—I’ll just be quite honest about it—most of the stuff we are doing is not being understood. You just have to be honest. And I think, I think, I wrote this the new man in Milwaukee and also the auxiliary bishop of San Diego and Detroit, just for kicks [Regi noises]. But I know they’re gonna have to come back to someone for a translation. Not because the Latin’s that difficult—because, ya know, Antonius, he has to approve that, and three or four other people in the office have to approve it, so they understand it. They say, “Ooo, isn’t that nice look at this nice phrase.” But how many other people, just around the countryside, are understanding this? They’re not, they’re just not.

D: Antonius is the top man for approving things in the office?

F: Well, he has to. He has to countersign everything. If he’s not there well, then, another one of us. So, two people have to sign every document. And he found one or two typing mistakes ‘s’ and ‘t’. And I said, “Well, fine.” But uh. And so, he understands this stuff, and the superiors do. And but, I know that other people are not—do not understand these things. And how long is this, this fake situation is going to go on is another story.

C: How long would estimate that the situation has been something like this were Latin is not really being—

F: Well, maybe forty years now.

C: Forty years.

F: Yeh.

C: Is there a reason you can think of?

F: Well, it was taken out of the seminaries. I mean, it’s just not being taught anymore.

C: So, by lack of education, not of—by ignorance.

F: Well, yeh. I mean, it just if you don’t learn these things careful and stuff. Ya know, *mea interest* either you know *mea refert* or *mea interest* or you don’t. And if you don’t [Regi noises] it’s just gone.

D: And now are there enough trained people to even teach it?

F: Well, that’s another thing. Well we did, we not only lost, I would say from about—okay—oh forty years, ’62, bah, a little later, maybe thirty-five, thirty years let’s say thirty. Okay, 1970, by that time most, they’d say, “No we have other things to do. And the world is going on, moving ahead. We’re not going to spend nine years on Latin when people are starving down the street and nuclear war and all this other stuff.” So the Church was taken-up with other questions very strongly. And they said, “One of the things we don’t need is the nine, ten years that we used to spend on Latin.” So it was just [Regi noises] that was the end of it. And over night, just over night. Well they did the same thing every other place, ya know. I mean degrees in Harvard and Oxford and Cambridge and—that used to be all Latin. You used to have Latin Composition, Greek Composition to get into Oxford, Cambridge. That was all just ditched-out the window, period. So it’s been a, been a kind of a universal phenomenon. How—where it’s gonna go; how worse it’s gonna get, or better, or what’s gonna happen: I really don’t know.

C: What groups of people, outside of the office, do you speak with in Latin ever?

F: Well, very few because I don’t ever meet them. Oh, yeh, every once—I don’t like congresses because they’re a waste of time—but we have Latin meetings, or congresses



V. b. (continued)

with some people when they're between talks. We shuffle around or move around and speak Latin.

D: Is this within the Church?

F: No, outside the Church.

D: With Classicists?

F: Classicists. Oh yeh, oh yeh. Oh yeh. For example, you probably didn't know this, there was one man there from California was red-head and a red-beard, Cortius, just for that week. Then he had to go back. And, oh, he wants to come back. But he spoke Latin marvelously. I don't know where he learned, got the art, the practice, or the training to do it but—so there are people who can manage nicely.

D: *Audivi*.

F: *Eo loquentem* [chuckling].

C: I believe he was involved in a living Latin club at his university.

F: Yeh, maybe out there; maybe I think Nancy Luellen's thing. Yeh, I think.

D: Are there more—in terms of people trained in Latin—are there more outside the Church now than in?

F: I would say so. Right now, I think so. I mean, look at all the people in class. There are very few clerics around, no one [chuckling]! And they ask me that in the office too. I say, "Well, that's your business, friend." [And they say,] "Ah! All priests should know Latin!" And I say, "Fine, now you just can't sit here and say it! You have to do it or do something." [They say,] "[Regi noises], it kind of annoying. It's just not a good time." Ya know, they say, ya know. It's not a good time. And I got a letter—Oh my heaven sakes—a terrible letter—well, the poor man now. He, a lay man I know, his wife and his baby, they have a little child in Washington, Paedino. And he left school in Washington to go out to Lincoln, Nebraska with Fabian, ya know. And he's teaching Latin out of Our Lady of Guadalupe Seminary out there. Well, he just wrote me this letter. I just read it and I answered him this morning. But the second part of the letter was disastrous. He said, "Everyone's, ya know, you can't even mention they're against our Society"—this is the Society of St. Peter, ya know the once Lefevbrite people, got it. And he said, "there's such opposition to this Latin business, there's still a tremendous" ya know, like reactionary, 'well you want the 'old' way', etc., etc., and 'you don't want Vatican II', and 'these people are a bunch of kooks and nuts out on the right' and that's still very strong. I didn't even think—I didn't even think of it. And he wrote this whole page. And I wrote, and I said, "This other—your second page—brought me *plurimum dolores* about all these dissensions and stuff in the Church. Right now, I don't think I could go to a seminary and talk about Latin, I just—they would just brand me as some sort of nut, ya know.

D: This is a good chance to ask a question later down on the list, "What do think of the various groups, schismatic or otherwise, as who prefer the Latin liturgy?"

F: Ya, ya, well I can see this, I can see this, "What is your opinion about various groups advocating a return to Latin liturgy?" Well, this is out of the question. Now what will be interesting, maybe, I don't know how you're going to do this. As Paul VI wanted, maybe to have our Catholic people learn some of the traditional, traditional hymns of the Church; like some of that stuff of St. Thomas Aquinas, ya know; or the Kyrie, Gloria in Excelsis Deo, and stuff. That I wouldn't be against, but it would have to be done very very well, and very very carefully, and with no kind of suspicion your, ya know,

## V. b. (continued)

imposing, or going back to the 'old' system. And I really think—I've talked to some of these people—they don't talk to me because they know what I think of it right away. I really don't think they're helping the cause at all, at all. In fact, it's counterproductive. They say, "we want the good ol' Lat—" Even like you have young people coming along, they say, "We want the Latin Mass!" I says, "listen friends the Latin Mass was out before your parents were born! What are you talking about? You don't know what the Latin Mass is!" You see. They're kind of marching along with some sort of sentimental thing there. I don't think they're doing anybody any good, anybody any good. And I say, if you get some—I don't know what—get someone like, Springstein, or I don't know what, Joe Blow advocating Latin, yes. But to have some Monsignor or some priest getting up, "We want Latin liturgy!" Well, you'd just be laughed out of existence today. I'm sorry, that's just the way things are. I wouldn't go to a seminary today to talk about Latin. I would maybe go to maybe a public school or just a general convocation or something to talk about these things or the beauty of these things and the literature. But to go to a seminary to encourage people to study Latin, I'd say it's hopeless for those people.

D: The approach has been so aggressive it's been counterproductive.

F: Oh yeh.

C: Is there a reason that, that you know of, that developed in the Church—that political division?

F: Well, it's almost like, in a certain sense—I hate to make these awful, terrible comparisons, but I would almost, like say in society it's like saying, ya know, "The old American Nazi Party has the solution, or the Klu Klux Klan has the solution," ya know, and they're marching and stuff. Well, it's never going to work. And all they're doing is perpetuating a certain attitude.

D: What directions should they turn their energies then? Teaching Latin?

F: Well, I would.

D: Studying Latin?

F: I would. Silently, humbly. If I were the Pope or someone around here—

[In reference to the ever-growing blanket of mosquitoes covering my legs] You have a little problem there. Don't you have other clothes? Or why don't you put this bag over your knees, or something? Yeh, that's right put something like somewhere; there you go. [Resuming] But that's what I would do, and I know some priests have done this, and in fact some of my students have done this in their parishes. They start a little group there, ya know, let's see maybe like a little bit of the homilies and stuff of Augustine, or St. Augustine, about Christmas or and things and that, or Easter. And then of course people see this; just a small group and then be done with it. But any kind of return to the old thing is never going to work.

C: Would it be possible even?

F: I don't know how. You can't impose things today. Because you can look at that pedophile stuff; you can't impose anything today! And so, there are other problems and you see papal authority doesn't work because no one cares. And a so the Pope will say [Regi noises]—they just say, "Well, he's crazy, thank you," etc. And it just won't work. Authority simply will not work. I would say if I were some people, I'd say, "good example might work." Good example might work.

V. b. (continued)

D: [To Michael] Do you have left on your list?

F: Oh, lots. So, “the various groups, schismatic of otherwise, advocating a return to Latin liturgy” and everytime, every journalist who ever talks to me about the matter always brings this up, “Do you like the idea that the Mass is in the vernacular?” Yes, I do. Yes, I do. And a, “Do you like the idea that Latin has disappeared?” No, I don’t. Of course, the compromise would be: have the liturgy for the people there in the vernacular, they have to understand what they are doing, the prayers, the sources of their faith. They have—that’s out of the question [for being in Latin]. But I believe that there is a place for Latin in the training, let’s say, of the minister of the Church or a bishop, or even an educated Catholic lay person. So, I’m all for that. And people want to catch me all the time and they want me to say, “No! that whole thing was a disaster; we should go back to Latin!” which I’m never going to say. I’m not that stupid. But the fact is—can they ever make a difference? I don’t think so, personally, but anyway let them try. Because it’s just so—it’s just bluh. I think it’s bluh. But let them try, good luck.

C: What language do the Bank-o-mats in the Vatican appear in?

F: Well the language, that was the thing there at the entrance to the office.

D: You’re talking about the ATM machines?

C: Yes, the ATM machines.

F: Well there’s a little thing in Italian, “Insert your card,” and then they asked me seven years ago to put a little Latin thing, just one line. The rest goes on in Italian the whole thing’s in Italian, but that one line there—

C: Which is?

F: The introduction, “*scidulam adinserito (quaeso) ut faciundam cognoscas rationem*,” “you should insert your little card so that you might get to know the process to be done.” And the only reason that was done—it was almost a joke—because when they were setting the thing up, the technicians were there with the television screens and that stuff, and they said, “Well, what’s going on down this hall?” I said, “we have the Latinists down there the correspon—the international section.” They said, “Oh, that would be clever if we put the instructions here in Latin.” So, on the spot, I just kind of devised this little thing, which is just been sitting there now for about seven, eight years—I don’t even know how long it is. But it’s not that the whole banking system is Latin. That’s really a mistaken idea. The introductory sentence is in Latin. [TAPE END]

F: I mean look at, for example, the reform of the educational system in England with Thatcher. They said [Regi noises] we have to cut down on—we have to reform on fiscal things, we have to cut down on things which aren’t necessary. And so see, with all of her conservatism and so forth and so on, demolished the whole thing. The same thing happened in Italy. Ya know, seven, eight years of Latin some of the people we’ve met around the place here. And I’ve talked to some of them, guests and stuff, and at the bar and on some of our outings. They’ve all had seven, eight years of Latin. Well, now it down to about five or six and now they’re calling it ancient culture; not even Latin.

D: Well, so this prompts the question.

F: So, just to finish, one of the things, I believe, well it’s just human nature, as always. It’s a reaction, you see. We had so much Latin before that when the liberation came, when the liberation came, it really came [chuckling]. And even the Italians they had

## V. b. (continued)

Latin—oh yeh—I can see the students on the bus, on the 44 coming up. Oh my heavens! heaven sakes, even today have them—to hear them speak about Latin is something horrible. Of course they have these old school moms and these old bitties, who are jamming conjugations and declensions and all kinds of stuff. And, of course, the students hate it. And all they do is prepare for an examination, and at the end throw it out the window. Well, the whole—I think the whole teaching approach has been responsible for this and also the fact that in the Church and outside the Church there may have been too much Latin before. And as I say when the bowl broke, or when there was a little bit of air, BOOM, it just split right open and that was the end of it. And so here, everything was in Latin; everything, everything, everything, everything, everything.

C: Then people, though, were able to function in that kind of environment.

F: Because there was no other choice, of course. And we did, but then, of course, little things came in [Regi noises]. I mean to hear the Mass for the first time—this is before you were born, but it was like 1965. And to hear that then, the first time, and so, this is unheard of!

C: First time in the vernacular?

F: Yes, yes, and [Regi noises]! Like the ‘Our Father’ and stuff [Regi noises]—who ever s—this is unheard of! Even the people knew ‘*Pater Noster*’. But then to have this come along, well then, the thing was just like a tidal wave, and that was the end of it. And when you think of it, when you think of it, baptisms, like I had the other day there in our little chapel last Sunday, I mean—

C: In Latin?

F: No, no, it was in Italian. I mean some of the Latin students here, Amy High, had their children baptized in Latin and a few other people, okay their parents understood it the people around them, they liked it very, very much but older people had been trained in Latin, you see. So they liked it; that was all right. But when I think of it, that all the baptisms and millions and zillions of people, this is all in Latin where the people knew absolutely nothing. They would see this, and a little bit of anointing, and a candle, and dunking the head, and three drops and they just had belief or faith that this was, ya know, a valid baptism, but understanding absolutely nothing, this, this, this just couldn’t go on. So there were all kinds of things, there I think, I really, really believe that as the a—psychologically there was too much of it, maybe too much Latin. It was the only subject before and now it was just ditched [chuckling].

C: Would you say that was also what allowed it to maintain itself over the years, though?

F: Certainly.

C: That such a stress was placed on it.

F: Well, certainly there was a stress. And I knew, this was in the beginning in minor seminary, if you could not do Latin, you didn’t—you were told to leave the seminary [Regi noises]. And this Conrad, and other Latin teachers, who were in charge, their decision was the final one. This person cannot go on for studies because this person cannot handle Latin. It was one of the, the signs—I mentioned in class—of a divine vocation. Well, after a while, when this dawned on some people they said, “Oh well, we just can’t go on this way.” And BINGO that was the end of everything. You see, it was very human, it was very explainable, not from ill will, but for other reasons.

## V. b. (continued)

C: So, do you think that the decline of Latin was largely due, then, to the changes that came about after the Second Vatican Council, or was that more coincidental?

F: Actually, I think it was way before Vatican Council. In the 1950's we had fights in the seminary. I was for Latin and my Latin teacher, he was for Latin, but there was a rumbling already in 1955, 56, this is six years before Vatican II. There was a rumbling already. Liturgy and stuff, and the Greeks in the old days, "that was the language and they had Greek, then everyone spoke Latin. Well, everyone is speaking English now, why can't we do what they did in the ancient world?" Of course all these historical studies were coming out and there was this big movement. And one of the reasons it switched from Greek to Latin is because people didn't know Greek anymore, but they knew Latin. So they said, "Fine. No one knows Latin today, why don't we just make it French?" You see [chuckling]? So this is way before Vatican II; I wouldn't blame it on Vatican II, it was kind of like—

D: Is this more or less the reasoning in the Reformation for the Protestants?

F: Oh, yeh.

D: Along the same lines.

F: Oh, yeh. I mean Luther produced his German Bible, which is a monument of German language, literature. He said, "What's this? Were supposed to know the Bible and it's all going on in Latin. Some priest in the corner [Regi noises] and the people are out there like a bunch of dumb oxen. Certainly, why certainly. Certainly, certainly. I'm sorry it was just because in the old days everyone—not everyone understood it, but you were talking about the intellegentia and stuff, the different people around the place. People in the old days, educated people knew it. And that was the end of it: doctors, lawyers, and stuff. They knew Latin and could handle it and it was so beautiful and stuff. But taxi drivers and stuff, what are they supposed to do?

D: Well, this begs the question, then. Why should anybody know Latin except for maybe a few, a handful of scholars.

F: Well, I don't know what a 'handful'—it depends on what you mean by a 'handful'.

For me, it's just part of Western—okay, at least for our life, for the next hundred year, I don't know what's going to happen in the end there, but this is all of our Western culture is Latin, and our language is Latin, and our thinking is Latin, the categories are Latin, whether we like it or not.

D: So even for besides—for people other than Roman Catholics?

F: Oh heaven sakes, certainly: any educated person. You just have to, just have to. I would just say, you're just missing something. What do you think that Erasmus, that Thomas More, that all that stuff in the Middle Ages, that was going on in Milwaukee English? Well it wasn't [chuckling]. You see? So I don't know what you mean by here, "What is your judgment about the common attitude Latin—savant—okay—accessible only to the brightest students, scholars and professors?" That I'm against, as you know this in class, "Those struggling refusing to learn Latin out of fear of inadequacy?" I would demolish that whole thing right away and say, "you can do—look at this beautiful phrase here. How would say this and that?" And they would—I see from my beginner students downtown, and also for example, some in the summer school, who are having a terrible time in the beginning and all of a sudden started blossoming and feeling very sure of themselves. Anyone can learn Latin.

## V. b. (continued)

D: To put it briefly, what sort of change in thinking and education do you think needs to occur?

F: Well, I insist, as I have mentioned a million times, if we would just treat Latin as a normal Human language and study the thing as a language and use it as a language. But for the Italians—and for the Germans it's worse, of course they would laugh and agree with me anyway—the Germans because they treat the thing—as I mentioned so often in class—like a dead frog. And you, all the rules and regulations and all the exceptions: the Germans know absolutely everything, absolutely everything. But I say what kind of a—this is just like an exercise in some sort of gymnastics.

D: Not a living language?

F: Well, no. And they miss the whole, they miss the whole point, they miss the whole beauty of a sentence. They say, “Ah, this is an ablative. And this is this and this is this. And this is used once by Cicero here.” That's just fine, and they won't even read the sentence, ya know. I said, “What about the beauty of the whole sentence?” “No, no! That's not important!” They're interested in what kind of rule, in what kind of book, ya know. You can't believe how strong that is. Unless that's changed, we're just going to lose the whole thing.

D: Do you have any questions left there, Michael?

F: Oh, I'm sure. Out of fear, I would say, out of fear and inadequacy: I say, “Well bums and ignorant people, and dogs, and streetwalkers were all speaking Latin for ages around here. What do you mean inadequacy?!” You see it's the concept of whole thing I don't like. You see the Germans think this golden bow came down from Heaven with all these rules in it. And, oh my heaven sakes, Adelbert came up with some questions and I said, “Where in the world did you hear this?” And I opened up my little ‘Gildersleeve and Lodge’ and I said, “Well look at this, there's nothing about this thing.” He said, “Ah, I was always told, I was always told!” By some Nazi teacher! You know, and they came out with this thing. And they're horror stories, absolute horror stories. Go on.

C: Do you—

F: No, no, go on!

D: We almost exhausted all of my questions.

F: Go no, go on. They'll kind of overlap here and then—

C: Is there ever a situation that you find yourself in at the Vatican where you need to use Latin as a common language with whomever? Has that ever come up in recent history where you simply do not have a common language other than Latin, and you can both effectively use Latin?

F: Oh, yeh. Oh, yeh. As I say, international things: things that would belong to everybody. I mean, just as an example. Like the Pope's Christmas card, just as an example. I mean it just has to be in Latin. What language are you going to put the Pope's Christmas card in, eh?

D: How many people does that go out to?

F: Well millions, heaven sakes. Everyone knows that and it's just a silly thing, but other very important meetings and declarations and things like that, that really belong to the whole world and you simply cannot discriminate. And there's a certain amount of rumbling—I've heard that too—because they wanted like to fall back because some of the people down there, ya know, officials in the Church, cannot deal with Latin. And so

## V. b. (continued)

they're English and Italian and French, you see. And then people are going to say, "What is this business?" Of course, English and Americans, the Americans are at a cultural occupation of the world, which I don't like, okay. And people are accusing the Church even of that. The Italians, of course, that's the whole Mafia here, the whole Italian thing: trying to run the Church again. And then you can't even use some of these other languages. They say, "Ah, that's the old French trying to get back with their Empire, or whatever it is, ya know. So all this stuff, so there is a little bit of rumbling but most people just accept the fact—they would say, "Well okay, okay. If you don't like American imperialism and this kind of—what language are you gonna use?" You see. Latin. "No, no. Forget about Latin; no one knows it anymore." And then you're right back to where you started.

C: So, could you then just—let me just ask the question. Why has the Vatican maintained Latin as its official language?

F: Well, okay, okay. That's a very good question. And I have question marks. Okay, I'm 63, 64, but I don't think it's going to go on. They maintain it because it has always been that way. And they say, "Well, no." And the fact is, I've done one or two documents I did the Beatitude of the Superiors. And they said, "Well, we have to—why don't you work a little while, the next month or so, on this—on the Latin translation of this document at least for the archives." Well, I don't know what kind of a thing is that, ya know. "Oh put it in Latin and put it in the thing so that in a hundred or a thousand, million years from now if they are going to consult the thing, they'll find it in Latin." You see. Well that—that's this awful mentality. So, it's being maintained because that's the way it always was, period.

C: So for posterity—

F: And I'm afraid, for example—the Pope sends out, Paul VI started and this man continued, like these congratulatory letters: twenty-fifth anniversary of the bishopric, or fiftieth anniversary of priesthood. The Pope sends a little congratulations like and dahdahdah and talks about his life and so forth and so on to these bishops, but that's definitely going to end. Because they just don't understand the stuff anymore, we're writing this stuff—and I've said this in the office a million times. And I said, "All you need is to have to have some superior up there: a cardinal Secretary of State. And the Pope would say, 'Okay.' to say—the Cardinal Secretary—to say, 'why don't we send these congratulatory letters in the vernacular?' And if the Pope were to say, 'yes.' BANG! Three-quarters of the work in the office would disappear in one second." Now it's just going on because that's always the way it's been done, but I'm not so confident because, because, because you can feel it down below they just don't understand this. We understand it *inter nos*, you see. And it comes from the fact that people are not being trained in Latin.

C: Does proficiency in Latin ever affect ones ability to be assigned to the Vatican or to work in high level—

F: Well, they're supposed to be, but everyone knows they can't—they can't. Like the diplomatic core, ya know, they have an academy right at the elephant—[TAPE END]

C: For this tape, I need to hold it near you.

F: Why? Why?

C: Because it's not—

F: Sensitive. Okay.

C: [Inaudible]

F: Well, I don't care. But anyway. They go to the academy for three years and get their degrees and step out into the diplomatic service. And they're supposed to know Latin, but they don't. And they're kind of struggling, I mean, it's presumed they know Latin, Spanish, German, Italian, English before they go out into the field. And every summer, they're sent to a different country to get proficient in these languages and Latin is presumed to be one of the languages know by them. But [Regi noises] [Inaudible]... Because we send they Latin documents to the embassies of the Vatican around the world. And the governments say, "Well, we don't accept L—" The British won't accept Latin. And they say, "we want an official translation." So, the people at the embassies, Vatican embassies around the world have to put together a translation. HaHa, which means they're supposed to understand what's being said there, and sometimes they don't and they say, "*Che macella!*" "What a disaster! Because we're breaking our necks—" I've heard people at the embassies calling in professors from the universities to translate Vatican documents because the Vatican diplomatic corps can't do it anymore! You see, it's all a matter of training.

C: Could you discuss, then, in that context, what you have said before in class about not being able to use certain constructions and Latin—

F: Well yeh! I mean, you can't get too subtle because you're dealing with all these situations where no one knows—pardon the expression—nothing. And so, if I get real clever, and ya know [Regi noises]—sometimes clever just for kicks, just out of frustration. But just presuming that they're just not going to understand it that's all. I would say for example, "*Nostra minimi omnium interest.*" "It concerns all of us to no degree." *Nostra omnium minimi*, well, no one in the world is going to understand that. Unless you know that sheet that I gave you [chuckling] from Lewis and Short. Well, it's all there anyway. So, the fact is, you can't do this and I know—Oh! You've probably heard of the Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church. Well, we did the whole thing in Latin. And three of us in the office did the whole thing in Latin and I realized two years later, the whole thing was rejected, what we did. "Because," they said, "it's too Classical." And what they did not *nobis nesciendibus*, but almost. They got some other priest—I know who he is—here in Rome and they gave him a year. And they said, "Here is the text, which was prepared by our people in the office. And could you go through the thing and simplify this and bring this down." It's almost like 'put the subject first in every sentence' and all this other stuff. And so, we didn't even know this was happening and all of a sudden the Latin comes out and we said, "Where did this come from?" And then we found out this one guy was given this commission to bring the Latin down. And I didn't think it was that high to begin with. But it's all [inaudible]... I say, "Well listen friends, why don't you just take this beautiful, glorious Latin—it's gonna last a hundred years—I don't say Classical and brilliant and marvelous and sparkly and wonderful, and don't worry about how high it is. Like the Catechism of the Council of Trent: is a monument of Latin. They say, "No, we want the Catechism to be accessible to everybody." Well, what do you say, "*doctrinam Christi docemus*" or "*docemus Christi doctrinam*"? The word order and stuff like that; they would say, "*doctrinam Christi*"



## V. b. (continued)

*docemus*’ is too difficult.” Then, then, just forget the whole thing, friends. So even the Catechism—

D: They might as well put it in the vernacular than used the dumbled-down Latin.

F: Yeh, yeh I would. I said, “Well, look at—well.” The whole thing was just dismissed with one kind of sneering remark, “Well, it has to be accessible. And your Latin it was too beautiful, it was too Classical, or too glorious or gorgeous and so on and super—” Put an end to the whole story. I know it’s not encouraging. I know it’s not encouraging at all, but it’s rather realistic.

D: Let me ask my second to last question.

F: Yes, yes.

D: It’s number seven. In Gregory of Tours’ time, he noted the sentiment there, “*Philosophantem veterum intellegent doci loquentem rusticum multi.*” Is the situation today worse?

F: [chuckling] Well, yes, I would say so [chuckling]. Because they wouldn’t even understand a *rusticus*, a farmer, speaking Latin. But in those days, a *rusticus* could make himself understood and people could go along—now that would be asking too much.

D: What about a recovery like the Carolingian or the Italian Renaissance?

F: I don’t know how this could be possible; I just don’t know. On a small basis, on a private kind of a way, or this school, or that school, or even a chain of schools. Something like that I think is possible. But without a grandiose thing of a universal planetary renaissance, I just don’t think that’s realistic. But, for example, not that I care, but say they’re—who’s not having problems today—but for example the Jesuits, just as an example, if they were to say, “Okay, all of our high schools are going to come back with four years of Latin.” And they did one day; now it’s down to one, or whatever. And some sort of a stupid thing. I’ve been in Jesuit high schools and it’s all gone. But some have it maintained, you see, and other places not. Well if they had a general program: that this is going to be part of our curriculum and that’s just the end of the whole story. With joy and peace and dancing around; and people are going to be trained in Latin. And the whole world is going to know that if you go into a Jesuit school, you’re going to come out, you’re going to come out knowing or being trained in Latin to open this whole world to you and the other studies and everything else. I could see it in that way, kind of a Renaissance. All over the Church, everywhere, every parish or every diocese: no. But in a certain, in a certain area, a certain—I see something could be done.

D: So, it would be a different Renaissance than ones led by high-flying intellectuals like [inaudible]... and Erasmos or someone like that—

F: Oh yeh, yeh. It would have to be, it would have to be a grassroots Renaissance [chuckling].

D: What’s your evaluation of the Italian Renaissance and its effect on Latin?

F: Well, yeh, that was the thing; it was very bad. The Renaissance was probably the Latin language [inaudible]... because they were shooting so high, ya know, and everyone—they were vying with each other who could be more Ciceronian, et cetera. That they pushed the thing just out of the world. Everyone says that. And maybe you saw—it depends on where we were—but some of the Latin like St. Thomas Aquinas the ‘Two Precepts of Charity’ or the ten on the ‘Our Father’, “That kind of Latin,” they said, “should have been maintained.” Ya know, then Latin would have lived kind of on that

## V. b. (continued)

way. Almost like a vernacular language today. But they put the thing up so high: every word had to be Ciceronian, every construction and every fancy thing. And then it became the exclusive possession of a few people. The Renaissance really killed Latin. Everyone says this; Erasmus says this. He writes a big work. A big work: it's about forty pages about Ciceronianus and he calls them '*simii Ciceronis*,' 'Cicero's monkeys' in his day. And he said and their whole, and their whole effort is 'who can out-do Cicero?' And they imitate only Cicero and they use only Cicero's words and expressions—and he's making fun of them—Erasmus is making fun of them. And he knew that they were going to kill the thing, which they did. They practically did. They put it into chancelleries and into some professors' office but the people out there—ya know, in the classrooms and stuff lost it. You see? That's the general idea.

D: I'm all done, so anything you have left.

F: What do you have on your list?

C: I think we've covered everything really.

F: Really? Everything there?

D: I want to ask my last little praise in Latin, but only when you're—only when we're all done.

C: I'm finished.

D: All right—and you may want to correct me here, first, but. *Tantum aliquando hortari*—no *Tantum aliquando nos Latine ut perseveremus linguam Latinam discendo hortari*.

F: *Bene, hortabor vos—bene—hortabor vos **omni qua** possum animae virtute et mentis a studio ut artem hanc praeclarissimam per se clamini ut scientiam vestram augeatis ut **viteras has divinas pergi statis** ut linguam Latinam vobis efficiatis sermonem communem non tantummodo doctorum omnium sed omnium hominum per orbem terrarum* [chuckling].

D: *Gratias ago*.

F: *Libenter, libenter*.

C: Actually, I do have one more question. Do you think—and this is related, perhaps, to what you were saying before about Latin being a neutral language. Do you believe that the use of Latin within the Vatican City State, as it is today, promotes a common identity among the Vatican citizens or personnel?

F: Yeh, I don't know whether that's so strong today, you see. In the old days: yes. No one's ever accused me of being an American, for example. Because everyone knows Latin. A Ciceronian: yes. Because they just realize Latin is for everybody. Although, I don't know whether that argument or that reasoning is still valid today. Because you have people, United Nations, from every country, ya know, using English. And the use of English is not discriminating anymore, just as an example. Or Chinese, you can say what you want. And so the whole idea was—I heard this for many years, ya know—if you use English, well then your just the English language world and you're leaving out everyone else. I mean, Jacques Chirac and who was it then—the German chancellor and then the French Prime Minister—this is the other man who was he—they would speak in English. You see.

D: [Inaudible]

## V. b. (continued)

F: Yeh, yeh, no. The other guy, no, [inaudible] and the German man. No, no, his predecessor; he played the piano. Oh heaven sakes, the fact is, what I'm saying is even the use of English is not discriminating anymore because everyone is doing it: blacks, and Japanese and Chinese speak English gloriously, and all that stuff. So they're not going to say, "Hey, you're speaking, therefore you're this or that." Because the Russians speak English marvelously, as everyone knows. And so, I believe in the general thing that Latin puts you above and it makes you untouchable as far as the culture goes.

Although I don't know how strong that's going to be in the future, or even how strong it is now, ya know. But there was a fight going on between French and English—ya know, different camps, who's on the—now I don't want to say, "French is finished." It's not. But the English is coming in such a wave there that to converse or to do things in English is not even considered anything special anymore. I still like the idea of Latin around. As I say, it's a—when we were at the Forum last week there, with that man who came up with that thing of Plautus there. I don't know what nationality he was. I think he was Belgium or something like that. But that's the kind of stuff I like to see, ya know. Kind of like, almost, an immediate friendship based on a phrase that both people understood. You know: Latin. So the thing there, to see people's faces light up with that kind of stuff. I think that, with that kind of stuff, I think that's very, very precious and valuable; I really do. But again, you have this work or be actual in anything, you have to be trained and you just have to be trained. It's not going to come from pious thinking or praying or leaping or gnashing your teeth or something like that. You have to get down to business as you've been trying to the past couple of months. You have to get down to business and do it. And so I think you can start, and going—go home and do it [chuckling].

C: Could you comment on something, I believe you said in class about the use of Latin to communicate, that the Church used—the Vatican used to communicate with, I believe it was Eastern Bloc states during the various Communist regimes?

F: They did of course. The Church did, of course. Almost like crypt languages or cryptology or something. Of course, then the Communists caught on and learned Latin just as well heheheh. But during the war and stuff, and right after the war, that was going on. And then, of course, people caught on to that. So, [Regi noises] as I understand—people have told me this—as I understand, it went on for a while; and then, of course, people wised up to that and everything else. Someone was mentioning on the internet, or something about Vatican City—where you saying that?—ya know, you're talking about different geography, ya know, all this stuff you can find now ZIPZIP. And there's Vatican City and the languages for Vatican City were Latin and Italian. So, it's still considered—it's our diplomatic language, I mean, the Pope's credentials that go out for Vatican ambassadors are in Latin. What I wrote in Latin to Edia Min, to Clinton, to Ronald Reagan and so on. How much they understood is another story [chuckling].

D: Well, could, just real briefly, could you maybe list three or four types of documents that you write in Latin?

F: Let me just stand up for a minute, my backside is hurting me.

D: Then maybe we should—

F: No, no, I just have to do this standing. This wood here is just cutting off the—

D: You mentioned the congratulatory letters on anniversaries.

## V. b. (continued)

F: Yeh, the congratulatory letters are still in Latin. The appointments of bishops is still in Latin. When a new diocese is created, the apostolic constitution, which remains forever, is in Latin. The credentials are in Latin. [In reference to me climbing a large tree stump with my microphone] I'll this; I don't want you to kill yourself.

C: No, I'm fleeing the mosquitoes.

F: Oofa! there's one right on you, right there, I see. You've got sweet blood. Also the answers. [In reference to David's tape recorder running out] Oops!

D: Oop! There, I'm done.

F: You're finished. Also the answers that the Pope writes to heads of State. Their new ambassadors present their letters in Latin. Like I've written to Queen Elizabeth in Latin.

C: Do they ever respond in Latin?

F: No, no, they wouldn't [chuckling]. But the fact is, their new ambassador of England, or who knows, part of the old Commonwealth presents—they present their letters in the vernacular and the Pope answers in Latin: for now, as I say. How long is this going to go on? I don't know. It could change overnight in one second.

C: Do you recall the statement—just to give an example of this—that the Paul VI sent to the United States President during the first moon-walk?

F: Yeh, no. What happened, let me say—I don't no—what happened is the NASA sent him a picture of the Moon or whatever, Armstrong's things there, of him jumping around or something on the moon. And he wrote back, or he signed it; the Pope wrote—sent it back and he said, "*Vidimus sumusque admirati*" something like that, having got to the Moon. But I think it was put—I because I got a friend from the NASA, who showed me this it was—they wanted to share the thing with the Pope, and he answered that "*Vidimus sumusque admirati*" something like that [chuckling]. Come on, that's enough of the mosquitoes; this is an impossible situation.

D: Well, thank you. That's enough for me.

C: Yes, thank you very much.

F: Okay fine now.

D: *Gratias agemus.*

F: *Agemus cras: agimus*

C: *Benigne.*

F: *Libenter, libenter.* So, you're gonna leave tomorrow? You're leaving tomorrow?

D: *Perendie.*

F: That's right, it's only Sunday; I forget.

C: Should I have any follow-up questions about things—

F: Yeh write, write.

C: All right. Thank you very much.

F: *Libenter.*

Reverentia Sua, Pater Reginaldus Foster, jura sua, quae particeps percontationis habet, ante percontationem cognovit. Percontatione perfecto, mihi Reverentia Sua verba "can't do Latin" esse "unable to understand or communicate in Latin without making major mistakes" an "taking fifteen years to translate four lines" delicavit. Egomet a muscis noviens et centiens feritus sum in hac percontatione.

**N.B. Bold-print words indicate highly doubted transcriptions of phrases that are nearly inaudible as well as the uncertain spelling of proper names.**

# Index of Appendices

## Appendix I: *Field Documents*

- a: Interviewee Rights (Latin)
- b: Interviewee Rights (English)
- c: Rights of Observed Persons (Latin)
- d: Rights of Observed Persons (English)
- e: Introductory Letter: Priest (Latin)
- f: Introductory Letter: Priest (English)
- g: Introductory Letter: Bishop (Latin)
- h: Introductory Letter: Bishop (English)
- i: Introductory Letter: Cardinal (Latin)
- j: Introductory Letter: Cardinal (English)
- k: Interview Protocol
- l: Permission Letter: Priest (Latin)
- m: Permission Letter: Priest (English)
- n: Permission Letter: Bishop (Latin)
- o: Permission Letter: Bishop (English)
- p: Permission Letter: Cardinal (Latin)
- q: Permission Letter: Cardinal (English)

## Appendix II: *Calendar of Correspondences*

## Appendix III: *Archive of Correspondences*

- a: Recusatio et Testimonium: Pater Joseph Murphy
- b: Recusatio: Hoyos Dario Cardinal Castrillon
- b. ii: Versio Testimonii: Monsignor Camille Perl
- c: Recusatio et Testimonium: Monsignor Arthur Calkins
- d: Recusatio: Pater Jean-Marie Gervais
- e: Recusatio: Agostino Cardinal Cacciavillan
- f: Recusatio: Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger
- g: Acceptio: Pater Nikolaus Schöch

h: Response to Murphy  
i: Response to Perl  
j: Response to Gervais (Latin)  
k: Response to Gervais (English)  
l: Response to Calkins  
m: Response to Schöch  
n: Communiqué to Murphy  
o: Communiqué to Banach  
p: Second Communiqué to Banach  
q: Communiqué to Pavanetto (Latin)  
r: Communiqué to Pavanetto (English)  
s: Response to Monsignor Arthur Calkins (via e-mail)

## Appendix IV: *Responses to Survey*

a: Monsignor Arthur B. Calkins

## Appendix V: *Interview Transcriptions*

a: Pater Nikolaus Schöch  
b: Pater Reginaldus Foster